

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 29 OCTOBER 1901**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

TUESDAY, 29 OCTOBER, 1901.

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

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES.

ALLEGED INACCURACY—INTERPOLATION OF WORDS.

PROCEEDINGS OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

Mr. BELL (*Dalby*): As hon. members are aware a select committee has been appointed to inquire into an alleged inaccuracy of a report in *Hansard*; this select committee have prosecuted their inquiries to a certain degree, and in order to arrive at a conclusion, the members of this committee have summoned the hon. member for Oxley, Mr. S. Grimes, to attend before this select committee to give evidence. The hon. member for Oxley has declined to appear before this select committee, and it therefore becomes my duty, as chairman of this select committee, to report the matter to the House. The members of this committee desire the hon. member for Oxley to attend and give evidence.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. A. Rutledge, *Maranoa*): I beg to give notice that to-morrow I will move—

That Samuel Grimes, Esq., member for Oxley, do attend before the select committee on an alleged inaccuracy in *Hansard*, and give evidence at No. 3 Committee-room, on Thursday, 31st October, at 2.15 p.m.

Mr. BELL: I ask the permission of the House to make a statement with regard to the notice of motion which the Attorney-General has just given.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BELL: If I have the permission of the House—

The SPEAKER: As a matter of order, it would be quite irregular to discuss a motion of which notice had only just been given.

Mr. BELL: With the permission of the House, I would like to point out that this is new procedure. If any hon. member objects to my doing so, of course I cannot proceed.

The SPEAKER: I am quite unaware of the nature of the statement which the hon. member wishes to make, but I would point out again that the hon. member will be out of order in making any comment on the motion of which the Attorney-General has just given notice.

Mr. BELL: I wish to make a statement in reference to the report which I have just made to the House.

The SPEAKER: I have already pointed out that it would be irregular to discuss the motion of which notice has been given. It is for the House to signify its pleasure whether the hon. member shall be heard.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BELL: I wish to say that in making the report that I have just made to the House, I, as chairman of the committee, was instructed to make that report. The proper procedure, when an intimation of this kind is made to the House, is—as I think you, Sir, know from the researches you have recently made on the matter—for the leader of the House to make a motion that the hon. member do attend and give evidence before the select committee. In this case an exception has been made in favour of the hon. member for Oxley, who desires that some notice should be given him, in order that he may give reasons why the motion should not be agreed to. I, as chairman of this select committee, have agreed to a postponement, but in order to protect the interest of select committees in the future, when a recalcitrant witness is summoned, I hope that this will not be taken as a precedent, but that the leader of the House will forthwith, without notice, move that he attend in his place to give evidence.

### QUESTIONS.

#### CREATION OF NEW OFFICES.

Mr. JENKINSON (*Wide Bay*) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. The number of new offices created during the last ten years with a salary of £300 or upwards per year?
2. The names of the officers appointed.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. A. Rutledge, *Maranoa*): I would ask the hon. member to move for a return for this information. I find on going into the matter that it will embrace too much material to be included in an answer to a question, and if the hon. member will move for a return to-morrow, the Government will allow it to go as formal.

Mr. JENKINSON gave notice accordingly.

#### THE LINDON BATES DREDGES.

Mr. JENKINSON asked the Chief Secretary—

1. Did an engineer of the Harbours and Rivers Department, in an official report, strongly express his disbelief in the suitability of the Lindon Bates class of dredge for work in Queensland waters, and further urge that someone should be sent on a tour of inspection through America and England before giving any order or signing any contract?
2. If so, will he lay the report on the table of the House?
3. Is it his intention to institute a full inquiry into the working of the dredge, and their efficiency, or otherwise, to carry out the work they were purchased for?

The TREASURER (Hon. T. B. Cribb, *Ipswich*) replied—

1. No. In an unofficial report in October, 1897, one engineer did suggest to the Portmaster that he should

be sent to England and America to inquire into dredges generally; but at the time he knew nothing about the Lindon Bates Dredge.

2 and 3. The working of the two dredges is now undergoing the closest scrutiny.

### PRICKLY PEAR SELECTIONS BILL.

#### THIRD READING.

On the motion of Mr. BELL (*Dalby*), this Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Council for their concurrence.

### FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

#### INTRODUCTION IN COMMITTEE.

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

That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Factories and Shops Act of 1900.

Mr. McDONNELL (*Fortitude Valley*) knew that it was rather unusual to rise at that stage to refer to a matter of that sort, but he would like to ask the House if he could give him some information about the Bill. He would not have taken that action were it not that an advance copy of the Bill had been promised him by the Premier, and also by the Home Secretary, before the Bill was laid on the table of the House. He understood that a copy had been handed to Mr. Grimes, representing the one-man shopkeepers—

The HOME SECRETARY: No.

Mr. McDONNELL: And the other section of the shopkeepers in Brisbane, and, considering that, the least they could ask at the present time was that the Home Secretary should offer a little information with regard to the provisions of the Bill. The hon. gentleman would remember that, when he had waited on him in connection with the matter, he had asked him—not as a member of Parliament, but in the interests of a very large number of people outside who were opposed to any amendment of the Act—that, before doing anything in the direction of doing away with the Saturday half-holiday, which had been of benefit to a large number of people, and, in view of the strong feeling in opposition to that outside, the Government would give those people an opportunity of going through the Bill and make some suggestions—at all events of expressing their opinions, as they had had an opportunity of doing before the principal Act was introduced. Now, the Premier, at the deputation that had waited on him about a week ago, promised publicly that a copy of the Bill would be handed to him (Mr. McDonnell) before it was made public. He spoke to the Home Secretary afterwards, and the hon. gentleman seemed to agree. He did not accuse the hon. gentleman of breaking his promise. It was evident that the Bill had been pushed on in a great hurry. The forces behind the Government had forced them, evidently, to bring in the Bill, at all events before it was expected; and the result was that those who were deeply interested in the measure had had no opportunity of seeing the Bill or of making suggestions which might modify the opposition which it would meet outside.

Mr. KEOGH: It should have been brought in long ago.

Mr. McDONNELL: He would like to have some information from the Home Secretary as to the provisions of the Bill, as it was only fair that under the circumstances they should have some explanation at that stage, because, if the Bill was

what had been forecast, it would be received with very great regret, and would be a very great disappointment to thousands of people throughout Queensland.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. KEOGH: Not true.

Mr. McDONNELL: He thought it was not fair that he should make any further comments—

The HOME SECRETARY: Hear, hear!

Mr. McDONNELL: Further than to ask the hon. gentleman to give them a little information with regard to the provisions of the Bill.

The HOME SECRETARY took it that the reason why Bills of that sort were introduced in committee was, not that their principles should be discussed, but that, if there was any objection to a Bill of that kind being introduced, it might be stated. There were many inequalities and little frictions which had occurred in connection with the administration of the Factories and Shops Act of last session since it became law. That was inevitable in a measure of that kind. There were a great many persons who had felt that the provisions of the Act operated very severely on them, and it was a matter of notoriety that there had been very considerable agitation for an amendment of the Act in regard to several matters. There had been a largely-signed petition presented to the House asking for an amendment, and there had been a petition *per contra* presented by the hon. member himself. There had been numerous deputations, large and small, waiting on the Premier, some asking for an amending Bill, and some asking that it be not introduced, and that if it were introduced the objectors' views might be duly considered. So far as it was possible for a Minister to obtain the views of the people holding conflicting opinions in regard to the subject, that opportunity had been amply afforded. The hon. member had complained that an advance copy of the Bill had not been furnished to him; he also mentioned that such an advance copy had been furnished to those who had been advocating the Bill and their representatives. That was not so. Nobody had seen the Bill except members of the Government, and only the Attorney-General and himself had seen the complete Bill, because it only came from the Government Printing Office this morning between 11 and 12 o'clock in its complete form. As to its being forced on, he had been constantly asked during the last month when it was coming on, and the Premier, in reply to questions in the House, had said it would be brought on at the earliest possible date, and this was the earliest possible date. Every consideration had been given to the views so exhaustively expressed by deputations and petitioners who had laid their views before the Premier and himself. It was proposed to deal in the Bill principally with the question of early closing. That was the real reason why the Bill had been introduced, but the opportunity was taken of amending certain matters which in working out the administration of the Act had been found to be inconvenient and to require amendment.

Mr. McDONNELL: Do you alter the principle of the present Act in any way?

The HOME SECRETARY: So far as the methods to be adopted for arriving at the particular days upon which shops should close in certain districts were concerned, there would be some alteration.

Hon. A. S. COWLEY: Are you going to trust the people?

The HOME SECRETARY: They were going to trust some of them; they never trust

them all. Even the Labour party did not trust the people; they only trusted a certain section of the people. He did not wish it to be taken as a precedent—going somewhat into detail on a Bill when it was not before hon. members—but he would say he believed the right to a half-holiday and early closing on five days in the week would be continued to be conserved to all employees, and that the Bill, if adopted, would press very much more lightly upon certain employers than the present Act did.

Mr. McDONNELL: What about the Saturday half-holiday?

The HOME SECRETARY: He was not going to be drawn into a discussion of details. The hon. member would have ample opportunity to discuss the Bill on the second reading, and he would have ample opportunity of discussing the details when in committee. That a large and important section of the community desired that some alteration should be made in the present law on the subject was undoubted; therefore he trusted that there would be no further opposition to the Bill at this stage. With regard to the suggestion of an implied if not actual promise that copies of the Bill should be handed to certain advocates for and against the Bill in advance, his opinion was that it was a practice which had crept into being and which was not altogether a good one. He thought that when the Government brought down a measure, it was quite right that they should obtain all possible information; but he thought the House was entitled to the first view of a Bill when its ultimate form had been arrived at by the Government or the member who proposed to introduce it.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: That was a broad principle which should not be lightly departed from, and so far as he would be able, that would be the course of action which he would adopt in the future.

Mr. McDONNELL: He did not want to prolong this discussion, but the opening remarks of

the Home Secretary were his justification for rising to speak. The

hon. gentleman said that if the principles of this Bill were not of a kind that were acceptable, this would be the stage to oppose the measure. The Home Secretary had not given very much information about the Bill—in fact he had not gone any further than telling them that the principle of the principal Act would not be departed from, except with regard to the Saturday half-holiday poll.

The HOME SECRETARY: I did not say that. I did not mention the poll.

Mr. McDONNELL: He had asked the hon. gentleman what were the principles of the Bill which would be departed from, and the hon. gentleman said the method of selecting the half-holiday. Reading between the lines of what the Home Secretary said, it was evident that this Bill was brought in to meet the wishes of a certain noisy section—

Mr. KEOGH: I deny that. You are the most noisy of the whole lot. (Laughter.)

Mr. McDONNELL: He could give the hon. gentleman the credit of being the force behind the Government which had induced the Government to bring in this Bill, which he feared would be the means of undoing one of the best pieces of social legislation which had ever been put on the statute-books of Queensland. If the provisions of this Bill were such as he inferred they were from the remarks of the Home Secretary, they would be justified in not allowing it to go any further, because not only were the members of southern constituencies in favour of this Act, but wherever a poll had been taken, and wherever the people had been consulted, they had expressed their desire to abide by that Act. For

himself he felt justified in protesting, and protesting very strongly, against any alteration of that measure at the present time. He understood from the latter portion of the Home Secretary's remarks that it was not his intention in the future to consult persons interested in measures under consideration.

The HOME SECRETARY: I did not say that.

Mr. McDONNELL: He did not wish to misrepresent the hon. gentleman, but he understood the hon. gentleman to say that he did not intend that any advance copies of measures dealing with any questions should be forwarded to parties who were interested in them before they were placed on the table of the House, but that the Government intended to take the whole responsibility of not only the principles, but of the details of those measures. Up to this particular Bill he believed persons interested in Bills outside had been consulted and their suggestions embodied. Indeed, it was generally accepted outside that some of the most important measures that had been introduced into the House this session had been largely drafted outside by interested parties. The Home Secretary must recognise that when he was bringing in the principal Act he received a good deal of assistance from outside.

The HOME SECRETARY: I got a good deal of assistance in connection with this measure, and particularly from you.

Mr. McMASTER: It was only you and the Home Secretary who passed it through the House last time.

Mr. McDONNELL: He hoped the hon. member would not deny the part he took in another place in introducing into the Act a provision which had been undoubtedly of great benefit to the shop assistants in Queensland. He hoped the hon. member would fight as strenuously now in favour of the Saturday half-holiday as he did on that occasion. Under the circumstances it was only fair that the Home Secretary should have given them more information about this Bill. He did not wish the hon. gentleman to take any unusual course, and he could only regret that the hon. gentleman had not seen his way to follow out the lines that he adopted before, or, at all events, to carry out the promise that was made publicly by the Premier. If he had done so, he might have relied upon the same secrecy being observed by those to whom the draft of the measure was entrusted as was observed before. As he had not done so, he could only say that if the Bill was what he was afraid it was, he and every member with whom he was associated would do their part to prevent it being passed. For himself he protested against the amendment of an Act, in the administration of which they had not had ten months of practical experience.

The HOME SECRETARY: He wished to put himself right. He had not said that he would not consult people outside in connection with any legislation that he might hereafter introduce. All he had said was that when a Bill was finally drafted, and finally agreed upon by the Government, the first body that was entitled to know its contents was the House. When the measure was introduced members would be able to get a copy with their papers in the morning. He thought that that was the correct way of dealing with such matters. But in the earlier stages of the preparation of a Bill, they ought to consult with those who would be able to give valuable information, and probably might give them, in confidence, a draft of the measure. Both sides of this question had been most exhaustively set forth, and the submission to both sides of the Bill as finally adopted by the Cabinet would tend only to delay the measure.

The only alterations that could be made in the Bill were those made in committee after it had passed its second reading.

Mr. CURTIS (*Rockhampton*) had received a communication from Rockhampton asking him to strenuously oppose any amendment of the present Act.

Hon. A. S. COWLEY: Of any kind?

Mr. CURTIS: Just so; but he had replied that he must see the Bill first. An agitation had been going on in Rockhampton recently to have the afternoon holiday observed on Wednesday instead of Saturday. A poll was taken, and those who advocated the Wednesday half-holiday were defeated by a majority of something like 1,000 votes. So that there was no doubt that in Rockhampton, at all events, the consensus of opinion was in favour of the Saturday half-holiday. It had been pointed out that with the Saturday half-holiday the employees obtained one continuous holiday from Saturday afternoon to Monday morning, which was a really substantial benefit. On the other hand, it was said that the Wednesday half-holiday would be a break in the week, and be of no material advantage to the employees. He was bound to say that if the Bill made it optional to close on Wednesday or Saturday afternoon it would meet with a considerable amount of opposition, and he believed it would eventually lead to a breaking down of the holiday arrangements altogether. He knew, of course, that the present Act had operated very harshly on the small shopkeepers who did not employ any assistants, and if the Bill proposed to exempt the small shopkeepers it might be worthy of a considerable amount of consideration at the hands of the House.

The HOME SECRETARY: Can we not discuss that on the second reading?

Mr. CURTIS: He had nothing further to say, except that if the Bill proposed to make the half-holiday optional he was afraid it was bound to work unsatisfactorily.

Mr. KEOGH (*Rosewood*) had to congratulate the Home Secretary on the stand he had taken in this matter. He did not see what right any person had to a copy of the Bill, and particularly the hon. member who had started business lately with a large number of assistants. What right had he to a copy of the Bill, to put into the hands of his assistants, when other parties had never asked for the same privilege? He had never asked for a copy of the Bill, and he was just as much entitled to it as the hon. member. He thought it was quite time enough to discuss the measure when it got into committee.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): The hon. member for Rockhampton, Mr. Curtis, had pointed to the magnificent answer given in Rockhampton to the question referred to the ratepayers, which resulted in a majority of nearly 1,000 in favour of the Saturday afternoon half-holiday.

Mr. KEOGH: What was the answer given on Charters Towers and Bundaberg?

Mr. LESINA: It appeared according to a leading article in the *Rockhampton Bulletin* that those voting for the Saturday afternoon half-holiday numbered 1,457, and those against it 459. The miserable minority of the opponents of the Saturday half-holiday showed that the agitation was largely confined to a small section of the people who were making a lot of noise because they had got money and a section of the Press at their back. Apparently they were able to influence the Government, but when it came to a vote of the artisans and labourers and shopkeepers, and assistants, and even the country people, they were defeated. It was thought that the country people would vote against the Saturday half-holiday, but not they.

In the Gogango and Fitzroy divisions, which included the country, there was a big majority in favour of the existing provision of the Act. The moral to his mind was this: A small, busy section of night owls and other persons who were dissatisfied with recent legislation had agreed to create a great deal of noise, and the result had been that the Government had introduced an amending measure under which it was proposed to interfere with a very beneficial Act which had been received with acclamation all over the country. He could assure the hon. gentleman that as far as he was concerned, even if the matter was not a party question, he would do all he could to prevent the passage of a measure of that kind. It was a step backward and not forward.

The HOME SECRETARY: See what the Bill is before you speak about it.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had come to a resolution, which was agreed to.

#### FIRST READING.

On the motion of the HOME SECRETARY, the Bill was read a first time, and the second reading made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

#### SUPPLY.

##### RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

##### HOME SECRETARY'S DEPARTMENT—CHARITABLE ALLOWANCES.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £70,878 be granted for charitable allowances. The chief increases in the vote were in connection with the Jubilee Sanatorium for Consumptives at Dalby. The salaries there were set down at £798 and the contingencies at £1,200, which were previously paid for out of the general hospital vote. There was a total increase of £1,998. Against that there were certain decreases, which by general economy it was proposed to save. The Inspector-General of Hospitals and Charitable Institutions was set down for £200, as against £800 last year—a saving there of £600; and in the travelling expenses there was a saving of £50. Then it was considered unnecessary to grant £200 this year for the Female Refuge, Brisbane, and in the vote for hospitals generally there was a saving of £2,000, making a total decrease of £2,850. That being set against the increase of £1,998, left a net decrease of £852. He would be glad to give hon. members any information they desired.

Mr. BROWNE (*Croydon*): There were two or three items which he wished some information on. First of all with regard to the Inspector-General, he believed it had been said outside that this office was practically done away with.

The HOME SECRETARY: No.

Mr. BROWNE understood that this officer, Dr. Hare, was in charge of the Incurable Hospital at Diamantina.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes; but he holds the two positions.

Mr. BROWNE: Last year a similar question was asked, and the hon. gentleman said he thought that Dr. Hare was the right man in the right place. But he wished to refer to a much more serious item, and that was the £2,000 decrease in the vote for hospitals generally. But that was not the true decrease, for he found on referring to the Auditor-General's report that the amount last year voted for hospitals was £76,610 15s. 9d., and this year only £63,000 was asked for, making a decrease of £13,610. He did not know whether the hospitals could get on with that, or whether there was any amount going to be put on the Supplementary Estimates; but considering the

depressed state of the times, he thought there would be a bigger tax on hospitals this year than last year. It would therefore be better to economise in other ways than in the vote for hospitals. Of course the endowment depended upon the amount of public subscriptions, and seeing the number of unemployed and the distress actually existing, he did not think that the same amount of subscriptions would be forthcoming this year as were forthcoming last year. He thought every member of the Committee should be prepared to increase the endowment to hospitals, and this might be especially necessary in the West, where, owing to the drought, they might not be able to raise sufficient funds to carry on. He was afraid that if the vote was largely reduced a great deal of suffering would have to go unrelieved.

HON. G. THORN (*Fassifern*) said he was going to raise the very same question that had been raised by the hon. member for Croydon. He thought it was a great mistake to curtail the vote to hospitals. But he principally rose to discover whether any cures had been effected at the consumptive hospital at Dalby. His opinion was that consumptives would not be cured at Dalby,

as the climate was too subject to [4.30 p.m.] extremes of temperature. Medical

authorities throughout the world were agreed that places suited for the cure of consumptives must not be subject to such extremes. He thought the hospital should be shifted to the coast, where the temperature was uniform. He could find a splendid place for a hospital in a dry belt to the north of Brisbane. He did not wish to say one word against Dalby, or against the hon. member for Dalby, but he thought that the hospital might be used with great advantage for other purposes, as there were other diseases for which the climate of Dalby might be curative. He would like to know whether any cures had been effected, and what was the number of deaths at Dalby from consumption. He was quite sure they would die quicker at Dalby than in any other part of the colony. Brisbane itself was not a bad place for consumptives. He knew of people who had had to be carried here almost in the last stages of consumption, and yet they had recovered and lived for twenty or thirty years afterwards. If those people had gone to Dalby, however, the first winter would have killed them. He knew of cases in which people who had been sent to Dalby had died of consumption, while their mates, who were in about the same stage of the disease, came back to Brisbane and recovered, and were now living in Brisbane.

The HOME SECRETARY was pleased to say that the fears of the hon. member for Fassifern were not likely to be realised. Having regard to the fell disease which was treated in that institution, he considered the results so far were good. The number of patients resident in the sanatorium on 1st July was twenty-six, consisting of twelve women and fourteen men. Since then fifteen had been admitted, consisting of three women and twelve men. The patients dismissed during last quarter numbered thirteen—six women and seven men—of whom eight had been discharged cured.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: Having regard to the generally received opinion about the absolute fatality which ensued upon an attack of phthisis, those results justified the establishment of the institution.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GIVENS: It is a pity it was not built on higher ground, though.

The HOME SECRETARY: It was possible that a better site might have been found. That he was not in a position to say; but the results

were eminently satisfactory from his point of view as head of that department. In addition to those he had mentioned, another man was dismissed, the disease being *in statu quo*, probably having gone too far for the treatment to be of any value. It could not be said that the institution was a great drain upon the resources of the State. He thought it was economically managed.

Mr. JACKSON : Do all the patients pay ?

The HOME SECRETARY : He was not aware that any paid. There was provision for separate rooms, and perhaps some little additional privacy to those who chose to pay ; but, if any paid at all, it would only be one or two. As a rule, people who were able to pay did not go there. They preferred to go to Roma or Charleville and make their own arrangements for cure. With regard to the question of the hon. member for Croydon, he did not know how many hospitals Dr. Hare had inspected during the twelve months.

Mr. BROWNE : He has a very big tour, I know.

The HOME SECRETARY : Yes. He picked out the hospitals to visit in a judicious way. He recognised that it would be impossible for him to visit the whole of them and inspect them satisfactorily in twelve months, and he, therefore, in planning out his itinerary, made arrangements to visit those hospitals which were most important, being the larger hospitals, and involving a larger expenditure of public money than others, and also visits to which would occasion less delay than to those in far distant and isolated centres. In that way he had acquired a great deal of valuable information. He had reported in more or less detail in regard to each hospital visited, and had also furnished him (Mr. Foxton) with an annual report ; but, unfortunately, it was not received and read by him in sufficient time to enable him to lay it on the table before that vote came on for discussion. Indeed, the appendices had still to be attached. The annual report itself dealt largely with general topics, but the appendices would consist of abbreviations of the reports dealing with the individual hospitals. He hoped to be able to lay the report and the appendices on the table during the present week. He thought a considerable amount of saving would be effected in the general administration of the hospitals without in any way departing from the main principles which had hitherto guided the management of those institutions, and the information gained by Dr. Hare during his tour of inspection would stand good, possibly, for some little time. Under the circumstances, and having regard to the fact that only the hospitals of lesser importance had not been visited, as a rule, he consented to an alteration being made in the agreement under which Dr. Hare was working. The arrangement previously was that he was to give his services exclusively to the Government, and to receive £800 a year and travelling expenses ; but with Dr. Hare's report to go upon, he felt justified in modifying the arrangement to the extent that Dr. Hare should be allowed the right of private practice as a consulting physician and specialist, and that he should receive £200 a year as medical superintendent of the Diamantina Hospital for Chronic Diseases, and £200 a year as Inspector-General. That was the arrangement temporarily made with Dr. Hare. He was satisfied that the appointment of Dr. Hare was an excellent one. He was thoroughly conscientious and thoroughly imbued with the necessity for carrying on the charitable institutions in a thoroughly efficient manner with due regard to economy.

Mr. DUNSFORD (*Charters Towers*) : Hon. members were constantly besieged with applications from country towns in regard to con-

sumptives who wished to enter the Dalby Hospital. He believed, however, that it was confined exclusively to those who were in the early stages of consumption, and, if that was so, it would be well for the Home Secretary to make the fact generally known. He thought better results might be obtained if some place were provided by the Government in a healthy part of the colony where consumptives could be gathered together and receive treatment, instead of being treated in the wards of charitable institutions—a system which must tend to spread the disease. The moist atmosphere of Dunwich must tend to hasten the progress of the disease. There were any amount of spots in Queensland, especially in the North, where consumptives might have their lives prolonged, even if they could not be cured ; and provision should be made for the treatment of persons in the later stages of the disease, so that their sufferings might be alleviated and their lives prolonged, and the spread of the disease might be checked. This vote included an item of £3,500 for benevolent societies ; and he wished to draw attention to the fact that while some towns, such as Rockhampton and Toowoomba, received unconditional grants in connection with these societies, there were other towns where the grant was made conditional on a certain amount being raised locally. He did not know how the unconditional grant was obtained—whether by logrolling or otherwise—but he knew that in Charters Towers, where they had a benevolent society second to none in the colony, the Government grant was conditional on a certain amount being contributed locally. The society found great difficulty in carrying on at the present time owing to want of funds, and he wished to mention that the Premier promised a grant of £500—an unconditional grant—to enable them to build some more cottages. According to the *Northern Miner* of the 11th June, 1900, Mr. Dawson, then senior member for Charters Towers, introduced a deputation to the Premier, and Mrs. Plant, the head of the charitable organisation, laid her desires before the hon. gentleman. She asked for a special grant for the institution in order to erect a few more cottages, and she pointed out that Rockhampton received a yearly grant of £500. The Premier said that if this grant was made to Rockhampton it should be the same on the Towers, and he would see that it was placed on the Estimates if Mr. Dawson did not stonewall it. That was the report of what the Premier said, and he thought that promise should be fulfilled. He would ask the hon. gentleman, if possible, to carry it out. This association was doing a splendid work, but it was not in too good a position with regard to funds. The association in Toowoomba received a grant of £250, and that in Rockhampton £500. Surely Charters Towers, which had a population of 25,000, was entitled to be given a similar grant. He would also ask the Home Secretary for some information with regard to the Brisbane Charity Organisation Society. He noticed from its last printed balance-sheet that this society's total income was £182, of which £60 was contributed by the public, and £122 by the Government in the form of endowment, and the amount dispensed in relief was only £13, while £150 had been spent in salaries, and some small sums in rent, advertising, and commissions. He noticed that the Home Secretary was president of that society. Its mission apparently was to guide and assist other societies in giving relief. If spending £13 in relief was carrying out that mission, he did not think that this society would be very much assistance. If the Home Secretary said that it

was only an administrative society, and employed itself in getting information and making inquiries, he was of opinion that it was doing work which should be done by the Home Secretary's Department. If money could be found for a Brisbane society of this kind, where such a small percentage of its income was spent in relief, surely some money could be found for an organisation such as they had in Charters Towers, which spent every shilling received from the public and from the Government in charity.

The HOME SECRETARY: He supposed he must give the hon. member credit for speaking in ignorance of the subject, because otherwise he would have to make the uncharitable assumption that the hon. member was wilfully trying to mislead the Committee. He did not want to imply that at all. He wondered if the hon. member had read anything about the charitable organisations in the old country, or had taken the trouble to read the reports of the annual meetings of similar societies in Melbourne or Sydney. If he had, he had signally failed in his study if he had not perceived that they were doing excellent work. The society in Brisbane was working on the same lines, and nearly every society in and around the metropolis and in the neighbouring towns had associated with and recognised the good work that it was doing. It was a society established principally

[5 p.m.] for preventing the unworthy from receiving those donations of the generous public which ought to go into the pockets of the worthy.

Mr. LESINA: A Pecksniffian society.

The HOME SECRETARY: Well, he was not aware that the hon. member for Clermont contributed anything to benevolent societies.

Mr. LESINA: I manage to pay my debts.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Clermont is not in order in using language of that kind, which is of an offensive nature, to other hon. members.

Mr. LESINA: He made an offensive remark to me.

The HOME SECRETARY: If the hon. member ceased interjecting he would cease to reply. He had no desire to take the slightest notice of the hon. member, but when he made personal remarks he might be permitted to reply when under other circumstances he would take no notice of him.

Mr. LESINA: Your coachman is waiting at the door of Parliament House to be paid.

The HOME SECRETARY: That was a remark he would take notice of. He called attention to it, because it was the third time the hon. member had made it. Unfortunately for himself, he had not been able to afford the luxury of a coachman for five years, so that it was impossible that he could be kept waiting. The charge was one of those which probably the hon. member contributed to the *Worker*, which he did not read. It was only because the hon. member occupied a position in Parliament that he took notice of such a charge. It was mean in the highest degree to make such an allusion, because there was not the shadow of foundation in it.

Mr. LESINA: Advertise the fact in the *Street* at Government rates.

The HOME SECRETARY: Let him tell the hon. member that there was no person who had ever been in his employ who had not been paid to the last shilling, and if the hon. member or anyone else could prove that he had been anything but a good master he would forfeit any sum the hon. member liked to name, which he could afford, to the Brisbane Hospital. Every person who had ever been in his employ, and every person who had been connected with him in business would, he ventured to say, bear the same

testimony, and when the hon. member reached his age he hoped he would be able to invite anyone to come forward and bear the same testimony regarding himself. He apologised to the Committee for the digression, but he felt it necessary to take some notice of unworthy statements of that kind. He desired to point out that the Charity Organisation Society was run on exactly the same lines as the Melbourne society. There were something like 14,000 records in the hands of the Melbourne society, and they were of the greatest value, not only to the society itself, but to kindred societies all over Australia, in preventing the unworthy imposing on benevolent societies. For instance, one man who was discovered was a professional beggar, obtaining relief from two or three societies, and he went about in kid gloves and top hat, and drove about in hansom cabs.

Mr. GIVENS: He ought to have been put in gaol.

The HOME SECRETARY: He was not sure that he was not. However, the Brisbane society was extending its ramifications over the three divisions of Queensland, and it was hoped that the results attained would more than justify its existence. The hon. member had referred to the small amount of cash distributed by the society. That amount was merely given as casual assistance on Sunday, for instance, so that the applicants for relief might have something to tide them over until the distributing benevolent societies could be communicated with. That was the explanation of the matter, and he could assure the hon. member that he would find that this society had been doing a great deal of excellent work. Then with regard to the Charters Towers society—

Mr. DUNSFORD: They want £500.

The HOME SECRETARY: He knew that, but the proper solution of the difficulty was not in the mere giving of grants to the Charters Towers home, as in the case of Rockhampton, but in the remodelling of the whole system. The small benevolent home at Rockhampton was established many years ago, and it was always regarded as a branch of Dunwich, but for the sake of economy it had been managed by the benevolent society as a separate and distinct institution, and it had been subsidised in the ordinary way.

Mr. DUNSFORD: It gets £71 endowment and £500 grant.

The HOME SECRETARY: No. The benevolent society at Rockhampton received an endowment of £261 3s. 2d., and the Charters Towers society received £479 8s. 10d. That meant that in Charters Towers, a much larger sum was contributed than in Rockhampton, and they earned a larger endowment in consequence. The £500 for Rockhampton was for the benevolent asylum there, which was not managed directly by the Home Secretary, but by the benevolent society. It might be argued that the same arrangement might be made with the Charters Towers home, but in that case, a similar arrangement would have to be made with Townsville, because, Townsville was more in line with Rockhampton than Charters Towers was, and so a sort of off-side kind of benevolent asylums would have to be established. One had been established at Toowoomba, as a result of a promise made by the late Sir James Dickson when Premier, and it received a smaller grant than the Rockhampton home. He was bound to admit that having visited the benevolent cottages at Charters Towers they were entitled to the same treatment as was meted out to others, and he proposed to place them on the same footing with Rockhampton and Toowoomba. They should be branches

of Dunwich and Government benevolent institutions in the proper sense of the word. Possibly, if this year had been a fat one instead of a lean one, the Government could have placed the amount on the Estimates for the Charters Towers institution. But it was one thing to put a new amount on the Estimates and an entirely different thing to knock off amounts from institutions which had been successfully running, as a result of the endowment. These institutions were getting on very well as benevolent asylums, and he might say that a considerable number of the inmates of the Charters Towers asylum had been received into Dunwich—he thought fifty such applications were dealt with—he was not sure about the number—but he knew a large proportion of these inmates had been dealt with in this way, and to that extent this society had been relieved of the burden these people created.

Mr. TOLMIE (*Drayton and Toowoomba*) thought that each member of the Committee had a specific interest in the vote under discussion, and that, instead of this vote being diminished, it should be increased, and that there should be a proper distribution of this relief. He was very pleased to hear from the Home Secretary that the Jubilee Asylum at Dalby had succeeded in the last quarter in sending out eight patients who were thoroughly cured of consumption. The Queensland Government was to be congratulated on being the first Government in the Australian Commonwealth which had taken this matter up from a national point of view. In New South Wales and Victoria the matter of treating consumptive patients was exciting a great deal of interest, but it had been dealt with there more by private enterprise and municipal enterprise than by Government aid. The mayor of Sydney, when presiding at a meeting, complimented the Queensland Government with regard to this matter, and he said that he hoped the time was not far distant when the New South Wales Government would follow in the steps of Queensland. But, at the same time, he (Mr. Tolmie) thought the Queensland Government might have gone further in the matter. They had taken this step five or six years ago, but since that they had seemed to remain inactive. The Queensland Government was a progressive Government—although some of his friends on the opposite side did not think so—and he hoped they would still deserve the name of a progressive Government; and that they would go further and adopt some of the plans which had been adopted in the old country, so as to stamp out this disease. Under the municipality of Sydney, a house to house visitation was made, and where persons were found to be suffering from consumption, the people in the house were asked whether they would allow the place to be fumigated, in order to stamp out the disease. Perhaps the Queensland Government would act in that way in the future. He was sorry that the Inspector-General did not give annual reports like other officials on this matter, for this was one which was exciting a great deal of interest. He saw that the Inspector-General was still retained at £200, but if he did not travel, he thought he would cease to be a proper inspector. He should travel from institution to institution and see that Government money was properly spent, and he should report periodically whether the methods adopted were good ones. But, if he simply remained in an office in Brisbane, and drew up his report from the various reports that were sent in to him, he was afraid that they could not regard that as a very satisfactory report. In speaking some few weeks ago on the motion of the hon. member for Kennedy with regard to increasing the allowance to old people outside Dunwich, a remark fell

from the Home Secretary that he would have taken exception to at the time but that he thought he could better serve the interests of the motion of the hon. member for Kennedy by not speaking on that occasion. The hon. gentleman made some reference to the benevolent institutions at Rockhampton and Toowoomba, and said that they were uneconomically managed.

The HOME SECRETARY: Did I say that? I did not mean to do so.

Mr. TOLMIE: The hon. gentleman will find his remarks on page 1108 of *Hansard*. He did not know how the institution at Rockhampton was managed, but the Brodribb Home at Toowoomba was as economically managed as Dunwich. The report of the Brodribb Home, which was now before him, showed that the total cost of management last year was only something like £69, £39 being the salary paid to the matron, and £33 16s. being paid in wages. The daily cost was 1s. 0½d. per day per inmate, or a cost of 7s. 5½d. per week. But in that cost of management there was a certain proportion of the expenditure due to the erection of additional accommodation which would have reduced the actual cost of management—based on the same lines as Dunwich—to something like 6s. 3d. or 6s. 4d. per week. That was almost exactly the cost of management in Dunwich. So that it was hardly fair to say that the Brodribb Home was managed in an uneconomical manner.

The HOME SECRETARY: I did not say that. I will read you what I did say.

Mr. TOLMIE: He could scarcely object to the hon. member for Charters Towers taking exception to a grant of £250 being made to the Brodribb Home, but he was sure that, if the hon. member visited the institution, he would see that the money was well spent, and would very much prefer to see £500 or £1,000 spent in the same manner.

Mr. DUNSFORD: I did not take exception to it.

Mr. TOLMIE: Up to the present time the money at the disposal of the Brodribb Home had been quite sufficient to enable it to defray all expenses, but gradually it was attracting a number of old people from places as far west as Cunnamulla, who desired to go there rather than to Dunwich, so that the expenditure was becoming larger every year, although the average was being kept down. He might say that, although last year the daily cost was 1s. 0½d., the previous year it was 1s. 1d. per head, so that it would be seen that they were keeping down expenditure to the lowest point commensurate with the good treatment of the patients. He believed they were better treated than the inmates of Dunwich, especially the old ladies, who could enjoy their cup of tea five times a day. They were served with a cup of tea at 7 o'clock in the morning before they turned out of bed, and such treatment was appreciated by those old people. The building itself was pleasantly situated, and since the last visit of the Home Secretary, when he had declared the institution open, great improvements had been made about the place. It had now a beautiful garden and every comfort of a home. In addition to all the liberty that it was possible for the old people to enjoy, they were exceedingly well treated inside the institution; and, rather than do away with such institutions, the Home Secretary should encourage their foundation in every town in Queensland, so that the old people could spend their remaining years among their friends. Like the leader of the Opposition, he regretted that it had been found necessary to reduce the amount paid to hospitals by £2,000. The cost of hospital management was bound to increase yearly. He was not altogether in favour of Government grants for everything, but he did believe in hospitals and similar

institutions being supported by the Government; and, if all other grants went by the board it was a noble work for the Government to take care of the infirm and the sick. He hoped that the circumstances of the State would be much better next year, and that if an increase was made, the Home Secretary would see his way to increase rather than reduce the grant to the Brodribb Home.

The HOME SECRETARY thought he would have to do something for Charters Towers first. The hon. member must have misunderstood him. He felt confident, when the hon. member mentioned the matter, that he had not stated in the bald way in which the hon. member put it that the cost of the Rockhampton benevolent institution and of the Brodribb Home was uneconomical. He felt certain that he was comparing the cost of management per head in the large institutions with that in the small ones, and that turned out to be correct. By way of personal explanation, he wished to read exactly what he had said, as he should be very sorry that the good people of Toowoomba should imagine that he had disparaged the Brodribb Home, which was an admirable institution. What he had said—he thought in reply to the hon. member for Kennedy—was—

I understood the hon. gentleman to advocate the establishment of small benevolent asylums, such as exist at Rockhampton and Toowoomba.

Mr. JACKSON: Throw the burden on the district.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member must be aware that a more uneconomic method of dealing with this question could not be devised than that. I do not desire to say anything disparaging, or to minimise the good work that is being done in Toowoomba by the Brodribb Home or any other such small asylums of that character, or to disparage the Charters Towers Home, which, however, is scarcely on all-fours. I only wish to emphasise the fact that the congregating of large numbers in asylums of this sort, as is done in Dunwich, necessarily tends to minimise the cost of maintenance, because the management has far less expense per head than otherwise; that is, than if we had a large number of small asylums.

He was speaking of a large number of small asylums—each with its own management and staff, and separate buildings—as distinguished from large institutions, in which perhaps 100 times the number of patients could be accommodated.

Mr. JACKSON (*Kennedy*): As Charters Towers was about the centre of the Kennedy electorate, he took an interest in whatever concerned that town. It was unfortunate that the Premier had not been able to redeem his promise with regard to this grant of £500, because that hon. gentleman, like any other honourable man, would endeavour to keep a promise he had made, whether it was made privately or publicly. If there was to be any discrimination, in his opinion North Queensland—and particularly goldfield towns—should be given the benefit. There was the expense of sending people from Charters Towers as far as Dunwich; there was the fact that mining was a hazardous occupation—in Victoria there was special provision in connection with old age pensions that men following mining need not arrive at the age of sixty-five before making application for the pension; and there was also the fact that Charters Towers was the largest town in North Queensland. For those reasons, he thought Charters Towers should have had special consideration. He did not want to discount what the hon. member for Toowoomba had said about the Brodribb Home; but he could say that the Charters Towers Benevolent Asylum was quite as well managed as the Brodribb Home. He agreed with the hon. member that such asylums should be encouraged instead of having the numbers at Dunwich

increasing year by year. Apart from the question of expense, which he thought was about 1s. per head less at Dunwich—

The HOME SECRETARY: A shilling a head would not represent the difference.

Mr. JACKSON: He did not care if it was 2s. a head—the humane point of view should be considered. Those old people should not be taken from the places where they had lived so long, and where they had formed acquaintances. Of course, the old age allowances should be applied as far as possible, but it could not be applied in all cases. He understood the Home Secretary to say he would put Charters Towers, Toowoomba, and Rockhampton on the same footing in future with regard to these special grants, but he did not know whether the hon. gentleman intended to develop a special system of grants to different centres.

The HOME SECRETARY: I said I hoped for the establishment of larger institutions in the three large divisions of the colony as branches of Dunwich, and managed on the same lines.

Mr. JACKSON: That was satisfactory as far as it went. He recognised that the Government could not grant a subsidy for a benevolent asylum in every little town; but there were certain large centres to which the system of making special grants might be applied, and he was not sure whether in the long run it might not be found an advantage even on the economical side, because most of those asylums were very economically managed by committees and honorary officials. It was satisfactory to know from the Home Secretary that a special grant would be made to Charters Towers in the near future, and he hoped the time would not be far distant when the finances were in such a condition as to allow the grant to be made.

Mr. BELL (*Dalby*): Before this went to a vote, he would like to say one or two words in agreement with the suggestion made by the hon. member for Charters Towers with regard to having some establishment or institution in which aged persons, who were afflicted with lung disease, could be gathered together instead of perpetuating the present system of having them indiscriminately distributed over the various Government institutions in the different parts of the colony. He rather thought that in some report by an expert there had been a suggestion made to that effect, and whenever the finances of the colony would allow it, he thought it would be a very good thing to do. He was glad to hear the official remarks that fell from the Home Secretary as to the very good work that the sanatorium at Dalby had been effecting in making cures in cases of phthisis. That had proved the remedial properties of the Dalby climate upon lung diseases. When the hon. gentleman was casting about with a view to establishing such an institution as had been suggested, he (Mr. Bell) did not think he would find a better locality than the foothills of the Bunya Mountains. When the Home Secretary, who had the appointment of the location of the Dalby Sanatorium, was good enough to ask his advice on the subject, he recommended the present site, and the remarks of the present Home Secretary had shown that that advice had not been bad, but if anything the foothills of the Bunya Mountains offered even a better climate.

The HOME SECRETARY: He had forgotten for the moment the remarks of the hon. member for Charters Towers with reference to the establishment of a place for chronic consumptives. He would now quote one of the recommendations of the Queensland Society for the Prevention of Consumption contained in the report of the executive committee of that society. This society consisted for the most

part of medical men who had made a special study of this particular disease. There were Dr. Francis, Dr. Hardie, Dr. Hirschfeld, Dr. Love, Dr. Taylor, and Dr. Thomson, and Messrs. Thynne, Groom, and Pound; and he noticed that he had the honour of being one of its vice-presidents. One of their recommendations was the establishment of a hospital in Brisbane, and the erection of a detached building within the grounds of each country hospital for the use of chronic consumptives. They thought that that was the proper way, and that was carrying out the ideas of the hon. member for Kennedy about detaining these people among their own friends rather than isolating them in some distant institution. It rested with the local hospitals, wherever they could find the means, to follow out that suggestion, and erect buildings for the use of such sufferers.

Mr. JACKSON: I do not think any cases should be sent to Dunwich.

The HOME SECRETARY: The Government were doing the best they could. They had established a hospital for incurables in the Diamantina Buildings, and he thought there were a fair proportion of consumptives there. There was also a sum on the Estimates for the extension of that hospital, not the extension of the buildings, but the adaptation of the remainder of the buildings to the uses of the hospital, part only being used at present owing to motives of economy. This would take a considerable amount of money, but he hoped they would be able to proceed with it shortly. The climate of Brisbane was, at any rate, no worse for consumptives than that of Dunwich, and the difficulty of dealing with chronic cases outside of Brisbane could be met if the various hospitals would erect small detached buildings in their own grounds for the use of those cases. That would enable the patients to remain among their friends and in surroundings they were used to, and his view of the matter was that if a man knew that he was suffering from a disease which had reached an incurable stage, he would rather live among his own friends and relations, even if by so doing he sacrificed a month or two of life. The fact that the sufferer was among his relatives and those who were dear to him was of very much more importance to him than a month or two of life when he knew that in any event he was doomed.

Mr. BELL pointed out that a great many medical men were of opinion that, even if a man could not hope to recover, his symptoms were very much modified, and the painful nature of his disease alleviated, by residence in a climate which was suitable for the treatment of his consumption. He could not quite agree with the Home Secretary when he recommended the coast hospitals to erect separate buildings for the use of chronic consumptives. This State, which had done its work very well in regard to this disease, should continue its good work and provide some establishment for people who were in an advanced state of consumption, and the foothills of the Bunya Mountains was the best locality he knew for that purpose. He was also glad to see that the prejudice which had existed in some parts of the country with regard to establishments of this kind was rapidly passing away, and statistics could be gathered from the continent of Europe, where sanatoriums of this type were very numerous, showing that the death rate among the general population in the neighbourhood of those establishments was, on the whole, less than it was in other parts of the country. So that the prejudice that had existed was not well founded.

Mr. BROWNE: Every hon. member would admit the truth of what had fallen from the hon. member for Toowoomba, Mr. Tolmie, that the House and the Government of Queensland had

done a good bit towards the support of hospitals and that sort of thing. Hon. members on both sides had never been sparing in voting money for hospitals and charitable institutions, and for education. The Home Secretary, in referring to the hospitals for chronic cases, suggested that the country hospitals should put up small buildings for the use of consumptives. He (Mr. Browne) thought that our whole system of endowment of hospitals was wrong. A far more fair and equitable system, and one which would be more beneficial to the people of the country, as well as to the unfortunate inmates, would be for the Government to take full charge of all the charitable institutions and hospitals. There was a very large section of the community who would never give a farthing to charity unless they were compelled. Hospital committees were continually at work begging for subscriptions and getting up entertainments, and those who subscribed most liberally had, in addition, to put their hands in their pockets as taxpayers and subscribe over again. He believed in the Government taking the whole responsibility, and putting the entire burden upon the taxpayers, so that it might be more equally distributed. He hoped the day would come—and he did not believe it was far distant—when such a policy as that would be pursued. Under present conditions charitably disposed persons had their hands in their pockets perpetually, while those who refused to contribute were the first in their need to demand assistance from charitable institutions and hospitals. The question was a big one, and he would not occupy more time in discussing it, but he thought there was a great deal to be said in favour of the State taking over the entire responsibility in connection with charitable institutions of all sorts.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*) had asked one or two questions of the Home Secretary in reference to benevolent societies, and he now wanted to make a few remarks in connection with them. In looking over the report to which the hon. member for Charters Towers had referred, he found that the Charity Organisation Society had distributed £13 in relief at a cost of £159. The expenditure showed £115 on salaries and commission, £17 on rent, £18 on fares and advertising, £9 on printing, and there was a bank balance of £11. The income for the year was £182, with only £13 spent in relief.

Hon. E. B. FORREST: They should have spent nothing on relief. They are not there for that purpose, and you know it.

Mr. LESINA: What were they there for? The organisation seemed to be a body of Pecksniffs and Chadbands who pried into the affairs of Mary Ann Jones and Bill Smith. There was too much of that kind of thing. All charitable institutions ought to be under the control of the State, and all modern writers on the subject had concluded that charitable institutions would never be upon a satisfactory basis until they were exclusively governed by the State. Half of the pettifogging societies round Brisbane were maintained by the Government, and yet they never produced a balance-sheet. He would like to see on the table of the House the balance-sheets of the hospitals, and refuges, and maternity homes, and all the little squalid institutions which lived on public money—institutions composed of asthmatic persons who had nothing to do but probe into the secrets of poor unfortunate people whom they termed the "deserving poor." He found that the charity organisation, which he preferred to term "the Dives charity organisation," received £3 17s. out of the public last month, and investigated the cases of twenty-two Lazaruses, consigning eight of them into outer darkness. It asked the

public not to give indiscriminately in the street or elsewhere, as it only fostered beggars; its contention being that the best medicine for the beggar was work. He found that on the committee were Bishop Webber, whose see, apparently, was the ocean; the Rev. Roberts, who howled for black labour through the columns of the *Courier*; S. W. Brooks, an ex-kanaka missionary, who put in his spare time cursing the Labour party in a column allotted to that purpose in the *Telegraph*; the Rev. Whale, who got up on the platform and yelled for the kanaka; and the head of the Salvation Army. That was the kind of institution which received money out of the public Treasury, and which never showed a balance-sheet. How did they know what such institutions did with public money? That kind of professional philanthropy was played out.

The HOME SECRETARY: The balance-sheet is published for your information.

Mr. LESINA: That was the only balance-sheet that he had seen.

Hon. E. B. FORREST: If you subscribed you would get one.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: He strongly objected on principle to subscribing to any society that was controlled by professional philanthropists of any type or kidney. £3,500 was on the Estimates for benevolent societies, unspecified, to be distributed at will of the Home Secretary. A fair example of those institutions was the female refuge. He had recently asked for information as to the amount of public funds which that institution had drawn, and had been told that £6,430 had gone to it in thirty years.

The CHAIRMAN: I call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that there is no vote for that institution on the Estimates.

Mr. LESINA: Did the Government then want to prevent discussion? He maintained that he was discussing an institution which received last year from the Government £200 of public money.

The CHAIRMAN: I already ruled the hon. member out of order in discussing that institution.

Mr. LESINA regretted that the Chairman had ruled him out of order in discussing [7 p.m.] that matter, and he would let it go for the present. He would like to refer to the Brisbane Hospital, which he believed was a very well-conducted institution, and against which he had nothing to say. He found that they gave £12,000 or £13,000 annually to that institution, and it was only right that public attention should be drawn to the wages paid to the employees in that institution and to their hours of labour. According to a statement made last year by a member of the Committee, who was also a member of the committee of the Brisbane Hospital—Mr. Stoddart, the hon. member for Logan—one employee was paid 15s. a week; two, 12s. 6d. per week; one, 10s. 6d. per week; and one at 7s. 6d. Apparently these were not the lowest wages that had been paid, for last year they got an increase of 2s. 6d. a week all round. He found they worked ten and a-half hours a day, seven days a week, with every second Sunday off, and that these employees were expected to be inside the gates by 10 o'clock at night. How a person could be expected to keep himself and clothe and keep his family on 15s. or 10s. a week was past his comprehension. The man who got 7s. 6d. a week was paid at the rate of 1½d. per hour. Fancy that in a Christian country like Queensland, in this 19th century! And that was in an institution where everyone was expected to be on the alert, vigilant, intelligent, and willing and able to perform his duties. Then the person who got 10s. per

week received 1½d. per hour for seven days a week, and had to work seventy hours a week. The two who got 12s. 6d. per week got 2d. per hour; and the one who got 15s. a week—who was somewhat of an aristocrat of labour, a bloated capitalist—got the exorbitant rate of 2½d. per hour. To expect a man with a family to keep himself and his family on such a wage was infamous. No other term could properly describe such a disgraceful condition of affairs. They had been told by one hon. member of the Committee that some of these employees had been ten years in the institution, and that one of these employees was satisfied, and that he had no ambition to get into a better billet where he would receive a higher rate of pay. It was a good job that the majority of the community were not constituted in that way—that they did not show such oyster-like proclivities. Then some of the girls in this institution worked as much as eighty hours per week. If there was any person who wanted to be active, fresh, to be pleasant in the exercise of her duties, it was a nurse. They had limited the hours of labour in many directions, for instance, in the Factories and Shops Act. Women had been limited to ten hours a day in work where they had not so much responsibility, and where they had not to show as much cheerfulness as a hospital nurse or the same attendance. The Hon. E. B. Forrest said last year that each girl could go out at certain times, and, generally speaking, the nurses were satisfied, and the Home Secretary said that if they were not satisfied they could find some other occupation. It had been pointed out in extenuation that some of these persons in the hospital were apprentices, and that in the institution they acquired a knowledge which would fit them to go into other hospitals in the colonies, or to act as private nurses after they had passed examinations. There might be a great deal of truth in that, but there was no excuse for paying such miserably low wages. How could a girl, who had no one else to depend on, keep herself on 12s. 6d. a week? Mayhap some person had discovered some remarkable scientific method of how to live respectably on 12s. 6d. a week, and even save something. If the Government could get expert evidence of how to live on 1½d. per hour, perhaps private individuals would be induced to adopt it. The Government had spent £25,000 on advertising the resources of the colony at the Glasgow Exhibition—and fancy a colony boasting such a so-called large output of wool, sugar, oil, wine, etc., being a colony in which such low wages were paid! Those facts wanted to be published throughout Great Britain, so that unfortunate wretches would not be lured here by the highly coloured pictures drawn by immigration lecturers, and come into competition with people already in Queensland. He believed that some nurses actually came out in the last lot of immigrants, and whether there was room for so many nurses he did not know. The salaries of those unfortunate individuals was an excellent argument why all their benevolent institutions and hospitals should be placed directly under State control, as there never would be satisfaction till that was done, nor would decent wages be paid to those employed in them. The payment of such wages was a thundering disgrace to Queensland and to everyone connected with the institution. The State was paying between £12,000 and £13,000 per annum as a subsidy to the hospital, so that every taxpayer in the colony was entitled to express his opinions with reference to its proper conduct. There was a prejudice at present against hospitals and similar institutions being run by the State, just as at one time there had been a

prejudice against railway trains; but the time was coming when they would be made State institutions, and the wretchedly low wages that were being paid to the nurses and wardsmen would lead to that result. In other respects he was free to admit that it was an excellently-conducted institution, and quite on a par with the hospitals in the other colonies; but he must enter his protest against the wages that were paid. Another matter to which he wished to refer was the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind Institution, to which he found that the Government paid a subsidy of about £2,000 a year. A few weeks ago the papers contained reports of an unseemly squabble which took place at a meeting of the committee of the institution in connection with some new rules that they were adopting, and those reports emphasised the necessity for the institution being controlled directly by the State. It was essentially an institution which required taking out of the hands of the amateurs, lay and clerical, who at the present time were running it. If the sub-committee's report for January, 1900, was to be believed, the institution badly wanted not only new rules but new management. That report stated, in so far as the industrial section was concerned, it was to be run on commercial lines—which meant, he supposed, that the blind workers were to be sweated. There were forty or fifty blind inmates and workers, and they were not paid as much in the aggregate as five or six officials. The men got 15s. a week, and 12s. 6d. was stopped out of that for board. The women got from 7s. 6d. to 10s. a week, and no doubt a proportionate deduction was made from that for their board. The secretary and manager got £250 a year, and the matron £70. If the matter were looked into it would be found that the institution was becoming as big a sweating organisation as any charitable institution in Queensland, and excellent reason would be found why it should be taken over by the State. An unfortunate thing in connection with these institutions was the tendency for the management to drift into the hands of "Little Pedlington" persons who had nothing else to do, and took up philanthropic work as a hobby. After a time they got the notion that the institution belonged to them; and being unpaid, their antics were to a large extent winked at. The only way out of the difficulty was to make the institution a properly conducted State concern.

Mr. RYLAND (*Gympie*) regretted the reduction of £2,000 in the vote for hospitals generally, though he admitted that it would be far better if they were run either by the State or by the local authorities. Though the general public contributed two-thirds to the support of the hospitals, they had no voice in the appointment of the committees unless they become £1 subscribers.

Mr. BROWNE: In Croydon if a man gives 1s. a week and makes up £1, he gets a vote for it.

Mr. RYLAND: Sometimes the miners at Gympie put up £2 or £3 or £4, and nominated members to represent them, but that was only on special occasions. The great mass of the people had no say in the election of the members of hospital committees, who in some cases were no better than they ought to be, and did not represent the poor man—the one who, as a rule, had to take advantage of the institution. The present mode of collecting funds for hospitals was simply a sort of levying blackmail on good-natured men, and he thought the expenses should be met by taxation—either general or local. In the old country it worked very well under the Local Government Act.

The HOME SECRETARY: Do you advocate that system?

1901—5 A

Mr. RYLAND: He thought it would be better to have representation anyway. The local authorities could strike a rate, and that could be subsidised by the Government. The hospital committee should be elected by the majority of the ratepayers.

Mr. PETRIE (*Toombul*) did not agree with what the hon. member said about hospital committees. A certain number of the members of the Brisbane Hospital committee were elected by the subscribers and a certain number were nominated by the Government. Though he had never been a member of a hospital committee, his father was chairman of the committee of the Brisbane Hospital for many years, and he knew that was the practice. It was very difficult, even after the Government had nominated their number, to get the subscribers to elect their members.

Mr. DUNSFORD: Do they vote by letter?

Mr. PETRIE: They could vote by proxy. They knew in Brisbane that so much interest was taken in the matter that they had to go into

the by-ways and lanes to bring sub-  
[7:30 p.m.] scribes in to elect members for the hospital committee. It was easy to get men to serve on boards where there were fees paid, but there were no fees for service on the committee of the Brisbane Hospital, and it was difficult to get men who would give their time and their labour to the work of that committee to do the thing properly. He did not think they would find any man who had taken a greater interest in hospitals than the hon. member for the Logan, Mr. Stodart, who was the chairman of the Brisbane Hospital committee, and it was a slander on the committee of that institution for the hon. member for Clermont to make the statements that he had made.

Mr. LESINA: I used your own chairman's words.

Mr. PETRIE: The hospital committee had to do the best they could with the money that was available, and they had very heavy expenses to meet. The chairman of the hospital committee would be the last man to cut down any man's wages, and as for the nurses, they got experience and training in the service of the institution, and they had a lot to thank the hospital for. As members of the House, they ought to be proud that there was such an institution in Brisbane as the General Hospital. It had done a great deal of good work, and he was sorry to know that they had members on the opposite side of the House who would get up and try to disparage the institution. He did not believe that the hon. member for Clermont meant what he had said.

Mr. LESINA: I said the wages were too low.

Mr. PETRIE: The hon. member was a socialist, and he supposed that in the socialistic view the hon. member would run down any institution. He (Mr. Petrie) had got up to protect the Brisbane Hospital, because he had a great interest in it, and he did not think there was any member of the House, or any member of the community, who would cavil at the way in which that institution was carried on.

Mr. LESINA: Nobody does.

Mr. PETRIE: This institution was carried on on the best possible lines, and the object of the committee was to make it one of the grandest institutions in Queensland. He hoped the hon. member for Clermont and his colleagues would put their hands into their pockets and subscribe to it. He believed that those men who had most to say against the Brisbane Hospital were the last to try and do anything to forward it.

Mr. LESINA: The hon. member was suffering from some misconception if he believed that he (Mr. Lesina) had attacked this institution. On the contrary, he had said that it was very ably

conducted, and that it compared very favourably with institutions of the same character in the other colonies. At the same time he thought the wages of wardsmen and nurses and the hours of labour were not what they ought to be. In the one case they should be increased, and in the other they should be decreased. He had quoted the wages mentioned by the chairman of the hospital committee, the hon. member, Mr. Stodart, when he spoke on the question last year. He had used that hon. gentleman's own words, which would be found on page 2727 of *Hansard*, vol. lxxvi. : 1½d. an hour for a wardsmen for working seventy hours a week—that was a nice rate of wages for a man to keep a wife and bring up a family upon! Hon. members smiled at the idea. Their troubles about the poor man at 2½d. an hour! They told the electors that they were in favour of high wages, but allowed a vote of that kind to go through without protest. He protested as strongly as he could against men being paid 1½d., 1½d., and 2½d. an hour for seventy hours' work per week.

Mr. STODART (*Logan*) did not think that any member of the Brisbane Hospital committee need feel aggrieved at anything that had been said respecting the management of the institution. The whole discussion had centred on the rate of wages paid to wardsmen and nurses. As he had said last year, the wardsmen were paid according to merit and length of service. They did not look for able-bodied men. The man to whom the hon. member for Clermont referred as receiving 1½d. an hour or 7s. 6d. a week, was a man who was taken on out of charity on account of ill-health. He should be very pleased to give the hon. member particulars as to the wages paid, but would much rather that he attended a meeting of subscribers, so that they might get a subscription out of him. He took a very keen interest in hospital management, and was always glad to give information on the subject. All he could say was that any case of grievance or complaint or desire for increased wages was always given due consideration to. Warders, as a rule, commenced on 10s. a week; after six months they received 12s. 6d., and after two years 15s. After that they were paid according to merit. In addition they received two suits of uniform, and plenty of liberty as to going out. The committee were not responsible for the fact of a warder being a married man. They preferred single men, but if a man was in such straits that he desired that kind of employment, or sought it on account of not being very strong, there was no objection to employing him. The committee had employed warders who had left to better themselves in other States. Others again had gone to London, and having returned here they were glad to rejoin the hospital. As for the nurses, he did not think they were badly paid. They worked on an average ten and a-half hours a day, and there were fifty-eight of them. Three received £50 a year, twenty £40, two £25, four £30, eleven £35, and eighteen £15. They were being taught their profession, they attended lectures given by the medical officers, passed examinations, and became qualified in three years.

Mr. GIVENS: Do they get uniforms also?

Mr. STODART: Yes, they received uniforms also. They also received a fortnight's leave on full pay every year, and if they wanted further leave they got it, but not on full pay, and when sick they received full wages. In the Melbourne Hospital there were sixteen nurses on £40, and forty on £35; others receiving from £7 10s. to £20 a year, but there was this difference, that they paid a premium of £10 each. In the Sydney Hospital there were sixty-four nurses. They started at £20 a year and at the end of the fourth year received £36 a year. At the last

meeting of the hospital committee in Brisbane it was necessary to call for applications for six nurses. There were forty-seven applicants for the positions, and a great deal of influence was brought to bear on behalf of the candidates. He might mention that amongst them were the sisters and relatives of nurses who had already qualified, and these ladies were desirous of going through the same course as their friends. The home provided for the nurses was everything that could be desired, and the attention they received from the medical superintendent, so far as comfort and amusement was concerned, was creditable to him in every way. Everything was done to make a pleasant and happy home for them, and he had never heard of any discontent from any individual nurse or body of nurses. He was sorry to see the vote reduced this year, but at the same time the committee would do their best to get along with it. They found it their duty to assist the Government as far as they could, although it would be a tight squeeze to pay expenses. Owing to the increased cost of living, the butcher's bill was very considerably larger than it used to be, and milk and other things had all gone up in price. No doubt they would have a hard struggle to keep their expenses within their means; but with a little extra attention, and perhaps by devising means in order to get further subscribers, they would be able to wind up the year as well as they had done heretofore.

Mr. CURTIS (*Rockhampton*): During his temporary absence from the Chamber he understood that some hon. member deemed it necessary to challenge the vote for £500 for the Benevolent Asylum at Rockhampton. He would point out that it was not a Rockhampton matter altogether, but rather concerned the whole of the Central division, and it therefore appeared to him that the vote was not enough. From what he had heard of the management of the institution every 6d. was well expended. He understood also that an hon. member had interjected during the course of the debate that Rockhampton was not represented in the House. He thought that was a most absurd and uncalled for remark, and hardly worth taking notice of.

Mr. TURLEY: That was not said.

Mr. CALLAN: Yes it was, by Mr. Lesina.

Mr. TURLEY: He said: There is no one to speak for Rockhampton.

Mr. CURTIS: He had not been very well to-day, and, however well a member was, it might be impossible for him to be present in the Chamber all through a sitting. At any rate, it was rather ungenerous for the hon. member to have made that observation. Every Central member was as much interested in the vote for the Rockhampton Home as he was, and even the hon. member for Clermont might have defended it. He was glad the Hon. the Home Secretary had sufficiently defended it.

Mr. JACKSON did not altogether agree with the contention of the hon. member for Clermont that the hospitals throughout the colony should be entirely State institutions. His experience was that the hospitals throughout the colony now were very well managed. He would not deal with the question of wages raised by the hon. member for Clermont in connection with the Brisbane Hospital.

Mr. LESINA: These employees are poorly paid throughout the colony.

Mr. JACKSON: It was quite likely that they were poorly paid; but, as the hon. member for Logan pointed out, these employees—the men—were not always able-bodied men, and they could not expect the usual rate of wages. He had noticed a case of that kind in the Ravenswood Hospital. There was, however, something to be

said for the contention of the hon. member for Clermont—that the hospitals should be State institutions—and that was, if the whole of the money required was found by the State, then those people who were too mean to contribute would be compelled to do so. But that was the only argument in favour of that contention. He thought there was a great deal of benefit to be gained by having local committees to manage these institutions; but at the same time he did not think the Government exercised their powers sufficiently in nominating their representatives on these committees, especially in connection with up-country hospitals. It might be done in connection with the city hospitals.

The HOME SECRETARY: The majority of the members of the Brisbane Hospital committee are nominated by the Government.

Mr. JACKSON: He was referring to up-country hospitals.

The HOME SECRETARY: That has not been the practice heretofore; but I have given instructions that at least one Government nominee shall be on those committees.

Mr. JACKSON thought that would be an advantage. It was frequently found in up-country towns that the hospital committees worked in cliques, and the result was dissatisfaction among the public. He did not think that it would be a good thing, considering the financial state of the colony, for the Government to take entire control of all the hospitals and run them entirely. He had noticed, especially in connection with the hospital at Ravenswood, that the members of the committee took a special interest in that institution, and the same thing could be said of other country hospital committees. They visited the hospitals continually, personally, and investigated any complaints that were made. He was quite satisfied that the hospitals of Queensland would compare favourably with any hospitals in any of the other colonies.

Mr. W. HAMILTON (*Gregory*) was very sorry that the financial condition of the colony was such as to necessitate a reduction in these endowments.

The HOME SECRETARY: They will still get £2 for £1.

Mr. W. HAMILTON: He was in hopes that they would get a little additional assistance this year, especially hospitals in outlying districts. The hospital at Boulia had had to close up because, on account of the drought, the subscriptions had become so small that they were not able to carry on. They could only get a medical man to reside there by the hospital subsidising him, and when the hospital shut up he went away, and now there was not a medical man within 230 or 240 miles of Boulia. He did not know anything about the control of the Brisbane Hospital, but he knew that the hospitals in the West were very well conducted. He did not think a hospital could be conducted better anywhere. He knew that there was almost as much interest taken in the election of the members to the hospital committees in Longreach, for instance, as there was in the election of members to the Assembly. All classes combined to keep the institutions going. They resorted to every device to do that, and everyone contributed to them as liberally as they could. He had visited the hospital in his own district many times, and he had never heard any complaints there from anyone; in fact, the committee were to be congratulated on the way in which they had performed their duties, especially as they had a hard job to find the funds to keep the institution going. He would like to refer to the remark made by the hon. member for Toombul, that if hon. members on the Opposition side put their hands

in their pockets and so helped the hospitals they might be in a better position than they were. Perhaps hon. members on that side contributed

just as largely in proportion to their [8 p.m.] means as hon. members on the other side. He knew that he had always given as liberally as he could towards hospitals, and he thought the remark of the hon. member for Toombul was uncalled for. He wished to know whether the Ambulance Brigade received any assistance from the State, as he did not see it mentioned in the vote?

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes, they receive the same as the hospitals.

Mr. W. HAMILTON did not think that anyone would cavil at that, as it was one of the finest institutions of 19th century civilisation. He had seen the work of the brigade, and it was a splendid thing to see how speedily they came to the aid of anyone who was injured. They should be encouraged in every way possible.

Mr. NEWELL (*Woothakata*) would like to know whether it was the intention of the Government to subsidise all contributions to hospitals at the rate of £2 for £1. The people working in the Chillagoe district contributed so much out of their earnings for the Chillagoe Hospital, and he understood that their employers subsidised those contributions, the whole amount being given as a donation to the hospital; but the hospital only received endowment at the rate of £1 for £1 on those contributions. Now, when people contributed their 6d., or 1s., or 2s., or 5s., they had just as much right to get £2 for £1 endowment as contributors of 10s., or £1, or £5. He trusted the Home Secretary would see the matter put right. He had had some little hesitation when he had spoken on the matter before, but he had since found out that they only received £1 for £1.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member had touched upon one of the most difficult questions they had to deal with in regard to State subsidies to hospitals. It was known to hon. members that in Queensland hospitals were more liberally subsidised than in any other State in Australasia. In other States they managed to get along on a very much smaller subsidy—generally £1 for £1 on all subscriptions, whether for building purposes or for maintenance—while in Queensland the State contributed £1 for £1 on building fund subscriptions, and £2 for £1 on maintenance subscriptions. His own impression had always been that it should be rather the reverse, but that was merely by the way. It would certainly lead to the establishment of more hospitals and to the improvement and extension of hospitals generally if they were to make the subsidy, say, £1 10s. all round. In connection with the point raised by the hon. member for Woothakata, he would like to mention the case of the Torres Strait Hospital, at Thursday Island, which was principally maintained by the very small percentage which was deducted under the Pearl Shelling Act from the wages of those engaged in the pearling industry. He did not suppose that anyone complained of the compulsory deductions from their wages, but the amount received in that way was so considerable that the hospital was, as a rule, very largely in funds. In some years no subsidy had been granted for the simple reason that the hospital was accumulating funds unnecessarily. Prior to his taking office as Home Secretary no subsidy had been paid for a couple of years and when he visited the hospital they were coming to the end of their tether in regard to surplus funds, and, under the circumstances, he felt justified in sanctioning a special grant—which would not come to anything like the subsidy which was paid to other hospitals on their subscriptions—for the erection of some extra building which was

required, and which was slightly beyond their means. On a system like that, a hospital could almost be run without any subsidy at all.

Hon. A. S. COWLEY: Then you should lessen the contributions.

The HOME SECRETARY: That was what he was saying should be done. Sometimes for a year or two at a time no subsidy was paid.

Hon. A. S. COWLEY: Not the subsidy—but the contributions from the poor beggars who have to find the money. Why should they be put on a different footing to everyone else?

The HOME SECRETARY thought the system was a fairly good one, and he was convinced that if they had a law by which all wage-earners over a certain sum were obliged to contribute a very small percentage of their wages in the way in which it was done in connection with the Torres Strait Hospital, and in the way it was sometimes done in connection with railway contracts, and sometimes in mines, hospitals with half the subsidy they were now receiving would be in an infinitely more flourishing condition than they were at the present time. He did not think that the people who used the hospitals contributed as a rule. There was a number of persons who were of a benevolent and liberal disposition, and the burden of local contributions fell largely on them; and there was a very large proportion of men who would be no losers by such an arrangement, but would be great gainers. Hospitals were availed of to a larger extent by wage-earners than by other persons.

Mr. GIVENS: They contribute very largely, too.

The HOME SECRETARY: In some districts they did. The point raised by the hon. member was that where a certain amount was deducted from the wages of men, they naturally expected that they should receive the benefit of the hospital without question. It then became nothing more or less than a benefit society, to the funds of which the State contributed two-thirds, though the State contributed nothing to the funds of any other friendly society. There was one hospital in the State—he believed there was more than one, and he was going to have it altered—that had a provision in the rules that any person contributing should be entitled to the full benefits of the hospital should he become sick, without having to make any declaration that he was unable to pay. That was a most barefaced way of running a friendly society at the expense of the State. Having regard to the ease with which hospitals could be maintained under the system mentioned by the hon. member for Woothakata, he proposed that contributions made in that way should be endowed only at the rate of £1 for £1.

Mr. GIVENS: A very invidious distinction.

The HOME SECRETARY: It seemed to him that it was a perfectly fair thing to do, because there was a tacit understanding in all those cases that the person contributing was entitled as a matter of right to the privileges of the hospital.

Mr. GIVENS: So is every poor person.

The HOME SECRETARY: But some of those persons from whose wages deductions were made were not poor. In one case on the Central line there was a considerable amount of difficulty in connection with this deduction. He then partially arrived at the conclusion—and the opinion he formed then had since been confirmed—that the only practicable way to deal with the question, failing legislation, was the one he had mentioned, that was, making the subsidy £1 for £1, and he had decided that the hospital at Thursday Island should receive only £1 for £1 as a regular thing. A hospital was supposed to pay its way and have a small balance to work on; it was not supposed to have a large credit

balance earning interest as a result of accumulated subscriptions and endowment. When these credit balances had accumulated in that way hospital committees had looked round to see what they could do with the money, and proceeded to extend their buildings, and so evaded the conditions which applied to subsidies for buildings by paying for their buildings out of money—two-thirds of which—instead of half—had been contributed by the State.

Mr. J. HAMILTON (Cook): He had always contended—and he had endeavoured more than once to cause the Home Secretary to come to his way of thinking—that it was unfair that the contributions relating to the Thursday Island Hospital, because they were compulsory, should not be subsidised in the same way as the contributions to other hospitals. He was glad to say that the position of the hospital had been generally good. The Government had, on several occasions, given them grants, but he did not see why they should be put on a different footing from any other hospital. If they were put on the same footing as others, they would be able to make better hospital arrangements and provide more conveniences. At present they had to be extremely economical, because they had to depend upon their own contributions. He had objected to that year after year, and he thought it was most unfair.

Mr. BROWNE: The Home Secretary had given more arguments than anyone in favour of the complete State control of hospitals. He pointed out the difficulties connected with the present system, and said it would be a very good thing to get some way of compelling everyone to contribute something towards the hospitals. The way to make every man and woman contribute was to have a special hospital tax, and let the Government administer that tax.

The HOME SECRETARY: Who would be entitled to the benefits then?

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Everybody.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is just the difficulty.

Mr. BROWNE: He did not see that there would be any more difficulty in that regard than there was under the present system. If at the present time the State contributed two-thirds to the maintenance of hospitals, could not the State instead of paying that one-third contribute the whole lot, and administer the hospitals itself? No one advocated for a moment that the State in taking control in that way should abolish the whole of the committees. His suggestion was that the committees should be elected as they were now, or by the ratepayers, or by the electors on the electoral rolls. Everyone knew the pious frauds that were always being attempted on behalf of the hospitals. He had always taken an interest in hospitals, and he knew men on hospital committees—honourable and honest men—who would not do a dishonest action to benefit themselves—who would do almost anything to get an extra pound or two from the Government for the hospitals.

The HOME SECRETARY: We are constantly trying to bowl them out, and very successfully, I am happy to say.

Mr. BROWNE: That was the curse of the present system. The men who were on hospital committees, if they could devote the whole of their time to the management of the institutions, in looking after improvements, and so forth, would be able to do a great deal more good to the community than they were able to do now, when they had to concentrate so much attention on the question of raising funds. With regard to the Brisbane Hospital, he thought it was an admirable institution; but some of the business men and leading citizens of Brisbane

ought to feel ashamed of their contributions to the support of that institution. Let anyone take a subscription list of the Brisbane Hospital, and a subscription list of the hospital in any of the country towns, and they would see that in every country town or mining township every business man in the place and every miner looked upon their annual subscription to the hospital as one of their regular current expenses. If, however, they took Queen street from one end to the other, they would find gaps among the business men there who did not contribute to the Brisbane Hospital. If this system were abolished altogether, and the State supplied the whole money by putting a special tax on every man in the community, it would be much better. They would still be able to get good men to work on the hospital committees, and the hospital committees would not have to resort to all those little tricks and frauds which they adopted now, in order to get money for the hospitals. So long as the present system continued they would be bound to have these things occurring.

Mr. GIVENS (*Cairns*) desired, in common with the hon. member for Woothakata, to enter his protest against the invidious treatment of the hospital at Chillagoe. If they took the weekly subscriptions from the workmen's wages for this hospital, they would come to just as much as the subscription of a guinea or two a year which business men might make.

The HOME SECRETARY: You know very well that half the amount would not be collected.

Mr. GIVENS: He was not quite sure of that, even if the position taken up by the Home Secretary was the correct one. The claim to assistance from the State by a hospital in a new place was all the greater because of the larger amount that had to be raised locally to build and equip the institution, and because there was a smaller community to bear it. To make any distinction was very unjust and very unfair. Why should an institution of this kind be deprived of the usual subsidy—why should it be singled out?

The HOME SECRETARY: It is not one particular institution.

Mr. GIVENS: There were other districts where railway works were going on, and where deductions were made from the wages of workmen for the support of hospitals. Was exactly the same system followed in connection with them?

The HOME SECRETARY: In some, and I intend to make it uniform.

Mr. GIVENS: In most of these places there were old settled districts with hospitals already established. Was not there a hospital at Gladstone and one at Nerang?

The HOME SECRETARY: Where is the hospital at Nerang?

Mr. GIVENS: There was one in the district to which the contributions would be made. In this instance, however, there was no hospital in the district before, and it was a far-away district, where there were great difficulties in getting a hospital. He quite agreed with the opinion expressed by some hon. members that they would have no satisfactory system of hospital management until the State

[8.30 p.m.] took over the entire control. At the present time the State contributed two-thirds of the funds, and had a very small hand in the management, but by adopting the plan which had been suggested more efficiency would be secured, and a large number of people who now contributed nothing would be compelled to subscribe. It had been on two or three occasions thrown across the Chamber that members on his side did not contribute to charitable institutions. It was said recently by the Secretary

for Railways that no one ever saw his (Mr. Givens's) name on a subscription list for the Brisbane Hospital. That was quite true, but it was manifestly unfair to mention it, because hon. members had to contribute to the hospital in their own districts, and perhaps to more than one, while members representing metropolitan constituencies merely gave their guinea or two, had their names advertised, and were then able to point out how charitable they were. He was perfectly satisfied that, in proportion to their aggregate income, members on his side subscribed more largely to hospitals than members on the other side, and he knew of one hon. member who subscribed to no less than five of those institutions. His experience had been that the outside hospitals were generously supported, and he believed the poor people subscribed more in proportion to their income than the wealthy people. It might be said that it was they who used the hospitals most. That was quite true, but it was an enormous advantage to those who employed large numbers of workmen to have an institution like a hospital to take charge of those who were sick or injured. It was an especial advantage to wealthy people to have hospitals established to counteract the effect of epidemic diseases which would otherwise sweep off the wealthy people themselves. He desired again to enter his emphatic protest against the treatment accorded to the Chillagoe Hospital. The wages of 8s. a day were none too large, in a district where the cost of living was high, for a man to support himself and family upon, and the people, when they fell sick, had a perfect right to be treated in the hospital. He maintained that upon every ground the Home Secretary was not treating that hospital fairly.

Mr. SMITH (*Bowen*) could bear out the statement of the leader of the Opposition in regard to the liberal manner in which hospitals in the outside districts were supported. He knew of a case some years ago in which the owner of the Papuan Claim on Charters Towers had contributed to the hospital so much from every ounce of gold obtained from the mine, which came to a very considerable sum in the year. He was sorry to see the vote reduced, but no doubt if the subscriptions proved to be larger than the estimate the Home Secretary would subsidise them, even though he exceeded the amount of £62,000.

The HOME SECRETARY: Certainly, I must.

Mr. SMITH: According to the amount the committees raised so the Government subsidised these institutions, and he thought these committees were doing very excellent work throughout the length and breadth of the colony. They took a great deal of pains and trouble without pay in order to carry on these institutions in the best possible way, and he thought they deserved great consideration for the manner in which they carried out their duties. He hoped that if necessary the Home Secretary would not hesitate to increase the subsidy.

The HOME SECRETARY: He had already explained that this amount had been placed on the Estimates with a view that the contributions this year will be less than they were last year. The whole question of subsidy depended on the contributions by the public. If the sum on the Estimates this year was not sufficient, a sum would be placed on the Supplementary Estimates next year; the subsidy of £2 for £1 must be met. With regard to the invidious distinction alleged to have been made in connection with the Chillagoe Hospital, the invidiousness was entirely different to what the hon. member for Cairns imagined. It had been the practice heretofore not to endow such contributions at all. The hon. member had mentioned the Nerang line, where a fund had been established by a deduction from the wages of the men engaged on that line.

They paid a certain amount out of their wage, as was usual where accidents were likely to happen and where men were scattered along a line. Yet it might be necessary for some of these men to be brought into the hospital, and as there was a surplus from the fund in this case the contractor or the engineer in charge forwarded to the Brisbane Hospital £10, but that was refused on the ground that where a fund was established in that way it was not fair for the hospital to make it part and parcel of the fund of the friendly societies established on the Nerang line. Therefore the money was ultimately returned to the engineer with the intimation that it should be kept, and a ledger account would be opened for paid patients to be sent from that line to the hospital. That was the proper thing to do. But there were many difficulties in the way, and he thought they might try the experiment. It had been tried at Thursday Island and at Chillagoe, and he proposed to subsidise such contributions by £1 for £1. This concession had not heretofore been given. The Torres Strait Hospital for years had not received any subsidy at all. The whole thing was bristling with difficulties, and it was a very difficult matter on which to arrive at a proper conclusion, and he only desired to do the correct thing—not to enable a hospital to accumulate funds, but to enable them to do all that was required by the needy sick in the district. If they did that, the object of these hospitals would be attained, subsidy or no subsidy.

Mr. GIVENS: The two cases are not on all-fours.

The HOME SECRETARY: They were entirely on all-fours. He hoped the Committee would allow the vote to now go. He might apologise to the Committee for the time he had occupied, but he had been asked for certain information, and he could only be expected to give it and in a satisfactory manner. Therefore he would absolve himself from having wasted any time.

Mr. RYLAND did not agree with deducting anything from the wages of workmen in the way suggested by the Home Secretary.

The HOME SECRETARY: There is no proposal to that effect yet.

Mr. RYLAND: He protested against anything of that sort now, because it might come in the future. The working man was taxed quite enough through the Customs, and he should not be asked to contribute in this way towards the support of these institutions. Their wages should not be commandeered in this way. It was said that in some cases miners contributed so much per oz. to the hospitals, but he did not think the Mount Morgan Company did much in that way. They took 6d. per week off the men. These requirements should be met in the same way as other requirements were met. Let the State support the hospitals, and let there be a broader franchise in connection with the election of hospital committees. He said nothing against these committees, but he thought it would be better to have a broader—an universal franchise in these cases. He did not believe in the proxies in connection with hospital committees, for two or three men got together and they sat down over a glass of wine, and by the proxies they gathered they did what they liked. That was not right, and he thought the Home Secretary should give some attention to the matter. In connection with the Thursday Island Hospital he objected to the enforced contributions, even though the people who contributed in that manner were aliens. They should have the same rights when they came into this country as everyone else.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYLAND: Why should their wages be "commandeered"?

The HOME SECRETARY: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYLAND: The hon. gentleman did not appear to know that he was raising a grave constitutional question. The Japanese, as a nation, were on friendly terms with the British Empire, and they would hardly stand their countrymen being imposed upon, and debarred from exercising the rights and privileges of citizens of this State. (Laughter.)

Mr. CAMPBELL (Moreton): The remarks of the hon. member for Gympie were rather amusing. He seemed to know a great deal about the way in which members of hospital committees were elected. He spoke of its being done over a glass of wine, and that sort of thing. He wondered whether that was the method adopted in commandeering the electoral claims in the Gladstone district—whether a glass of wine came in there.

Mr. RYLAND: Or in the Cambooya case.

Mr. CAMPBELL: He was at one with hon. members on the other side with regard to the deplorable apathy on the part of the public generally in regard to subscribing to hospitals. As a member of the committee of the Brisbane Hospital, he knew of the great difficulty that was experienced in finding the wherewithal to keep the institution going. The institution was one which received patients from all parts of the colony, and the committee expected contributions from places outside Brisbane; but at the same time he was quite willing to admit that Brisbane did not do its duty by the institution. He was sorry to hear the statement of the Home Secretary with regard to what he called "enforced contributions," and what the hon. member for Gympie called "commandeering men's wages." So far as the Brisbane Hospital was concerned, that principle had been in vogue for some considerable time. Certain firms in Brisbane—including his own—had worked on that principle for some years. At a meeting of his firm's employees held some years ago it was determined that that was the only way of getting fair contributions from the employees. The employees found themselves that there were some of their number who did not subscribe when it was a purely voluntary matter, although they were well able to do so. Through absolute meanness they would not pay anything. Of course, many of them belonged to friendly societies, and they maintained that that was sufficient for them.

The HOME SECRETARY: Those societies do not get subsidies.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Some of them refused to subscribe to the hospital because they were members of friendly societies. And, while on that subject, he might say that frequently members of friendly societies went into the hospital, and, although they paid nothing towards the funds of the hospital, they were at the same time drawing funds from their society. That was a very bad practice, and when there was a body of employees it was only fair that some contribution should be asked from them. The argument from the other side was that the State should control and support the hospitals, but he was opposed to that principle, because he believed that they should encourage people to be generous and to assist others who were less fortunate than themselves. There was another matter in connection with the "commandeering" the hon. member for Gympie had spoken about. He stated that the unfortunate men who subscribed had no representation or voting power. Well, as far as Brisbane was concerned, he knew that in many cases that was not so. Many firms held meetings of their employees at which a certain number of their men were appointed to vote. In the case

of his firm there were about a dozen of their men who were elected as subscribers on behalf of the whole body, and they exercised the power to vote, and other firms did the same. He only hoped that the Home Secretary would treat subscriptions of that kind on the same basis as ordinary subscriptions and would pay the same subsidy upon them.

Mr. GIVENS : He can get over it if he likes.

Mr. KERR (*Barcoo*) thought that the hon. member for Moreton had given some very strong arguments in favour of hospitals being run by the State. He had made a statement about members of friendly societies. On behalf of members of friendly societies he desired to say that there were a very large number of them in Queensland, and that they had made provision for doctors and medical attendance for themselves. He had been a member of a friendly society for over thirty years, and if it were not for the friendly societies there would be a great many more people in the hospitals than there were at the present time. He knew of men who had applied to be treated at the hospital, as had been stated by the hon. member for Moreton, and who were in receipt of "sick pay" from friendly societies, but that sick pay was necessary for the support of their families. When they made application to get into the general hospital they were refused because they were members of friendly societies, and that was one reason why friendly societies were endeavouring to get a hospital of their own. The hon. member for Moreton stated that he believed in people helping themselves and not being a burden upon other people, and that was a principle which was believed in by friendly societies. The argument which had taken place on the vote had been altogether in favour of the State taking over the hospitals. By that means everyone would have to contribute, and if, as the leader of the Opposition suggested, a hospital tax was imposed upon everyone in the colony it would fall upon each one equally. The Home Secretary asked by way of interjection whether they would allow each one to go into the hospital. Certainly they

[9 p.m.] would. There were many people in the State who were members of friendly societies, and who never went into a public hospital. The hon. member for Toombul seemed to think that because members on the Opposition side did not contribute to the Brisbane Hospital they did not contribute to any hospital. He did not want to say what members on his side did, but he might mention, speaking for himself, that he contributed to five hospitals in his district—four already in existence and one about to be. When members representing Western electorates contributed to the hospitals in their own districts, it was too much to expect them to contribute to the Brisbane Hospital. If the State took over the control of all the hospitals it would be much better for the people.

Mr. LESINA asked why the vote for the female refuge, Brisbane, had been left off this year?

The HOME SECRETARY : He had already explained, in moving the vote, that it was because the annual grant was considered unnecessary.

Mr. LESINA agreed that it was unnecessary, seeing that this institution had a credit balance of £5,000 or £6,000. There was £200 down for the industrial home at Normanby Hill, an institution which carried on laundry work, and which did work last year amounting to £670. On account of the subsidy they received from Government, these institutions were able to do washing at ridiculous rates—from 1s. a dozen—and thus come into unfair competition with widows and others who took in washing in order to maintain

those depending on them; and the persons who were subjected to that unfair competition were driven to ask the State for assistance. Where State assistance was given to these institutions, the Government should exercise some control over the expenditure of the funds. There was the vote of £3,500 distributed amongst a number of "Little Pedlington" societies, and the Government subsidised another charity organisation for looking after the other subsidised institutions. It was the most gigantic monument to Government incompetence imaginable. As he had already shown, one institution gave away £13 in relief, and spent £159 in giving it away. That was the sort of thing that made the average man curse luridly. As the leader of the Opposition had pointed out, there was only one way out of the difficulty, and that was to make these institutions State institutions. If a hospital tax were imposed upon the community for the establishment and maintenance of hospitals, the whole charge would fall on the community directly, and they would be paid for once and for ever; under the present system, first they paid £12,000 per annum to the Brisbane Hospital, and then the hospital nurses and others collected money all over the community, and thus the community paid considerably more than if there was one direct tax. No doubt the arguments used to-night against State hospitals were used years ago against State lunatic asylums. The most remarkable argument used, if it could be dignified by the name of argument, was that which was used by the hon. member for Moreton, Mr. Campbell. He said that if you made these hospitals, which were already two-thirds State institutions, entirely State institutions, you would destroy the philanthropic spirit of the public. How could the passing of an Act of Parliament affect or destroy the sentiments in favour of philanthropy or the sentiments of benevolence? How could an Act of Parliament destroy those lovable traits in the human character? The statement was absurd, and it was remarkable that the hon. member should make such a statement. Take the Normanby institution. It appeared that the neighbours complained of the screaming of children in the shed in which they were placed while the mothers were engaged elsewhere doing work. The same complaint was made about the female institution in Turbot street. It appeared that the mothers in the Normanby home, who had "loved not wisely but too well," were separated from their children during their working hours, and the children were kept in a shed where they were looked after by someone. That was done so that the last half-ounce of work could be extracted from the mothers, bending over sloppy tubs all day. But of course this was done for philanthropic purposes—very likely for the purpose of convincing these females of the error of their ways. A girl who made an error, or who had "loved not wisely but too well," who had to enter one of these institutions, was employed at laundry work, for which she never received a pennyworth of payment, though she might work from 6 o'clock in the morning until the sun went down. Then she was allowed to go to a maternity home, and after she returned she stayed in one of these institutions for six months to earn sufficient to pay the cost of her keep. At the end of six months she took her child with her, and if she got any clothes they were given in charity; but she received no payment for the work she had done. In one of these institutions he noticed by the balance-sheet that the laundry work done amounted to £649 15s. 1d. That was out of a total of £1,624 which had passed through the hands of the institution in the previous year, but not a penny of that money was paid to the girls, and

£200 of the public money was paid to that institution. Such a system was infamously wrong, and for the hon. member for Moreton to say that to disturb that state of things would be to destroy the sentiment of benevolence, was simply "baying at the moon." It was neither logic nor argument; it was simply a bald statement made, the Lord only knew for what reason. But the average man, if he thought over the matter, must come to the conclusion that if institutions of this kind were taken over by the State, they would be conducted to the advantage of the community. Some of these institutions were nothing more or better than gaols. He knew one which he had recently visited, and which received a subsidy, which was exactly like a gaol.

The HOME SECRETARY: Which one is that?

Mr. LESINA: He would indicate it before he sat down. Every window was boarded up, and it was surrounded by a big iron fence, and the girls were not allowed to go out. Ten of the girls recently escaped by climbing over the fence by way of a protest against the conditions prevailing in the place.

The HOME SECRETARY: Do you say that that is subsidised by the State?

Mr. LESINA: Yes, it had been subsidised by the State.

The HOME SECRETARY: Is it one of those institutions which are subsidised now?

Mr. LESINA: No, it was not one on the list, but it was a sample of the institutions he was dealing with, and it was just as well—

The CHAIRMAN: I have already ruled that the hon. member cannot deal with an institution that is not provided for in this vote; and if the hon. member persists in defying the Chair, I shall have to take some other action.

Mr. LESINA: He said such institutions should not be permitted as they were at the present time to absorb the public money, and expend it in the way that they did. The Normanby institution, which he had named, was a type of these institutions which the State subsidised, and there was an unspecified vote which covered them.

The HOME SECRETARY: Not such homes as that, not one of them.

Mr. LESINA: These institutions were practically prisons. They paid the girls who entered them no wages for the work they did, and after six months drafted them out with a baby in their arms, and not a penny in their pocket. This state of things called for reform, and the debate which had taken place should show the Government that the time was now ripe for the State taking over these philanthropic institutions and making them State institutions. They were governed by the State and supported by the community, and every member of the community had a right to enter them if they so wished. There was no logical argument that could be used against the complete control of such institutions by the State. In the library was to be found a work dealing with the nationalisation of public health, in which the writer argued very ably and cleverly that the care of public health, either in hospitals or other institutions, was a national necessity, and should be under the control directly of the State. Such a system of dealing with their hospitals and other institutions would be a big stride in the direction of improving the happy-go-lucky system of administering relief which existed at the present time.

Mr. McDONNELL (*Fortitude Valley*): While agreeing with some of the remarks of the hon. member for Clermont, he could not help thinking that his statements were rather broad and far reaching in regard to a number of the institutions they were discussing.

Mr. LESINA: I did not refer to all of them.

Mr. McDONNELL: The hon. gentleman did not make any exceptions. He knew of some of those institutions which were doing particularly good and noble work, and were a great benefit to the community at large. He thought the money expended by the State upon them was money well spent.

The HOME SECRETARY: None better.

Mr. McDONNELL: At the same time he knew there were some of them, and one in particular referred to by the hon. member for Clermont, in which undoubtedly the generosity of the State had been much abused, and he was glad to see that the Government had recognised that fact by omitting the subsidy from the Estimates. He rose particularly to ask the Home Secretary if he received reports from the subsidised institutions, showing the work they performed during the year, and how the money was disbursed. He understood that some of them issued annual reports, but he was not sure whether they reached the Home Secretary's Department. He thought all such institutions receiving Government aid should send in their reports to the Home Secretary.

The HOME SECRETARY: He received reports from all the institutions. He was glad to find at least one member on the other side had something good to say of the philanthropic work that was being done.

Mr. BROWNE: Is that not rather rough?

The HOME SECRETARY: No, he thought not. The hon. member had been out of the Chamber while his friend the member for Clermont had indulged in his diatribes against philanthropic institutions generally which receive Government aid, and no member on that side had protested. He regretted that the hon. gentleman was not in his place—possibly he might have had some controlling influence over the hon. member, who had nothing but abuse for the splendid and noble work which the hon. member for Fortitude Valley said those institutions were doing.

Mr. LESINA: I object to the bad half—the sweating of girls. I will denounce it anywhere.

The HOME SECRETARY: He contended that they were doing splendid work, and he had his opinion about the hon. member's denunciation. He should know that something had gone wrong if the hon. member ceased to denounce him.

Mr. DUNSFORD: The fact is that you stopped the subsidy in one case because you did not approve of the way in which the institution was being carried on.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member was entirely wrong. The hon. member for Clermont gave one reason for that which was sufficient—that was, that that particular institution was in a very affluent state. The whole of its funds, however, would be required for extending its buildings when it had to move from its present site. The work done by the institutions which had been vilified by the hon. member for Clermont was the best and purest philanthropy that could be imagined. The unfortunates who were unable to help themselves were helped to a better life, and the homes were under the supervision of ladies who devoted their lives to that work, and who deserved the best thanks of the community for the work which they were doing for the community. He was glad to find that the hon. member for Fortitude Valley had a good word for those institutions, which, as any unprejudiced person would admit, were doing splendid work.

Mr. BROWNE agreed with a great deal of what the Home Secretary had said, but it was unfair of him to cast a slur on the whole of the members of the Opposition when he really only

referred to one member. He did not agree with a great deal of what the hon. member for Clermont said, but at the same time he thought Ministers would have a big job on hand if every time a member on their own side said something of which they did not approve they got up and protested. What were the facts with regard to those charitable institutions? The hon. member for Clermont had made a long speech, as he usually did.

The HOME SECRETARY: Half-a-dozen.

Mr. LESINA: Nothing of the sort. The subject justifies it.

Mr. BROWNE: He was not responsible for that. Immediately the hon. member for Clermont sat down the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. McDonnell, got up.

[9.30 p.m.] He did not presume to know as much as the hon. member for Fortitude Valley did with regard to these institutions here—he was a metropolitan member, and had lived in Brisbane for many years. He did not profess to know all these Brisbane institutions, but this he did know—

Mr. McMASTER: Why does the hon. member for Clermont denounce them when he knows nothing about them? He has been denouncing them the whole night.

Mr. BROWNE: He was not responsible for that. He was not going to go into what the hon. member for Clermont said. He was not the keeper of that hon. member's conscience any more than the Minister was responsible for the consciences of hon. members opposite. He might point out that two or three hon. members on his own side had got up and differed from the hon. member for Clermont on other matters. Hon. members knew that this question of subsidising charitable institutions which came into competition with people outside had been debated not only in the Australian Parliaments, but in the home Parliaments. He gave all credit to the work that these charitable institutions did, but it was a very difficult matter, and he would not attempt to solve it himself. The Home Secretary knew that similar complaints had been made in New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia, but he was not going to debate the matter to-night. As a rule, the Estimates were not made party questions, and it was hardly fair for the Home Secretary to get up and cast a slur on every member of his (Mr. Browne's) party because the hon. member for Clermont had expressed certain opinions in his own peculiar way—

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear! (Laughter).

Mr. LESINA: Other members express their opinions in a peculiar way.

Mr. BROWNE: He did not wish to do the hon. member for Clermont any injustice. What sort of a state would the House drift into if, when an hon. member on his side expressed some opinion that he did not agree with, he immediately jumped up to testify against it, or if the same thing happened on the other side?

The HOME SECRETARY: Then you don't agree with what he said.

Mr. BROWNE: No, he did not.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. BROWNE: But it was not a question as to whether he agreed with that hon. member or not. Other members on his side might or might not agree with him.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member's words seemed to meet with general approval from your party. That is what struck us.

Mr. BROWNE did not know how the general approval came in. When he came in he did not hear many expressions of approval. He thought things were going very quietly.

The HOME SECRETARY: Apparently the hon. member's contention was that a Minister in charge of an estimate had to sit meekly in his place and receive all sorts of thrusts, personal and otherwise, and say nothing in reply.

Mr. BROWNE: No.

The HOME SECRETARY said he was praising one hon. member—

Mr. MAXWELL: What about the others?

The HOME SECRETARY: He was praising the hon. member for Fortitude Valley for his defence of the noble work done by these institutions. He had refrained from expressing any opinion about the others. He said that he was glad that he saw one hon. member did not agree with the hon. member for Clermont, and then the hon. member for Croydon had taken him to task for saying something disorderly and improper. If the hon. member had heard all that had been said about him he would have admitted that he had borne it all pretty well.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. A. Rutledge, *Maranoa*): Everyone would acknowledge that the leader of the Opposition was very moderate in expressing his views, and set a good example. He would remind hon. members respectfully that the Committee had been a great many weeks discussing the Estimates; that they were not yet through the Home Secretary's Estimates, and that they had been four hours discussing one item. He appealed to hon. members to get on with business, because if time were spent prodigally at this period of the session, it might lead to matters being rushed through at a rate that would prevent discussion which might be desirable on some items later on.

Question put and passed.

#### FACTORIES AND SHOPS.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £2,755 be granted for Factories and Shops. There was an increase on the vote, but he had already found that it did not represent the increase which would necessarily take place in consequence of the increased work imposed upon the department through the recent legislation. The increases were: an accountant—a new appointment which was necessary as the result of the increased amount of labour, £200; a lady inspector, previously paid from unforeseen expenditure, £150; a clerk, also previously paid from unforeseen expenditure, £60; allowance to a district inspector at Toowoomba, £35; and an extra amount required for travelling expenses and taking polls of ratepayers, £150. That made a total increase of £595. Against that was a decrease of £30, owing to a slight change in the *personnel* of the officers, making a net increase of £565. As he had said, he had already found that a further increase would be necessary—not to any very great extent, he hoped, this year—but it was impossible to legislate in the direction that legislation had taken in connection with the department without increased expenditure.

Mr. McDONNELL: It was a matter of regret to learn that the additional expenditure in connection with the department was not going to be very much.

The HOME SECRETARY: I said it was not going to be more than I could help.

Mr. McDONNELL: If there was a department which was starved in the matter of having a sufficient number of officers to administer the Act it was this department. The staff of inspectors in the metropolitan district consisted of the Chief Inspector and three male and two lady inspectors—or six in all. They had to look after 1,400 shops and 817 factories, and it was an impossibility for them to do the work. Of course they could not include the boiler inspectors. The work was sufficient for three

times the number of inspectors if the Act was to be properly administered. He was rather surprised that the Home Secretary had not informed the Committee that he proposed to appoint at least three or four more inspectors in the near future, as it had been brought under his notice that the present staff was totally inadequate. For instance, how was it possible for an official who worked from 9 o'clock in the morning till 4 o'clock in the afternoon to detect breaches of the Act which were committed at 9 or 10 o'clock at night? He was prepared to admit that there were very few Government officials who did their work more faithfully or better than the inspectors in that department. They entered into their work with a will, and did their best. In fact, the only objection he had to make was that in a good many cases they were too lenient in connection with breaches of the Act. He knew it was their desire to administer the Act for the benefit of those whom it was intended to benefit, but it was an impossibility for the small staff to do all the work that the Act required. There should be no cheeseparing in the matter. The Chief Inspector said, in his annual report:—

I presume, however—the new Act having now been in force for a period of seven months—it is expected that reference will also be made in this report to the period covered by the Act of 1900: on that presumption I may say at once that the present staff is now quite inadequate to perform the work required under the new Act. If the work is to be done with credit to anyone connected with or interested in it, the staff must be augmented and reorganised to meet the altered, increased, and increasing demands imposed upon it. It may be mentioned, in passing, in demonstration of this assertion, that the volume of correspondence has increased 350 per cent. since July, 1899; and, suppose it be admitted that the correspondence for the first half of 1901 has been abnormal, there is still left a sufficiently large margin to support the assertion.

There was no doubt that the inability of the small staff to prevent many infringements of the Act had created in some quarters a spirit of opposition to the Act that would never have taken place if the Act was properly administered. He did not by that mean to imply that the inspectors in any sense neglected their duty, but it was impossible for half-a-dozen inspectors, no matter how desirous they might be to carry out the provisions of the Act, to see that the law was properly administered. Such a staff might be sufficient in a small place where there were 200 factories, but it was altogether inadequate for a place like Brisbane. If the Government desired to have the Act properly and fairly administered in the interest not only of employees, but also of fair factory-owners and fair shop-owners, they would increase the staff; and he should like to know if it was the intention of the Minister to make further provision in that respect on the Supplementary Estimates, or by any other means. He noticed that it was proposed to appoint an accountant, on which he would have something to say later on, and that there was only one additional inspector under the provisions of the new Act. The Government were very much at fault in this respect, and were not entering into the spirit of the Act as they should. While money was being lavishly spent in some directions, they practically starved this department, which dealt with matters concerning the health and lives of a large number of people. The Chief Inspector pointed out that the existing Act was so faulty that many prosecutions which would have been initiated had to be ignored because they could not be successfully carried out. The report of the department contained many statements which had been made in previous reports, showing that there was an indifference and apathy shown by occupiers to the requirements of the Act to such an extent that a number of

places were not registered, and that the necessary forms and returns were not filled up and supplied to the department. Year after year it was stated that a large number of people were so indifferent to their duties in this respect that the time of the department was largely taken up in trying to induce them to do what was required by the Act. He hoped that under the new Act a little more backbone would be shown by the department, and that there would be no repetition of this state of things. The Chief Inspector said—

It has been found expedient—when the department is satisfied that an occupier knows or should reasonably be expected to know the law, but violates it and takes the chances—to serve formal notice upon him of the commission of the breach: 1,299 such notices were issued during the year, which at first sight seems an absurdly large number. Notices for failing to forward records, however, accounted for 890 of these, which will give some idea of the exasperating delays and trouble the department has met with in collecting these documents. For failing to register premises 119 notices were served, which is nearly half the total number of certificates issued during the year, and while no doubt some deserved to be prosecuted, a great many were due to ignorance, and, after all, if no breach of the essentials of the Act other than registration was taking place in the premises, a conviction for that offence would be a comparatively hollow affair.

It was evident that a large number of people had been pressed by the department to do their duty, and he hoped that this condition of things would be tolerated no longer, but that people would be forced to comply with the provisions of the Act. He would ask the Home Secretary how many reports had been received by the Police Department of breaches of the Act up to the present time? Some time ago the police were given authority to report breaches of the Act to the officers of the Factories and Shops Department, and it was considered that that would be a great assistance to them, but so far he had heard of very few cases where the police had taken any action to report breaches of Part VIII. of the Act. Cases occurred even in the heart of the city as well as in the suburbs, and in South Brisbane and Fortitude Valley, where people wilfully and openly committed breaches of the Act so far as the closing of their shops were concerned. He was inclined to think that the police showed a lot of indifference in carrying out their orders with reference to the reporting of such breaches. He would also like to ask the hon. gentleman how many districts in Queensland had voluntarily asked to be brought under the provisions of Part VIII. of the Act, what were the names of those districts, what was the day on which the half-holiday was observed, and in how many places was the Saturday observed as a half-holiday where no poll had been taken? He asked for that information in order to justify statements made by the supporters of the Act that it was legislation which had been generally well received throughout Queensland. He had the information, but he would like it to come officially from the Home Secretary.

[10 p.m.] retary. He did not desire to take up more time now. Members on his side protested against the way in which the Factories and Shops Department had been starved in the matter of inspectors. The Act could not be administered in the interests of employers and employees by the present inadequate staff.

THE HOME SECRETARY: He had already stated that there were certain increases. There was an additional officer on the Estimates, and other officers would be sure to be required. One was about to be appointed immediately. He would like to appoint a few more officers, but these were times when they had to rub along with such small increases to the Estimates of public expenditure as could not possibly be

avoided. There was altogether thirty-five districts in which a poll had been taken, or in which no poll had been taken. Saturday, Thursday, and Wednesday had each been decided upon by certain districts as the day for the half-holiday; and there were other districts in which no poll had been demanded, and in which therefore they had decided by tacit consent, so to speak, upon the Saturday half-holiday. The districts that had decided on Saturday were Cairns, Charleville, Blackall, Hughenden, Sandgate, Ipswich, Maryborough, and Rockhampton. Thursday had been decided on at Gympie, Charters Towers, Beenleigh, Pittsworth, Ravenswood, Croydon, Laidley, Clermont, Gladstone, and Bundaberg. Wednesday had been chosen at Roma, Longreach, Cooktown, Mackay, Warwick, Mitchell, Wynnnum, and Toowoomba. No poll had been taken at Mount Morgan, Beaudesert, Muttaborra, Caboolture, Ingham, Clifton, Mareeba, Townsville, and Brisbane.

HON. A. S. COWLEY (*Herbert*): When a country town was brought under the operation of the Act, was an inspector appointed, or were the police appointed to see that the whole of the shops closed according to the Act, and to see that any transgressor was punished? One of his correspondents informed him that the shopkeepers at Ingham had been informed that they must form themselves into a vigilance committee, and lay an information against any transgressor of the Act; but the shopkeepers who closed their shops wanted the half-holiday for recreation, not to watch their neighbours. Was it intended in all districts where the Act was in force to appoint inspectors, and not to rely on the shopkeepers to act as a vigilance committee?

The HOME SECRETARY: There was no district without an inspector, but in some districts the officer charged with the work of inspection was the clerk of petty sessions or the acting clerk of petty sessions. Representations had been made to him that the Act was not being enforced or observed in one case—probably the case to which the hon. member referred—but on inquiry the information was found not to be correct.

HON. A. S. COWLEY: He understood that the officer at Ingham was a young man who filled a dozen offices, and filled them creditably, but he had no time for the additional duties of inspector of shops. His informant told him that when they applied to the police magistrate or the clerk of petty sessions—he did not know which—the answer they received was, “You must form yourselves into a vigilance committee, and if you find anyone transgressing the Act, it is your duty to lodge an information.” If that was so, it was time it was altered; but if the hon. gentleman assured him that such was not the case and no such instructions had been issued, he could not understand how it was that his correspondent had written what he did write.

The HOME SECRETARY: It was sufficient for him to say that no such instructions were given. He might have been wrong about the inquiry by wire, but the result of the representation, he was inclined to think, was that the Act was being fairly well observed, but on second thought he was inclined to think that that was Longreach.

Mr. LESINA: There were one or two facts in connection with the factories report that he wished to draw attention to. The first important point was the number of coloured aliens in our midst who were factory owners and who employed white people. This was a matter which should be of considerable interest to the hon. member for Herbert; and the Government as a whole should feel more than a passing interest in the figures contained in the report, for they

showed the hold the Asiatic aliens were getting on certain industries in Queensland. The facts and figures given should also tend to strengthen the conviction gradually growing on the public mind that the coloured alien was a danger not only from an ethnological point of view, but was a still greater danger from an industrial point of view. There was a tendency on the part of hon. members to cover up awkward facts of this kind, and the publication of those facts would make converts, and show the alien in the different light of a competitor with white men in their work. He found on page 4 of the factories report there was a table showing the number of factories in occupation of Asiatics. In 1899, in Brisbane, there were nineteen factories, in which sixty males were employed and ten white females—that was ten white girls were employed by Asiatic aliens in Brisbane. In Ipswich there was one factory, employing four females, of whom three were white. In Rockhampton there was one, employing three females, two of whom were white; and in Townsville there were two, employing eleven males, none of whom were white. The totals were twenty-three factories employing seventy-one males, and seventeen females, of whom fifteen were white girls. In 1900 there were twenty-two factories in the metropolitan district, employing seventy-one males, and fifteen females, all the latter being white girls. In Townsville there were three factories, employing eleven males and one female. The totals for that year were twenty-five factories, or an increase of two on the previous year, employing eighty-two males and sixteen females, of whom fifteen were white girls. On page 14 of the report, the inspector stated—

ASIATICS.—In Brisbane North there were twenty furniture factories last year employing 235 hands. Ten of these factories were occupied by Chinese and Japanese—chiefly the former—and employed sixty Asiatic male adults. It is thus seen that most of the Asiatic workers in Brisbane are connected with the furniture trade, and, as they make a considerable quantity of furniture which finds purchasers, they must constitute a strong element of competition. With respect to workrooms, it cannot be said that those occupied by Chinese do not fulfil the requirements of the Act. They are not first-class buildings, but, as the trade is a clean one, it is possible to find European factories which compare less favourably. This refers to the workrooms only, as the quarters I have nothing to do with, although I have entered them. As regards hours of work, there is a greater difference. The Asiatic lives on the premises, and his working hours are not so regular as the European's. If he has a job which is wanted urgently, he works by lamplight to get it done; also, he often works as his inclination directs. He is said to be industrious, but he does not work with the energy of a European. His working week, so far as I can judge, covers about sixty hours, whereas the European's working week in furniture factories is more like forty-five hours. As the Chinese do not employ boys—for that matter there were only seven boys under sixteen years in the European factories referred to—their hours of work are not restricted by the Act; in fact, except in sanitary matters, the Act touches but lightly any factories of the furniture class which do not use mechanical power.

That was the industrial aspect of the question. It showed that the coloured Asiatic alien was a dangerous element in the community, competing as he did with white people, who were part and parcel of ourselves, who were taxpayers, who professed our religion, who shared the same aspirations and ambitions, and patronised our institutions of a scientific, benevolent, literary, or historical kind. These were being starved out by the competition of the Asiatic alien. There was another point in connection with the employment of women, which was to be found on the same page—

The employment of white girls in the factories owned by Syrians I have a very strong objection to, as, although the wife is the nominal head, the men have

the most say in the matter. The work done by them is mostly hawking, and I have seen as many as five men at one time sitting smoking while these girls are working. It is not allowed or done by any European. Why should it be allowed to be done in their case? I have reduced the evil by talking to them, but they know very well that I have not the power to enforce it.

Half-a-dozen members of the House had passed a Syrian factory down below Fish's Steam Laundry, and they had noticed scores of times these dirty Syrians sitting on the benches smoking, spitting, wagging their legs, and very likely talking in their own lingo and making remarks that perhaps it was just as well their white employees could not understand. The Government seemed to take a fiendish delight in perpetuating this system, and yet it included in its Cabinet a member, the Hon. Mr. Rutledge, the Attorney-General, who was a most vigorous advocate of a "white Australia" a few years ago. That hon. gentleman was now up to his neck tied to the black-labour Government, which took a fiendish delight in perpetuating the dirty alien competition. It was no joke to an unfortunate carpenter or cabinet-maker to have to compete with the Chinaman or Jap. who worked seventy hours a week, and did much of his work by candle light. No matter how they looked at it, competition of that nature was a dangerous element, and should be excluded from the country altogether. It was by making dispassionate reports like that of the Chief Inspector of Factories known to the public that the fact would be gradually borne in upon their minds that the coloured pest was doing a national injury. It was a most serious and deplorable fact that in a community like this the children of white citizens should be compelled to enter the dens of Chinese and Japanese and Syrians and work for coloured scum like that; and it was time the people woke up to the fact that on the Ministerial benches, and behind them, were to be found deliberate cold-blooded advocates of the coloured curse which was in their midst.

Mr. McDONNELL thought the administration of the Act required a little more discussion. There was no doubt that in the Northern part of the colony, in Townsville and elsewhere, great exception was taken by shopkeepers to the way in which the Act was being administered. It was well understood that in a great many of those places the closing hours provided by the Act were not being observed, and the unfortunate part of it was that permission had to be obtained by the police officer, or clerk of petty sessions, who was acting as inspector, before a prosecution could be undertaken. If inspectors had the right to enter a prosecution when they discovered the Act being openly violated, there would not be as much opposition to the Act as existed in certain quarters. The hon. member for Herbert referred to vigilance committees, and the *Courier* yesterday morning reported that owing to the work of the vigilance committee at Mount Morgan several prosecutions for violation of the Act had been undertaken by the officers of the department. He thought it was a pity that those people were forced into the position of having to drive the department to take action. A similar state of affairs had existed in Brisbane where information had been given in reference to violations of the Act. Shopkeepers desirous of observing the law complained that their greedy neighbours had allowed their doors to remain open, and thus took an unfair advantage of those who observed the law. He would like to know how many prosecutions had been undertaken for breaches of that part of the Act since it came into force? He was glad to see that one hotel-keeper who had defied the provisions of the Act had been fined; but he should like the department to show a little more

energy. There was nothing which disgusted a fair-minded man more than to see an Act of Parliament which he faithfully endeavoured to obey openly violated by his neighbour and competitor. He was inclined to think that inspectors, either police officers or clerks of petty sessions, had not done their duty as faithfully in that respect as they ought to have done. At all events, they had not received that encouragement from the department which was their due. He knew that in Rockhampton a number of persons were practically defying the Act at one time. That sort of thing was going on for a long time before any action was taken, and

[10.30 p.m.] when action was taken some Chinese were fined in very considerable sums for breaches of the Act. He had made certain statements to the Chief Inspector, on behalf of the shopkeepers in Longreach, that the Act was being evaded by the Chinese in that town. He made that statement on a public platform, at the request of the Longreach shopkeepers, and when he came back to Brisbane he represented the matter to the Chief Inspector and to the Home Secretary, and he was glad to hear the hon. gentleman say now that that had been remedied since, and that the Act was pretty well observed in Longreach by these Chinese. He thought a little more energy and determination should be observed in regard to prosecutions for breaches of the Act, for that would give great satisfaction. If a few lessons were taught to persons who thought they had a right to ignore the Act, it would have a very good effect, not only in Brisbane, but in the colony generally, and in Townsville particularly, where representations were made to the leader of the Opposition when he was going through that the Chinese storekeepers there very largely evaded the Act. The result had been that many shopkeepers in Townsville, who were in favour of the Act, were very much disgusted at its administration.

Mr. BOWMAN (*Warrego*): He was exceedingly pleased with the report submitted by the Chief Inspector of Factories, which dealt with the conditions under the factory system which they had in the State. The few remarks made by the hon. member for the Valley previously, with regard to additional assistance, should engage the serious consideration of hon. members and of the Government. As a factory hand of many years' standing, he knew the disabilities under which many men and women worked in factories, and he also knew the hard work the inspectors had to undertake to watch the doings of employers, and particularly of those who were anxious to evade the law. The report of the Chief Inspector contained a great deal of valuable information and many valuable suggestions. The comparisons drawn between one colony and another showed at any rate that the inspector had had his eyes open, and that he had studied the beneficial effects of the factory legislation in Victoria. There was one paragraph which he would read. The Chief Inspector said—

Although industrial conditions may vary to some extent in different States, it is clear that—in Victoria, with a total of over 50,000 employees, the total amount of overtime worked by women and young persons is only 9,262 hours, while with our total of 17,960 employees it is 52,380—the amount worked here is, especially considering climatic conditions, excessive, and could be very greatly reduced without prejudice to business.

That was a statement which hon. members on both sides should be interested in, for he would not say that all the interest in this matter was manifested on one side of the Chamber. He knew that the Home Secretary had given a good many men who had waited on him a good deal of encouragement personally, and he believed that if the hon. gentleman had his own way—if he

could induce the other members of the Government to carry out his desires with regard to factory legislation, he believed that the system would be better carried out than it was at present. He wished to refer to the comparison with Victoria. Last year in Queensland, prior to the passing of the Act, the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. McDonnell, carried a motion in this House for the appointment of special wages boards. He pointed out from statistical information which he had received that these boards had been very beneficial to many in Victoria, especially in Melbourne. They desired to get that same system introduced in Queensland, but at that time the Home Secretary was disinclined to introduce it here. Personally he rather favoured arbitration courts, so as to regulate the wages paid to employees in factories. The inspector again said—

The one dominant factor affecting the internal industrial relationships of the respective States is that of wages, and whether we derive satisfaction or other wise from the comparison of the average earnings of operatives in these States with our own depends entirely upon the point of view from which the comparison is made. The report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Shops in Victoria for the year 1900 affords an opportunity of comparing the latest statistics of that State with our own.

Many conflicting statements have been made as to the success or otherwise of the principle of the minimum wage as applied in Victoria, but if, after experience of some years of its operations in six trades, they decide, as was done last year, to extend it to an additional twenty-one, there need be no doubt as to the opinion of the Victorian Parliament on the subject. It is impossible in such a report as this to compare all trades, but the figures in a few have been taken out on uniform basis for comparison.

In the bread-baking trade the average wage in 1896, in Victoria, was £1 12s. 5d. for men and boys. Last year it was £2 4s.; working hours, 48. In Queensland the average wage of men and boys last year was £1 19s. 8½d., and working hours vary from 48 to 70.

In the boot trade in 1896, in Victoria, males £1 16s. 10d., females 13s. 4d.; in 1900, males £1 14s. 5d., females 14s. 7d. In Queensland the average last year was—males £1 7s 5½d., females 12s. 2½d.

In the shirt trade in 1896, in Victoria, 14s. 5d., and last year 14s. 8d. In Queensland, 11s. 9½d.

In underclothing last year, in Victoria, 12s. 7d. Queensland's average was 11s. 5½d.

In the clothing trade in 1896, males £1 15s. 3d., females 15s. 3d.; last year—males £2 2s. 4d., females 18s 1d. Queensland, last year—males £1 16s. 0½d., females 11s. 10½d.

So it would be seen that the people who worked under the Victorian system had decided advantages over the people who worked in factories in Queensland, and he believed that this was largely due to the legislation that had been passed in Victoria, and which had operated successfully in regard to those who came under its operation. He and many others who took a great interest in this matter recognised that if special wages boards were appointed they would not be comprehensive enough—they would not affect a large number in different trades and occupations in the colony. They were hopeful that the Government would have seen fit to introduce legislation dealing with the regulation of their factories in that direction this year, but they could endeavour to insert provisions in committee in the Bill which had been introduced, giving similar facilities to those which worked so satisfactorily in other places. Another point which should appeal to hon. members was with reference to the employment of children. They were told in the report—

There is no minimum age fixed for employment in shops, consequently children under fourteen years of age may be employed; nor is there any limitation as to the age under which they may not be employed for night-work. At the present time there are some cases, fortunately only few, where girls under eighteen years of age are employed in certain exempted shops to a very late hour, sometimes between 11 and 12 p.m., and this we have no power under the Act to interfere with.

He trusted that the amending Bill would contain some provision dealing with that matter, so that inspectors would have power to prevent employers keeping children at work for unduly long hours. The boy labour question was one that was touched upon by the same inspector. The number of boys who were brought into the various trades was a matter of great concern to tradesmen. The inspector told them that hardly one boy in fifty went through a proper apprenticeship in Brisbane, and that, after a few years, they were able to take their place as journeymen in competition with men. He knew, from his experience of the boot trade, that when a boy learned the trade fairly well, he was preferred by an employer to a man, because he worked for less wages, and that was the experience in other trades as well. The inspector also referred to the overtime that boys were asked to work. He said—

In many cases the overtime was spread over a considerable period, and does not represent night labour. But in the biscuit factories this was not the case. This overtime was worked within a limited space of time and under trying conditions. Is it not cruel to work a boy forty-eight hours a week near an oven in a temperature of 100 degrees and over? What then must it be to work him fifty-six hours (overtime on three nights of the week)? These reflections apply also in a lesser degree to work in other factories where considerable steaming and cooking is done.

Now those were things that had come under the observation of the inspector or those under him, but at present there was no power in the Act to rectify the evil. Not only were boys subjected to those conditions, but here was another paragraph dealing with girls—

The necessity for a limit being placed on the hours worked by females in restaurants, pastrycooks' shops, etc., was, as reported last year, very great. In some cases the employees worked from sixty to sixty-six hours weekly, but in many of the smaller places they worked from seventy to eighty hours per week. In many cases no weekly half-holiday was given. In some places where the employees worked on the Sunday also, the only holiday was on every alternate Sunday, and even then the girls had sometimes to come back at teatime for a few hours. The girls were on the premises in some instances from 6 or 6.30 a.m. until 8 or 8.30 p.m., and on Saturday nights much later still. Some of the girls who worked very long hours were only fifteen or sixteen years of age, though this is not the case generally.

Mr. McDONNELL: That is not the case now—sixty hours is the limit.

Mr. BOWMAN: He was very pleased to hear it, but even sixty hours was altogether too long for those girls. In many of the restaurants in Brisbane the girls were simply worked like so many machines, and had hardly any time to themselves at all or any comfort. Attention was also called to some of the prices that were paid to a number of unfortunate women for work that they took out of doors. He would ask any hon. member whether he would care to have any of his female relatives making a dozen shirts for 1s. 9d.? Of course the prices ranged higher, according to the quality of the work; but, in the face of the statements contained in the report, it was their manifest duty to improve the conditions under which those women and girls worked. He remembered Colonel Reay and Mr. Maugher, now a member of the House of Representatives, some time ago speaking of their experiences in Melbourne. They stated that the Anti-sweating League was able to bring pressure to bear upon the Victorian Government to fix by legislation a minimum wage, so that a woman was always able to earn a decent living; but in Queensland it was impossible for any woman or girl to make a decent living at the prices stated in the report. That was the experience of some with whom he was personally acquainted. In connection with the

dressmaking and millinery workrooms, the report stated that, out of 657 employees, sixty-three were receiving no wages, fifty-six were receiving 2s. 6d. weekly, and 119 from 2s. 6d. to 5s. weekly—that was, about 36 per cent. of those employees were receiving an average weekly wage of 2s. 10d. In the order-tailoring workrooms, out of 605 female employees twenty-six were receiving no wages, fifty were receiving 2s. 6d. weekly, and sixty-three were receiving from 2s. 6d. to 5s. weekly—that was, about 23 per cent. of the employees were receiving an average weekly wage of 3s. Those numbers were from those employed at the close of the year. That was sufficient to show the necessity for strengthening the hands of the officials of the department, so that they could inspect the various shops and factories throughout the different districts of Queensland. He trusted that the hon. gentleman in charge of the department would consider it his duty during the consideration of the amending Factories and Shops Bill to make some provision for a special wages board, or a conciliation and arbitration court, so that employees who were unable to help themselves might get a fair wage.

Mr. McDONNELL asked if the Minister could give the Committee any information as to the number of reports received from the police of breaches of the Act in the metropolitan district?

The HOME SECRETARY: He thought three cases had been reported. In one case there was a prosecution, in another there was not sufficient evidence to warrant a prosecution, and the third case was now under consideration. In many instances, where reports had been received, inquiry was immediately made by the department, and warnings had been given to the persons concerned. It must be remembered that, although the Act had been in existence many months now, yet it was rather a new thing in many districts in the State, and in administering a law of this kind it was not desirable in the first stages to do more than warn people in such a way as to make it appear to them that they must observe the Act. There was really a great deal of ignorance about it in many instances, but taking the matter all round he thought the Act was generally observed, and that breaches of it were remarkably few.

Mr. McDONNELL: There would be less if action was taken in one or two cases.

The HOME SECRETARY: No doubt action would be taken very shortly. As long as the law was in force he was quite prepared to enforce it, but at the same time legislation of this kind should not be enforced too strictly in the first instance.

Mr. GIVENS: A lot of inspectors in outside districts want waking up.

The HOME SECRETARY: Then he hoped that inspectors in outside districts would take that as a warning that they were expected to do their duty, and see that the Act was carried out. He was prepared to back them up in anything they did in that respect.

Mr. McDONNELL agreed that it was wise to take the precaution of warning people in the first instance before taking more drastic measures, but he thought that in a good many cases it had been all warning. He noticed that there was provision in the vote for an accountant, and he hoped that in making the appointment to that office the claims of the chief clerk, Mr. Hely—who had been in the department ever since its organisation, and who had given satisfaction to his chief and the Minister—would receive consideration.

The HOME SECRETARY was not prepared to make any statement as to what was to be done with regard to filling the position of accountant. It was quite possible that, by a

readjustment of the office, they could run along without making a formal appointment of an accountant, and to appoint another inspector, who might really be more useful under the circumstances. All he could say at present was that the matter was under consideration.

Mr. LESINA thought laundries like that at the refuge in Turbot street should be brought under the operation of the Act.

Mr. McDONNELL: They are all under the Act.

Mr. LESINA: Then he thought the Act should be more stringently administered in regard to such institutions, and that they should be compelled to provide proper sleeping accommodation for the women who were employed in them.

Question put and passed.

#### GOVERNMENT MEDICAL OFFICERS.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £1,095 be granted for Government medical officers. There were certain increases in this vote amounting altogether to £230. Dr. Stewart, of Dalby, was a new appointment; his salary was £100 per annum, which included the whole of the medical attendance in connection with the Dalby Sanatorium. At Georgetown it was found necessary to appoint a medical officer [11 p.m.] at £30. At Toowoomba, Dr. Garde had an increase of £100 for duties which included medical attendance and supervision of the reformatory at Westbrook.

Question put and passed.

#### MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES (SUBDIVISION).

The HOME SECRETARY, in moving that £23,500 be granted for miscellaneous services, said there was an increase from £2,000 to £7,000 for expenses under Elections Acts. That was on account of the impending general election, which would take place before the next Estimates were submitted. Then there was an increase in the vote for relief of aboriginals from £6,000 to £7,000, because the vote last year was found insufficient. There was a decrease in the vote for foreign interpreters, £90. There was only one now, and he would be paid from the vote for incidentals. There was a saving of £500 in the vote for removals of police magistrates and clerks of petty sessions; and the grant of £1,500 for the South Brisbane Recreation Reserve, of course, did not appear this year. The total amount of the decreases was £2,090, and that amount deducted from the total increases of £6,000 left a net increase of £3,910.

Mr. BOWMAN: What is the society for prevention of consumption?

The HOME SECRETARY: That was the society he quoted from the report this evening. He supposed most members had seen their circulars and posters as to the means taken to prevent the spread of consumption.

Mr. GIVENS: Have they any other funds to work on besides this £50?

The HOME SECRETARY: There were the subscriptions contributed by the members of the society. It was a very desirable thing, and the society issued very practical and useful information.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Burke*) said he would like to have some information with regard to the vote of £3,000 for incidental and miscellaneous expenses.

The HOME SECRETARY: It was an item made up of a large number of small expenses. Everything that could not be provided for in the other departments was put down to the Home Secretary's "Miscellaneous expenses."

Mr. MAXWELL asked how the aboriginal vote was expended, and what salaries were paid out of it?

The HOME SECRETARY: The salaries of the protectors were paid out of this vote. Dr. Roth received £400 a year, and Mr. A. Meston £300 a year, and they were both allowed travelling expenses. Mr. H. Meston received at present £150 a year, but that was not a permanent appointment. He was doing special duty in the West. There were three other protectors, one getting £50, one £25, and one £20. That was in addition to what they received for other work. These were the only protectors who were paid. The teachers in the aboriginal schools on the mission stations in Torres Strait were also paid out of this vote, and from what he had seen there was no better spent money in this State. His visit quite opened his eyes on the question of the natives there, and if hon. members wanted an interesting trip they could not do better than pay a visit to the islands of the Torres Strait.

Mr. GIVENS: If you were to bring the blacks in the Southern division directly under the control of the Southern protector, you would have to bring them into Queen street.

The HOME SECRETARY: No.

Mr. GIVENS: I have seen him there all the year, anyway.

The HOME SECRETARY: No. The hon. member had not seen him there all the year. He (the Home Secretary) did not think the Southern protector was to be found in Brisbane, just now, for instance.

Mr. GIVENS: It is not long since he was.

The HOME SECRETARY: Just so; this was his headquarters, but he travelled backwards and forwards. He went on the Central line in one direction and on the Western line in the other. He travelled a good deal, and though Mr. Meston and himself did not agree on many things, he was one of the most economical officers that he ever came across.

Mr. MAXWELL: That is a great recommendation in these times.

The HOME SECRETARY: It was. The missionaries were not paid out of this vote at all.

Mr. GIVENS: They get assistance for maintaining the blacks?

The HOME SECRETARY: There were certain sums allowed to them for feeding the blacks, and those sums were paid out of this vote. The missionaries themselves were not in any way paid by the Government, but the Government—in order to secure proper education—provided a school teacher at each mission station, and the only difference between these schools and the ordinary provisional schools was that religious teaching was permitted at any time during school hours. For that reason the schools had been taken out of the jurisdiction of the Education Department and placed under that of the Home Secretary, subject only to the fact that they were periodically inspected by an officer from the other department, and his report was sent in to the Home Secretary's Department, and the progress was remarkably satisfactory. The amounts paid to the various mission stations for maintaining the blacks were as follows:—Mapoon (Batavia River), £200; Weipa (Embly River), £200; Bellenden Ker (Yarrabah), £200; Cape Bedford, £150; Deebing Creek, £300. That was to continue for two years under a special arrangement to 30th June, 1902, after which time it was expected that Deebing Creek would become self-supporting. Out of the money they had managed to save from the earnings of the blacks, they had been able to purchase two farms. They had already paid for one, cleared it, and cultivated it, and were making a very good thing of it. They had also stocked the Baramba Reserve with stock from Deebing Creek, and they were proud of it.

Mr. McMASTER: They are becoming capitalists.

The HOME SECRETARY: They had become capitalists, and they were communists, too. Fraser Island got £500, and Marie Yaamba £120. This latter was about to be closed. It had not been a great success, probably owing to the insufficient raw material to work upon. Bloomfield got £150. This had now changed hands, and, instead of being under the control of the Lutheran Church in South Australia, it had been handed over to the Lutheran Church of Bavaria, whose representatives out here were Mr. Schortz and the Rev. Mr. Poland, who had made such a great success of the Cape Bedford Station. At Baramba £250 was down for the maintenance of the blacks. This station had just been started, and for the present, instead of a schoolmaster being sent there, they were allowing £50 to the superintendent to get the station into proper working order.

Mr. GIVENS: Can you give us an idea of the total number of aboriginals now in the State?

The HOME SECRETARY: It was impossible to make an estimate. It had been variously estimated from 20,000 to 25,000.

Mr. MAXWELL: I think that is over-estimated.

The HOME SECRETARY: Dr. Roth, in whose district the greater number were, was of opinion that that was so. Dr. Roth had seen about 6,000, and he calculated that for every one he had seen there were two he had not seen.

Mr. MAXWELL: In connection with this matter, he saw that Mr. Meston, in giving his evidence before the other Chamber, was asked by Mr. Gibson in reference to the aboriginals cultivating sugar-cane, and he said he was preparing a comprehensive scheme to lay before the hon. gentleman. He was wondering whether it was the intention of the hon. gentleman to see that the aboriginals were brought in and placed on the cane-fields.

The HOME SECRETARY: I have not seen the comprehensive report yet.

Mr. MAXWELL: Did the hon. gentleman think it right that the aboriginals should be employed in that way?

The HOME SECRETARY saw no reason why they should not be. In some districts they had been employed in cane-cutting with success. There was one plantation on which at one time 100 of them were employed regularly every year.

Mr. LESINA asked for further information in reference to the contingency vote. Did it include the cost of advertising which the Minister authorised without reference to the Advertising Board? He knew that the Railway Department gave a considerable amount away to that little leprous organ the *Street*.

The HOME SECRETARY: No advertisements were paid for out of the vote. Any department of State could come down upon the vote for extra or unspecified expenditure.

Mr. KERR asked how the vote of £400 for pounds was expended? Were the local residents expected to contribute to the establishment of a new pound?

The HOME SECRETARY: In one or two instances, for special reasons, local contributions had been asked for. Probably in those cases a limited number of people would be benefited. Amounts up to about £40 were usually allowed, but sometimes, of course, less was granted.

Mr. KERR: The people of Jericho were placed at great disadvantage, because when carriers' stock was impounded it had to be driven 38 miles to Alpha. There was a yard at Jericho in which a dip had been constructed, but neither had been used, and he believed application had been made for the use of the yard as a pound. It would save a great deal of inconvenience, and be a great benefit to the people. Under present

circumstances, if a carrier's stock was impounded, he had to pay travelling expenses for over 30 miles as well as poundage.

The HOME SECRETARY: To whom does the yard belong?

Mr. KERR: He presumed to the Agricultural Department.

The HOME SECRETARY: All the local bench had to do was to apply to the Stock Department and inquire whether the yard could be used as a pound.

Mr. MAXWELL: Referring to the vote for election expenses, he would suggest that economy could be practised if returning officers sent the ballot-boxes and papers by mail instead of by special messenger. In some cases, where they had to be sent 60 or 70 miles, it cost a considerable amount to send by messenger.

The HOME SECRETARY: As a rule he believed the returning officers did the best under the circumstances. It was not always convenient to send by mail, and in his own district he knew of instances where it was necessary to send by special messenger, but as a rule they were sent by mail.

Mr. KERR: There was another way in which the Home Secretary could effect some saving.

There was one polling-place in his [11:30 p.m.] own electorate which was not within a great distance from another polling-place, and the presiding officer got £5, and yet there were only two votes recorded there.

Mr. MAXWELL: He recollected a case where men had to go 80 miles to record three votes.

Mr. LESINA: Nearly every hon. member could find instances where the Government showed cheerful willingness to establish polling-booths in order to get three votes when they knew that those votes would be for their side; and in other places, where they knew the majority of the votes would go "labour," there was the greatest difficulty in getting a polling-booth.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is only a bald statement.

Mr. LESINA: It was a fact. There was the case at Opalton, where thirty or forty men had to ride 80 miles to record their votes. He had known them to borrow horses and travel that distance, record their votes, and then go back again to their work the next day. Such a thing was infamous, and only a Government which was utterly shameless would do this sort of business, but this Government was so utterly shameless that they would do anything. It was just as well that these facts should be made known.

The HOME SECRETARY: If they were facts.

Mr. LESINA: They were facts. He knew places in his own electorate where only one, two, three, or four votes were recorded, because the men there said they would "go for the big fellow Government," and yet in the face of all this, this Government was asking them to calmly pass this vote for £7,000 for the next election—they asked that smilingly. He would guarantee that the Government would see that there were polling-booths enough in the districts of Nundah, Cook, Balonne, and other places where they knew they had a majority of supporters. They would avoid doing everything that would tend to give Labour voters a chance of voting. They would even delay sending the lists, as they had seen in the case of the elections at Rockhampton North and Gympie. Every member's political existence depended on votes, and he would not be doing his duty if he did not point out these facts. He protested against this sort of business. They could see what low, mean, paltry steps this Government would take at times when dealing with hon. members on his side. They were quite willing to establish ten booths in Brisbane, and the Hon. A. J. Thynne,

a gentleman in "another place," could go round in a cab and strike property votes, but not so at Millchester, where there were 200 or 300 men living 5 miles away from Charters Towers. No, they would make these men walk or take a bus or a cart—they would not establish a polling-booth there. Then the polling-booths in Charters Towers might be congested late in the afternoon, and the result would be that perhaps 100 men would not be able to record their votes. This Government would not stop at anything like that—that was pettifogging and mean. He knew there were at one place in the Clermont district about 100 men, who had settled down, who worked hard, and who strove to make a livelihood, but they would not have a chance to record their votes at the next election, because this Government thought they had a democratic reputation—that they would not vote for some browbeaten Government candidate. He strongly protested against this vote going through, knowing how wretchedly this Government expended money. He hoped his remarks would be remembered.

The HOME SECRETARY: Most of them have no foundation.

Mr. LESINA: Then with regard to contingencies, he noticed £2,000 or £3,000 put down for miscellaneous expenditure, and if the Chief Secretary's Department had £2,000 put down for this, how was it that it was included in that item in the Home Secretary's Estimates? He protested against the statement of the Home Secretary in that respect being made without proof. They had cut down the vote for hospitals and benevolent asylums, and yet here hon. members were asked to pass £3,000 *holus-bolus*, without any investigation. They had no idea how it would be expended. If the House and the country were satisfied, all very well, but he was not at all satisfied.

Mr. KERR stated that, although Alpha was a place where revision courts were held for the electoral districts of Clermont, Leichhardt, and Barcoo, the polling-place was taken away from it, and the resident electors were forced to travel 38 miles by rail to record their votes. They had to pay their railway fares, and were compelled to wait for a train to take them home again. Seeing it was a place where a revision court was held, it was surely entitled to be a polling-place.

The HOME SECRETARY suggested that the hon. member should bring the matter under the notice of the returning officer before the election. Notwithstanding all that had been said he could not bring to mind any case in which a recommendation had been made by a returning officer for the establishment of a polling-place which had not been complied with.

Mr. MAXWELL: We do not say it is the fault of the department. We say it is the fault of the returning officers.

The HOME SECRETARY: They were surely able to trust their returning officers. His experience of those gentlemen was that they were men with an earnest desire to do their duty impartially. Notwithstanding what the hon. member for Clermont said, he was prepared to give a flat contradiction to the bulk of the statements the hon. member had made. Of course he had made them in general terms, and had given no instances as the hon. member for Barcoo had done.

Mr. LESINA: Opalton was a case I quoted.

The HOME SECRETARY: There might have been some reason for it in that case that he did not know.

Mr. LESINA: Fancy the hon. gentleman making a general statement like that. He gave him a specific instance, which was sufficient in itself to prove the correctness of his contention.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes, if your facts are correct—which they very seldom are.

Mr. LESINA: He supposed the returning officer desired to carry favour with the Government. Some returning officers had a weakness in that direction, like some civil servants, and refused to have polling-places in certain localities.

Mr. MAXWELL did not think the Government were to blame in the matter at all. In his own electorate many places had been missed simply through an oversight of the returning officer, who did not look into the matter very particularly, probably, and was not acquainted with the district.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is quite possible.

Mr. MAXWELL: He had brought the matter up simply because he thought it could be done much cheaper.

The HOME SECRETARY: What the hon. member said was probably correct. He knew of an instance in his own electorate where he might fairly expect to receive the larger number of votes at that particular polling-place, but no polling-place was appointed there.

Question put and passed.

#### GRANT IN AID OF ROADS AND BRIDGES.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £5,000 be granted in aid of roads and bridges. There was a large reduction in the vote, due entirely to the fact that it was necessary to curtail expenditure.

Mr. GIVENS: In addition to the very large reduction in the endowment to local authorities, they were brought face to face with another reduction of £6,900 in this grant. He should like some information from the Home Secretary as to the particular districts in which the £11,000 was spent last year, and he would also ask for a little consideration for a district which was partly represented by the hon. member for Woothakata and partly by himself, in the spending of the £5,000 now asked for. He took it that the vote was put on the Estimates mainly for the purpose of giving assistance to outside divisional boards which had to maintain main roads leading from the interior to the coast, and also to assist in building bridges, the cost of which was too great for the resources of any individual board. Leading to the ports of Cairns and Port Douglas from the interior there was a 10-chain main road. It was a very difficult job to keep it open. It went over the Herberton range, and was pretty nearly all in the territory of the Tinaroo Board, and was practically outside the portions of the division where there were any residents, or from which the local authority received any rates.

The HOME SECRETARY: What is there at the end of the road?

Mr. GIVENS: It was a main road leading to the Mareeba Railway terminus, and at the other end were Herberton, Mount Garnet, Irvinebank, and Watsonville.

The HOME SECRETARY: Those are mining fields. You will have to go to the Secretary for Mines for assistance.

Mr. GIVENS: Those places were mining centres, but it was also a main stock road to the coast. There was a vote in the Mines Estimates, but that was for roads to new goldfields.

The HOME SECRETARY: The item in the Estimates for the Mines Department is £2,000 for roads and bridges to gold and mineral fields.

Mr. GIVENS: Not a farthing of that vote was available for the road he was referring to. The Tinaroo Divisional Board made application last year for a portion of this vote, and the Minister assured him that the matter would have his favourable consideration. The board had 1901--5 B

also made application this year for a grant for this road on which they had done a great deal of valuable work, from which they derived only a small benefit compared with the benefit derived from it by outside local authorities, who did not contribute towards the expense of its maintenance. It was the main road to Georgetown and all the Western mail centres, and the board had built high-level bridges over the creeks, and he thought they should receive a portion of this vote to assist them in maintaining the road. But what he particularly wished to know was where this £11,000 was spent last year?

The HOME SECRETARY was under the impression that the Tinaroo Divisional Board had not fared at all badly out of this vote. Unless his memory misled him, the board had received something like £600 or £700 in addition to their endowment, and quite irrespective of any sum they had got from the Mines Department.

Mr. GIVENS: They never got a shilling from the Mines Department for this road, but I believe the original road was opened by the Mines Department.

The HOME SECRETARY: The vote for the Mines Department was taken from the Home Secretary's Department, and was administered on exactly the same lines as the vote for the Home Secretary's Department, and the reason it was transferred to the Mines Department was because that department was likely to have better information with regard to roads on gold and mineral fields. At any rate, the Tinaroo Divisional Board got £150 last year for the road from Atherton to Mareeba.

Mr. GIVENS: The Tinaroo Divisional Board got £150 last year for the maintenance of a road from Atherton to the Russell River Gold Fields, but not for the road from Atherton to Mareeba. But he should like to have the information as to how the £11,000 voted last year had been spent.

The HOME SECRETARY was unable to give that information, but nothing like £11,000 was spent. As a matter of fact, not half that amount was spent, because the Treasury refused to carry forward a vote, and moneys which were granted the previous year, to the extent of £6,000, had to be paid out of that £11,000, but he had not got the particulars with him.

Mr. GIVENS: It was very strange that the hon. gentleman knew that £150 had been granted for the road from Atherton to Mareeba, and yet did not know anything about the other roads.

The HOME SECRETARY: It was for the year 1899-1900 that the £150 was granted.

Mr. GIVENS: He was speaking of last year, and he was satisfied that no such sum was granted to the Tinaroo Divisional Board for the road from Atherton to Mareeba for that year.

It was surely right that the Committee should know that the money voted last year had been properly spent, but the information was not forthcoming. He had an idea that a considerable portion of it was spent in some of the Southern electorates which were not entitled to a shilling of it.

The HOME SECRETARY: Why should not the South get some of it?

Mr. GIVENS: He had no objection in places where boards were likely to find difficulty in maintaining a large mileage of roads which were not solely used by the people in the division; but he did object to any portion of the vote being expended in suburban electorates around Brisbane. That was openly insinuated—he did not know it of his own knowledge—and the Home Secretary refused to clear the matter up.

The HOME SECRETARY: He had already expressed his regret that he had not the information here. It was not altogether his fault, or the fault of the officials, who were under the

impression they had it with them. The hon. member objected to the South getting any portion of the vote.

Mr. GIVENS said he had offered no such objection, and the hon. gentleman must accept his denial.

The HOME SECRETARY said he certainly understood the hon. member to say he objected to the South getting any portion of the vote. However, he would accept his denial, and appeal to to-morrow's *Hansard* to see which was right.

Mr. GIVENS rose to a point of order. The hon. gentleman must accept his denial without any qualification.

The HOME SECRETARY: He would do so, but he still said *Hansard* would be right.

Mr. NEWELL said he was sorry the vote had been cut down. He could use the entire amount in his own electorate. The road mentioned by the hon. member for Cairns went through very rough country, from hundreds of miles of which not a shilling of rates was received. He did not know what the people there would do unless they put their hands into their own pockets, and unfortunately it was not like a hospital subscription—they did not get £2 for every £1 subscribed. He fully expected that he would get the most of that £5,000 himself.

Mr. BRIDGES (*Nundah*): The vote was for £5,000, and the amount was very small. There was £2,500 for roads and £2,500 for bridges. He would certainly do his best to get the £2,500 to which he was entitled.

Mr. LESINA: Last year he wanted information with respect to this vote, but he did not get the information he wanted. He believed that if all the information had been given it would have been found that the money was spent in Ministerial constituencies, and largely in the South. In his district there was a road over which coal for the Government was drawn 12 miles to the nearest railway station, and money was wanted to repair that road. He supposed the reduction in the vote was due to the fact that Queensland had to pay her share of the war. There might be other reasons. There was £3,000 spent in crackers the other day.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is out of order in referring to that on this vote.

Mr. LESINA: He wanted to know why the Government had made the reduction in the vote. There was a deficit in the Treasury, and he supposed it had to be made up by reductions in current expenditure. Government mismanagement and extravagance were responsible for the deficit. By reason of this reduction in the vote, communication throughout the country would be interfered with; trade would consequently be interfered with; and the country generally would suffer. That would all be due to the fact that the Government, by extravagance and brainless administration—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. LESINA: By unintelligent administration they had made it necessary to reduce the vote.

Mr. HANRAN (*Townsville*) rose to a point of order. The hon. member was not speaking to the question before the Committee. They had been listening for the last two hours to a lot of ridiculous nonsense, and he trusted that it would be stopped.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must be aware that I have to guard against calling members to order unnecessarily. The hon. member for Clermont has wandered from the question a good deal, and I again ask him to speak to the question.

Mr. LESINA bowed to the ruling of the Chairman, and concluded by mentioning some of the evils that would follow in the train of the reduction of the vote, for which the extravagance of the Government in the past was responsible.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed; the CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had come to certain resolutions, and the resolutions were ordered to be received at the next sitting of the House.

The Committee obtained leave to sit again at the next sitting of the House.

# ABORIGINALS PROTECTION AND RESTRICTION OF THE SALE OF OPIUM BILL.

## MESSAGE FROM THE COUNCIL.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of a message from the Legislative Council, intimating that they had agreed to the Bill with amendments, in which they invited the concurrence of the Assembly.

Ordered that the message be taken into consideration at the next sitting of the House.

The House adjourned at twenty-three minutes past 12 o'clock.