

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY 8 NOVEMBER 1906

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. HARDACRE (*Leichhardt*): I desire to be allowed to make a personal explanation. I would be exceedingly sorry if even in the heat of debate I made an unjust accusation or a personal statement against anyone. In reference to the statement of yesterday afternoon, that I accused Mr. Kidston, the present Premier, of personally approaching Mr. Philp, the present leader of the Opposition and the late Premier, for the purpose of inducing him to take him into his Ministry, when I sat down yesterday I had a strong impression, in spite of what members said to me, that I had not made such a statement, and indeed on looking up the *Hansard* report I find that it does not contain the statement on my part. The words I am reported to have used are that he was intriguing, which is an entirely different thing to saying that he personally approached the Premier. The only expression which may have given rise to that idea was one—namely, "He can ask his own colleague, the Minister for Agriculture, if he did not approach Mr. Philp and ask him to take in himself and the Premier." The "he" there is not alluding to the Premier, but to his colleague, the Minister for Agriculture. Then another expression used by me, "You told him that you were sick and tired of the Labour party," was made by way of interjection, and that expressed my understanding, but the information I had was not by personal statement but by a message which is alleged to have come from the present Premier and received by the then Premier.

The PREMIER: Who alleges?

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Leichhardt appears to me to be going beyond a personal explanation.

Mr. HARDACRE: The leader of the Opposition denied yesterday that the Premier approached him, and I do not wish to be uncharitable or say anything unfair. (Government laughter.) Nobody would be more pleased than I would be if the statement I made yesterday was unfounded, and I am anxious to receive from the Premier and the Minister for Agriculture a denial. (Government laughter.)

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PAGET: Can't you accept the word of the leader of the Opposition?

Mr. HARDACRE: In order that my action on this point may not be misunderstood, I may state that it was alleged that there is in the archives of the Labour party a letter—well, I have seen the letter, and I would be glad to read every word of it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the hon. member not to proceed any further. He is going entirely beyond a personal explanation, and raising matter of a very contentious nature.

Mr. HARDACRE: I do say if I have made a statement—

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Apologise.

Mr. HARDACRE: I do not apologise at all—(Government laughter)—but I should be very glad indeed to find that my expressions are wrong.

The PREMIER: I also want to rise to make a personal explanation. Just as I did yesterday, I deny again that there is any foundation whatever for making such a statement in connection with my name. If I did it, I would not be ashamed of it. It would be no discredit, and I do not think I am such a fool—and I think members in the House who know me will not think I should enter into an agreement which

Hon. W. Kidston.]

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

THURSDAY, 8 NOVEMBER, 1906.

The SPEAKER (Hon. Sir A. S. Cowley, *Herbert*) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

SHEARERS AND SUGAR WORKERS ACCOMMODATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

On the motion of the HON. P. AIREY (*Flinders*), this Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Council, by message in the usual form.

EXPLOSIVES BILL.

THIRD READING.

On the motion of the PREMIER (Hon. W. Kidston (*Rockhampton*), this Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Council, by message in the usual form.

could only do me good when it became public, and which I would be ashamed of when it became public.

Mr. LESINA: You said yesterday that you would not be ashamed of it.

The PREMIER: I do not think there is any occasion to be ashamed of the idea of being in office with Mr. Philp. If I thought it was right to do it I would do it to-morrow.

Mr. LESINA: You don't deny it, do you?

The PREMIER: Oh, yes; I deny that I authorised Mr. Denham, or anyone else, or that such a thing was ever mentioned to me or was ever in my mind, or, so far as I am aware, ever in the mind of anyone else.

Mr. PAGET: Especially in the mind of the leader of the Opposition.

The PREMIER: I could not say whether it was in his mind or not; I do not know; but I never heard that Mr. Philp had ever any such thing in his mind, and I would have been surprised to learn that he had.

Mr. HARDACRE: He had not.

The PREMIER: What surprised me in the statement of yesterday was that such a statement as this should have been made a charge against me by a gentleman who himself confessed that he had been intriguing with the same party, and that he had been offered a portfolio.

The SPEAKER: Order! That incident is closed, and must not be reopened by the hon. member.

Mr. HARDACRE: I did not hear what the Premier said. I am not afraid of anything that can be said about me.

SUPPLY.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE. HOME SECRETARY'S DEPARTMENT.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £3,127 be granted for the "Chief Office." There was an increase altogether of £227, which was made up as follows:—Chief clerk and accountant, from £400 to £450; record clerk, from £170 to £180; clerk in the accountant's branch, £130 to £150; despatch clerk, £130 to £140; clerk in the correspondence branch, £110 to £130; clerk in the accountant's room, £100 to £110, an additional clerk at £60, and the salary of the clerk and chief messenger from £180 to £200. There was a slight decrease in connection with the type-writing, as a result of a rearrangement of the work caused by the retirement of one typewriter and the appointment of another.

Mr. WOODS (*Woothakata*) wished to make a personal explanation, as he was told that this was the proper time to do so with the Chairman in the chair. On the last occasion when they were discussing Supply he was given to understand that he had made a definite charge against the administration of the Agent-General's Office in London.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the Committee that the hon. member should make the personal explanation?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. WOODS: The hon. member for Moreton mentioned the other night that when he called into the office of the Agent-General in London he was informed that the Agent-General was abroad. He (Mr. Woods), referring to that incident, said that in all probability Sir Horace Tozer was in Germany fixing up his commission for the price of wolfram. He wanted to say now that that statement had gone through the Press,

[*Hon. W. Kidston.*

and had created a wrong impression in the minds of the people of Queensland. As the Agent-General represented Queensland in London, he (Mr. Woods) would not be doing a fair thing if he accused Sir Horace Tozer of being dishonest. He did not want the statement to go abroad that he was accusing Sir Horace Tozer of being connected with any of the buyers, or with the price to be paid for wolfram. The opinion of the miners of North Queensland was that the information they had received in the last twelve months was better than the information they received previously. So far as the Mines Department was concerned, the officers of that department had supplied the information that they obtained from the Agent-General as soon as they possibly could to the miners of North Queensland. The information supplied was not perhaps as satisfactory as it might be coming from an officer occupying that position in London, but it was better than it had been. As the impression had got abroad that he (Mr. Woods) had made a statement which insinuated that there was dishonesty on Sir Horace Tozer's part, he wished to withdraw that statement.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP (*Townsville*) was very pleased to see some increases in the salaries of officers of the Home Secretary's Department, but there was one officer who did not get an increase—the Under Secretary, Mr. Ryder, who was one of their oldest servants, having been in the public service since 1862. He was the senior Under Secretary in the service and had been getting £750 a year, when he was reduced, by that brummagem Public Service Inquiry Board brought from another State, to £700. Other officers were getting increases to their salaries, but Mr. Ryder was left as he was before.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The Home Secretary said that reduction was for his benefit.

HON. R. PHILP: He was pleased to see the chief messenger, Mr. Mulcahy, getting £200 a year. Mr. Musgrave, who was reduced by the Public Service Inquiry Board, was down again at his old salary. It seemed to him that the Commission vindictively reduced some of the salaries.

Mr. REINHOLD: And the public servants don't know what it is for.

HON. R. PHILP: They did not know to this day what the reductions were for. Mr. Ryder had been in the service for forty-four years; he was at the head of the under secretaries, and while he had £50 taken off him, the chief clerk, Mr. Gall, who was under him, received an increase of £50. He did not object to Mr. Gall getting an increase, because he was a good man and deserved it, but there was no justification for reducing Mr. Ryder. Mr. Ryder was a long way under seventy years of age; he had known him personally for many years, and he could say that there was no better Under Secretary in any department than Mr. Ryder at the present day. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. REINHOLD (*Brisbane South*) asked if they were going to discuss the whole item on the first vote, or if it was desired that they should just deal with the Chief Office.

The HOME SECRETARY: Do as we did last year, and take each vote as it comes.

The CHAIRMAN: I will point out what the practice has been. It is that a general discussion on the administration of the department may take place on the first vote, and the details are left to the respective votes that follow.

Mr. REINHOLD: He only wanted to know if they were likely to be debarred later on, and be told that they should have mentioned certain matters on the first vote.

The HOME SECRETARY: Certainly not.

Mr. REINHOLD agreed with the leader of the Opposition in regard to some salaries being increased, and yet others which were reduced by the inquiry board remained where they were. Mr. Musgrave, who had been in the service since 1878, was getting £250 a year, and he was reduced by that board to £200. He had not had any of that £50 restored to him, while other officers of the department who received rises of £10 and £20 last year and the year before were down for rises again. The chief clerk and accountant, who was down for a rise of £50, also got an increase of £50 in July, 1904. He had no objection to that, except that it was beyond the amount provided for by the Act.

The HOME SECRETARY: There is a clause in the Act dealing with that.

Mr. REINHOLD: The hon. gentleman evidently referred to the clause which said that, if an officer was not getting a salary commensurate with the services he performed, he should get promotion. There were twenty-five to thirty officers who were getting more than the Act allowed, and others were getting no increases at all.

Mr. MACARTNEY (*Toowong*): There was something in the remarks of the hon. member for Brisbane South. This question of increases and reductions was on a most unsatisfactory basis so far as the public service was concerned. One man got an increase, and another did not. Another was reduced and got it back, and again another was reduced and did not get it back. The public servants could not understand it at all.

The PREMIER: They come before the Public Service Board.

Mr. MACARTNEY: He did not think it was possible for the Public Service Board as at present constituted to be able to consider each and every officer. It generally depended on personal contact with the Minister, or the recommendation of the Public Service Inspector. It was a very unsatisfactory state of things, indeed. He understood that the Public Service Inquiry Commission was going to put the public service on a satisfactory footing. A few years ago he spoke pretty strongly on the matter, and he was told by the Home Secretary that Mr. Ryder's reduction of £50 was better for him than his being subject to special retrenchment. That was not so, as his reduction was apparently permanent, whereas if he had been reduced by the Special Retrenchment Act it would only have been temporary. He believed that the Minister was sorry now that he had made that statement. The hon. member for South Brisbane had mentioned that there were cases where officers had had their salary increased, not only once but two or three times. There was no justice in that; when they saw that others were left as they were, it required explaining. He had no idea who the clerk was who was receiving £200 to whom reference had been made, but he was heavily retrenched

[4 p.m.] some years ago, and he had not had his salary restored since. And yet another officer received increases year after year, and increases out of all proportion to the provisions of the Public Service Act. That required some explanation, as £50 was more than an officer of that class was entitled to under the strict provisions of the Act.

The HOME SECRETARY: No; section 24 provides for that.

Mr. MACARTNEY was quite aware that under that section the hon. gentleman might claim that the increase was warranted; but that section was intended to apply at a time when the service required to be adjusted on an equi-

able basis, when the work performed by officers required to be made commensurate with their salaries. The Act was passed about the year 1895, and surely it did not take eleven or twelve years to place the service on a proper footing.

The PREMIER: It appears that that is the case.

Mr. MACARTNEY: It suited the hon. gentleman, and therefore it was the case. He was glad that the hon. gentleman was honest, and took up the position that officers who performed some special service for the Government or for a Minister were entitled to special increases under section 24. That might be the law, but he did not know that it was particularly creditable to the Government. He did not know what special services Mr. Gall had rendered to the Minister to entitle him to that increase. He had no doubt he was a very good officer. He always understood he was a very good officer when he was in the Audit Department, and probably he was worth the money that was down on the Estimates; but some explanation was necessary. He did not know what special service Mr. Gall had rendered, except that he was a member of the Dunwich inquiry board.

Mr. BOWMAN: And he did good service there, too.

Mr. MACARTNEY: He might have done; but could the Minister explain why one man was specially well treated and another was specially badly treated?

The HOME SECRETARY: There would be no difficulty in showing that the increases given were well justified. He believed every hon. member would admit that Mr. Ryder was an exceedingly capable and useful officer. (Hear, hear!) He believed the only Under Secretary in the service who received more than £700 per annum was Mr. Brady, the Under Secretary for Works, and that gentleman had some extra claim on account of his being a professional man. He did not think that £700 was a bad salary for an Under Secretary. (Hear, hear!) He thought that in New Zealand the highest salary paid to an Under Secretary was £600; but, if the Committee thought £700 was not sufficient, of all the Under Secretaries in the service Mr. Ryder had undoubtedly one of the best claims for an increase. (Hear, hear!)

Hon. R. PHILP: He was getting more than £700 before. Why did you reduce him?

The HOME SECRETARY: Mr. Gall, the chief clerk and accountant, was at present doing the work that was previously done by two men, and he was doing it remarkably well.

Mr. LESINA: Then you are sweating him.

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. member for Clermont not to interrupt the Home Secretary. He will have an opportunity of speaking, and he must allow others to speak without interruption.

Mr. LESINA: I only asked a question. Do you rule that I cannot ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The HOME SECRETARY: Mr. Gall was doing the work previously done by Mr. Lawson, the chief clerk, and the accountant, Mr. Kob. Mr. Lawson was paid £500, and Mr. Kob £450—

Hon. R. PHILP: Mr. Kob has been out of the service for years.

Mr. LESINA: I rise to a point of order. I desire to call your attention to the continual interjections of the leader of the Opposition. If I made them, I would be called to order.

Mr. Lesina:

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Clermont is one of the most persistent interjectors in the Committee.

Mr. LESINA: That does not justify others.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There are many interjections that I do not take notice of, because the hon. members who interject are not in the habit of continually interjecting, but the hon. member for Clermont persists in making interjections.

The HOME SECRETARY: Mr. Gall was therefore doing for £450 work for which £950 was previously paid, and he was doing it efficiently. Not only was that the case, but for a considerable time he had been doing the work with a smaller staff than his predecessor.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Would you say that he has been doing it without any other clerical assistance?

The HOME SECRETARY: He had been doing it with a less staff, on the whole, than there was some years ago. With regard to the officer who did not receive an increase, he was reduced by the Public Service Inquiry Board two or three years ago. They could not lay down a rule that they must promote every officer quite irrespective of his personality or the work he did. He did not want to say anything against this officer. Probably he was conscientiously doing his best, but the work he was doing at the present time was well paid for with a salary of £200.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): The explanation of the hon. gentleman was not altogether conclusive. If his statement was correct, then Mr. Gall was being sweated, since he was doing the work of two men for less than half the salaries formerly paid for that work. Mr. Gall was a good officer, and he believed he was entitled to a rise.

Mr. RYLAND: The office was overmanned before.

Mr. LESINA: In that case there might be some justification for the change that had taken place; but, on the face of it, it bore the appearance of getting the work previously done by one of those men for £50 a year. He hoped the Minister would not sweat his staff. He thought Mr. Ryder should have participated in the general rise. This was not New Zealand, but Queensland, and the fact that £600 was the highest salary paid to an Under Secretary in New Zealand was no justification for a salary of that description being paid here. Mr. Ryder was entitled to a rise, especially as rises were being given to other officers who were probably not as deserving. Everyone knew that the Home Department was one of the largest and most important in the State, involving an expenditure of many thousands of pounds, and, had it not been for Mr. Ryder's assistance, the Home Secretary would never have been able to perform a tithe of the work he got through. The hon. gentleman should show his gratitude by placing another £50 on the Estimates, and give him back his old salary. Ministers were continually boasting that they had restored all salaries, but it was merely an empty boast. Here was a case where a man was doing practically the whole work of this important department, largely because of the incompetence of the Home Secretary, and he was not even given back his old salary. There seemed to be no general system of giving increases at all. There were two persons doing precisely equal work, and one was given £10 more than another. On what intelligent system was such a thing based? The Premier constantly boasted of the intelligence he had brought to bear on reorganising the finances of the State. Here was a simple thing that any fifth-form boy could

settle in ten seconds; and yet the hon. gentleman, who was receiving £1,000 a year, made no attempt to settle it, and the Home Secretary, who was receiving another £1,000 a year, made no attempt either. In an earlier Estimate he had referred to an increase which was given under circumstances which justified the suspicion that the giving of increases was more in the nature of payment for services rendered than anything else. During the discussion on the *Hansard* staff the other night a somewhat similar conclusion was come to, and hon. members and the country were led to believe that certain special services must have been rendered to the Government when increases were given. When times became more prosperous salaries that had been retrenched should be restored and increases should be given to deserving officers. He had no particular affection for Mr. Ryder, and was merely advocating the restoration of his salary as he would do if it were any other officer. There was room for a general rise in salaries throughout all the departments, including the Railway Department, and he should very much like to see such increases placed on the Supplementary Estimates. There was another matter that he would like to bring under the notice of the Committee in connection with the administration of the Home Department. There were a great many matters connected with such a big department that deserved consideration. The departments in charge of the Home Secretary numbered about eighteen, and they covered the most important offices in the State. It was only natural that among so many officers there should be a number of grievances, and he should like to know whether it was proposed to discuss these matters on the first vote, or deal with them on the different votes as they came before the Committee? There was bound to be a long discussion on the vote for Dunwich, the Advertising Board, and Hospitals and Charitable Institutions.

Mr. REINHOLD: They have already decided to take those matters on the separate votes.

The CHAIRMAN: The practice is to take a general discussion on the administration of the department on the first vote, but to deal with the details with reference to the suboffices when those votes come before the Committee.

Mr. LESINA: In that case he would wait until they came to the votes with which the matters he wished to discuss were related. He had no complaint to make with regard to the Chief Office. He had found the work connected with the administration of affairs in his district most promptly attended to. It was a pleasure to be able to say that they had at the head of the department a permanent officer who was intimately acquainted with all the work of his department in all its various ramifications, and that at a moment's notice any citizen or member could get from him any information that he desired. It was a bad thing to be constantly dancing attendance on the Minister in order to get him to do things which could be just as well done by the Under Secretary, because if the Minister did a thing for a member he considered that that member was under a compliment to him, and expected his thick and thin support during the remainder of the session. If an hon. member could not get a thing that was legitimate from the Under Secretary, and he had to go to the Minister, he would be using improper and corrupt influence. He did not do that kind of thing, and he hoped that no hon. member of the Committee did it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. member will not pursue that subject. It does not seem to be relevant to the question before the Committee.

[*Mr. Jackson.*]

Mr. LESINA: He was simply pointing out that the Home Department was one of the best organised departments in the State; that the Under Secretary was a well-informed, approachable, and experienced officer; and that the public could perform their business with him satisfactorily, without troubling the Minister. That being so, he thought the salary of the Under Secretary should be restored to what it was previously.

Mr. MANN (*Cairns*): He was not surprised at the speech just delivered by the hon. member for Clermont, who was only consistent in his inconsistency. He waxed quite eloquent the other evening in opposing an increase to the Under Secretary to the Chief Secretary, and now he was urging that an increase should be given to the Under Secretary of the Home Department.

Mr. LESINA: No, no; not an increase—a restoration.

Mr. MANN: An increase. He should like to read to the Committee a speech the hon. member made on the 23rd of October of this year, which would be found in *Hansard*, page 1291. An amendment had been proposed to reduce the salary of Mr. McDermott, who only received £600 per annum, and the hon. member for Clermont said he—intended to vote for the amendment. He did not say that Mr. McDermott was too well paid. He thought he was well worth the money; but he did not think, in the present strained circumstances of the finances, that they could afford those rises.

Mr. FORSYTH: They are not strained now.

Mr. LESINA: Until every man in the Government service got his due they must be strained. Giving large increases to men with big salaries seemed to be the Premier's idea of democratic politics; but it was not his (Mr. Lesina's).

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the hon. member is quoting from a debate of this session, he is not in order.

Mr. MANN: He would simply say that the hon. member waxed very indignant at the proposal to give £600 a year to the Under Secretary of the Chief Secretary's Department, and said that, while men on the Goondiwindi Railway were getting only 6s. 6d. a day, he would never give his vote for an increase of £100 a year to a highly-paid officer. He was one of the loyal democrats who would never give an increase to highly-paid officers until the poor sweated railway men got their due. Last session the hon. member got up and howled about a £10 increase to the land agent at Cairns, just because that officer was in his (Mr. Mann's) electorate. Now the hon. member, just to have a dig at the Home Secretary, asked in the most indignant fashion why the Government did not give an increase of £50 a year to Mr. Ryder. The hon. member occupied two billets; he drew a salary from *Truth*, and another as member for Clermont, and yet he only paid his servant girl 2s. 6d. per week.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is not in order in making those personal references to the hon. member for Clermont.

Mr. LESINA: He was surprised at the Chairman calling the hon. member for Cairns to order for making personal remarks about him (Mr. Lesina).

Mr. MANN: He had no wish to make personal remarks about the hon. member for Clermont—(laughter)—but simply wanted to point out his inconsistencies, and to say that, with the hon. member, he believed that until the railway men were getting something like a decent wage, Mr. Ryder, or any other officer drawing £700 a year, should not receive an increase.

Mr. FORSYTH: Mr. Jackson—

Mr. LESINA: Mr. Jackson, I wish to make a personal explanation.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the Committee that the hon. member for Clermont be heard?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: He wanted to give a most emphatic denial to the statement that he ever in his life paid a servant girl 2s. 6d. a week. There was absolutely no truth in the statement. If any hon. member in the Chamber could prove that it was true, he would resign his seat in the House.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

Mr. LESINA: He told the hon. member the statement was a lie.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must remind the hon. member for Clermont that, when the Chairman rises, he must take his seat.

Mr. LESINA: I did not see you rise.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not defy the Chair in that manner, and he is not justified in saying that the hon. member for Cairns made a deliberate misstatement. I understood the hon. member to say that the hon. member told a lie.

Mr. LESINA: He did.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the hon. member said the hon. member for Cairns was telling a lie, he must withdraw that statement, as it is unparliamentary.

Mr. LESINA: He withdrew the statement that the hon. member was a liar, because it was unparliamentary, and he did not desire to use unparliamentary language with reference to any member in the House. He said the statement the hon. member made was untrue. If the hon. member proved it, he (Mr. Lesina) would hand in his resignation to the Speaker, and not attempt to get back again.

Mr. MANN: It is common talk.

Mr. LESINA: He did not care whether it was common talk or not, it was untrue. There was a good deal that was common talk about the hon. member, but he did not care to repeat paltry lobby gossip.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member, having denied the statement made by the hon. member for Cairns, should now proceed to discuss the Estimate before the Committee.

Mr. LESINA: Having replied in a way which, he thought, was pretty effective, and which ought to close the hon. member's mouth for the remainder of the session, he wished to say that he did oppose the increase to Mr. McDermott, as he did not think that officer should have got an increase. But he was not asking for an increase to Mr. Ryder. He merely asked that his salary should be restored to its old amount, and there was a great difference between increase and restoration.

Mr. FORSYTH (*Carpentaria*) thought the Chairman was justified in calling the hon. member for Cairns to order. (Laughter.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must confine his remarks to the Estimates.

Mr. FORSYTH: He thoroughly approved of the statements made by several members with regard to Mr. Ryder. Mr. Ryder had been a member of the civil service for forty-four years, he had received £750 a year for some years, and his salary was then reduced to £700, not because he was not competent, but because a certain board recommended the reduction. He did not

Mr. Forsyth.]

believe that the Home Secretary or the Government would have reduced that officer's salary on their own responsibility, because somebody else recommended the reduction they made it, and that was not creditable to any Government. The salary of Mr. Ryder should certainly be restored to what it was prior to 1904. According to the Home Secretary, if any Under Secretary was entitled to an increase it was Mr. Ryder. Why then did not the hon. gentleman, believing that, put an additional £50 on the Estimates for the Under Secretary? If the State finances showed a deficit he could understand the Government not restoring the salary, because we had a balance last year and were likely to have a bigger balance this year, and he saw no reason why Mr. Ryder's salary should not be restored to £750. The Minister said that the Under Secretary for the Works Department received £750, but that was because he was a professional man. He (Mr. Forsyth) ventured to say that the department of which Mr. Ryder was the head was infinitely more important than the Department of Public Works. There was an enormous amount of money spent in connection with the Home Secretary's Department, which he did not think was wrongly spent, as the hon. gentleman had a great many

officials under him. This department spent £440,000 a year. The

expenditure of the Public Works Department was very small in comparison, and the question arose whether a man who was in charge of a department spending £500,000 a year was not more entitled to get a good salary than a man whose responsibility, so far as expenditure was concerned, was so much less. The efficiency of the department had to be kept up. A man might be very extravagant, and it would be difficult for any hon. member of Parliament or the Home Secretary to see whether he was acting wisely in spending money in a certain direction, and anyone who was placed at the head of a department where such an enormous amount of money was spent was entitled to an increase, if he had the confidence of the Minister. Mr. Ryder should get £750, the same as he did before, and the same remark applied to all Under Secretaries who had been reduced. With regard to Mr. Gall, who was put down for £400, the Minister had told them that that officer was doing the work of two men, but was not Mr. Gall doing it in 1904?

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes.

Mr. FORSYTH: If he was doing the work of two men in 1904 when this Government appointed a commission to go into the qualifications of these officers—which commission only spent ten minutes in some departments, and yet were able to say whether a man was entitled to £20 a year more—and the commission were satisfied that, while he was doing the work of two men, he was only entitled to get £400 a year, how was it that he was now entitled to get £450? The commission were supposed to know what everyone was worth down to £1 a year.

Mr. BOWMAN: Because they think he is worth it. He is one of the best officers in the department.

Mr. FORSYTH: That was not the point at all. If the hon. member was a business man, he would know it was nonsense. They appointed experts to find out what individual officers were worth, and they put him down for £400 a year, and reckoned that he was well paid at that.

The HOME SECRETARY: As times were then.

Mr. FORSYTH: That was the point he wanted to get at. If it was as times were then, because the Government were in a parlous con-

[Mr. Forsyth.

dition, he did not object to this gentleman getting £50 extra, but why was it that others who were getting a small salary then were getting no advance at all? It only showed that there should be some system in the Government service, and men, if they were competent, should be raised automatically. That was what business people did, and he advised the Home Secretary to take a leaf out of their book. At the end of the year they went through the salaries of the men employed, and if a man had been in the service for a long time and was a good man they recognised that he was worth so much, and, as a rule, if business was good he got an increase, but if business was bad they would say: "You are worth so much but we cannot afford it now, and when business is good we will give it to you." Now, when the times were good, the Government gave it to some individuals and not to others. His objection was not against those gentlemen who were getting £450 a year, but the Home Secretary had argued that he was doing two men's work in 1904, just as he was doing now. He remembered Mr. Morgan, the late Premier, asking them how they could expect Ministers individually or collectively to judge as to what increases were required in the public service, and stating that they wanted the board to do it because those gentlemen had had experience. Why did the man who was next to Mr. Gall, at £200 a year, if he was doing the same work as he did in 1904, not get an increase too? There were two men getting respectively £200 and £240 a year. Mr. Musgrave had been in the service since 1878, and Mr. Key since 1887. Mr. Musgrave had £70 a year knocked off his salary by the commission, and if the Home Secretary had been in his position he would have considered himself very hardly treated, and entitled to some consideration now. Mr. Key was getting £240 in 1904, and was still getting the same amount, and he had been in the service since 1887. Perhaps all these men were getting well paid for the work they were doing, but after they had been in the service for such a long time they expected an increase. The Government had stated that they had increased the salaries of the civil servants all round, and yet these men were left out. Were they competent, or were they not? If they were not competent, they should not be kept there, but shifted somewhere else, and other people put in their place. Miss Graham, one of the typists, got £90. Another typist who got £70 had £78 in 1904, when the Government knocked off £8, and in another year the salary was reduced by £2. It was a most remarkable thing how this wonderful commission could so balance the qualifications of anybody to that degree. They took off £8 a year off a poor woman, and later on gave her an increase of £12. The first typist was Mrs. Julius, who was reduced from £156 to £100 a year, or to the extent of one-third of her salary.

The HOME SECRETARY: She is retired.

Mr. FORSYTH: In any case she was reduced £56 a year, and retired two or three months ago. He might say that he did not know these men at all, and he would like to ask the Home Secretary how it was that one clerk who received £200 a year had not got an increase with the others. In a staff where each man knew exactly what the others were getting it placed a man in a somewhat invidious position if he was the only man who did not receive an increase. If there was some condemnation to be urged against the man it could be understood, but there was nothing against him at all, but that he was not worth £240. If they wanted to have goodwill and discipline amongst their officers, so that they could work

cordially together and loyally for the Government, then they should advance them all round. He knew a number in the service who were getting small salaries, and they were not getting any increases at all. These men had to grin and bear it, as they could not get employment anywhere else. They should have some definite system to work on, and the officers of the State should be treated fairly and squarely. The Under Secretary was down for £700 a year. Had the Government decided definitely that, no matter what abilities an Under Secretary might have, no matter how brilliant he might be in the department, his salary was fixed for that amount and would not go any higher? If that was so, then they would know where they were. He hoped the Home Secretary would give some explanation why Messrs. Musgrave and Key were not increased.

The HOME SECRETARY: I have already explained it.

Mr. FORSYTH: Then the explanation was not satisfactory to the Committee, and it would not be any more satisfactory to the men concerned.

HON. E. B. FORREST (*Brisbane North*) did not think the Committee should be called on to discuss the individual salaries in the way they were doing, otherwise they would be wasting the whole night. The Home Secretary should give them some idea of the principle he adopted in framing the Estimates so that they would know where they were. With regard to that brum-magem Special Civil Service Board Inquiry—as it had been called—they were told that when that board finished its labours everything would be put on a proper footing, and that something like some principle would be introduced into the service. Where was the least evidence of any general principle being adopted? What had been the sum total of the labours of that commission? It was all bunkum, and an absolute waste of money. The men on that commission did not know what they were talking about. There was only one man who knew anything about it, and that was Mr. Brennan, and he had not the slightest hesitation in saying that Mr. Brennan regulated that commission from start to finish. They had Mr. Brennan with them still, but what had been done since? The Home Secretary should give the Committee some idea of the principle he intended to adopt in future. Where was the Public Service Board in this matter? Was this all a hole-and-corner arrangement? If the Ministers wished to act as a Public Service Board they should let members know what their movements were, and publish a report the same as the other departments. He could not understand why Mr. Musgrave had been left without receiving any increase. He was a good man. He did not know him personally, but he knew about him. He could not understand why the Home Secretary allowed other Under Secretaries to get £750 a year and leave Mr. Ryder at £700, more particularly as it was only a few years since Mr. Ryder was getting £750. He was not quite certain, but he understood from the Under Secretary that if it was the wish of the House that Mr. Ryder should get an increase of £50, then he would put it on the Supplementary Estimates. He was sure the Committee would give that expression of opinion. The hon. member for Toowong said that the members of the public service could not understand the position at all. No wonder they could not understand it, as no one else could understand it. The Ministers themselves did not understand it; or if they did they carried out the idea in a very extraordinary way. They were told that the explanation had been given, but if that were so, then he agreed with the hon. member for Carpentaria that the

explanation was not a satisfactory one. He asked for a further explanation on the particular subjects referred to in the Estimates.

Mr. KEOGH (*Rosewood*): He was very pleased indeed to see the increases that were made; but he was surprised that some consideration was not shown to Mr. Musgrave. He was a faithful servant, and had been receiving £250, and none of the other officers were more deserving of a rise than he was. If he got back the £50 he lost he would not be getting a rise, but would be simply placed in the same position that he previously occupied. He hoped the Home Secretary would take the case into his favourable consideration.

He hoped he would also favourably consider the case of Mr. Ryder.

[5 p.m.] That gentleman was one of the oldest officers in the Government service; he was a most efficient officer, and he did not see why any other officer should receive a higher salary. He was decidedly entitled to a rise of £50. The hon. gentleman said that Mr. Brady was a professional man; but if he was paid £750 he did not see why Mr. Ryder should not receive the same salary.

Mr. MACARTNEY did not know Mr. Musgrave or the work he was doing, but hon. members must admit that a reduction of £50 on a salary of £250 was a very serious matter. The Public Service Inquiry Board had recommended a reduction of £70, and the Government themselves must have considered that unduly harsh, for they did not accept the recommendation to the tune of £20. Still to make a reduction of one-fifth in a salary was a very serious position to place a man in. After the country had been prosperous for two years, one would have thought that the Home Secretary would have received the remarks that had been made that afternoon with a little more sympathy. He hoped the hon. gentleman would yet take the matter into consideration, and give some answer to the Committee that would indicate a sense of fairness which one would expect him to possess.

Mr. HAWTHORN (*Enoggera*) thought it was a pity that Mr. Ryder's salary had not been reinstated. He was a very deserving officer, and now that prosperity had come again to the State the extra £50 should be restored to show Mr. Ryder that the Government did not consider that his abilities had waned or that his position had become less important than when he was paid £750 per annum. He certainly thought Mr. Gall deserved the increase of £50. He was now occupying a position which was formerly occupied by two men, and, as far as he could see, the work was being carried out quite as effectively. He looked upon Mr. Gall as a very good officer. He had had dealings with him on many occasions, and he had always transacted his business in a satisfactory manner. He thought that some general system should be initiated whereby members of the public service could look forward to receiving regular increases when they did their work satisfactorily. There was nothing more disheartening than for a man to expect year after year that he was going to get an increase and then fail to get it. There were men who had been eighteen or twenty years in the service who were still drawing very small screws, and regular increases of a few pounds year after year would be regarded as a considerable boon. At present the service was not as attractive as private employment, and some system by which men could look forward to regular increases would attract a good class of clerks to enter the service.

Mr. REINHOLD did not want to be misunderstood. His objection to the increase was only relative. He did not think it was desirable

Mr. Reinhold.]

to give large increases while other officers were left out in the cold. The Government should be just before they were generous. They might be very generous in giving large increases of £100 to some officers and £50 to others; but where did the justice come in compared with men working for a wage of 6½d. an hour in the Roma-street goods-shed? As long as the Government could not afford to pay those men more than 6½d. an hour, they had no right to give a man an increase of £50 who was only entitled, under the Public Service Act, to an increase of £30.

Mr. MACARTNEY: It was surprising to hear the statement of the hon. member for Brisbane South that there were men employed in the Roma-street goods-shed for 6½d. an hour. As the Home Secretary did not appear inclined to answer the various remarks that had been made on the subject of the salaries in the Chief Office, he wished, on the administration vote, to say a word or two in regard to the treatment of a certain police pensioner.

The HOME SECRETARY said that it would be better to raise the question on the police superannuation vote; otherwise, things would get thoroughly mixed up.

The CHAIRMAN: If it is a detail that the hon. member desires to bring before the Committee, it would be better, and more in accordance with the usual custom, to bring it up on the police vote.

Mr. MACARTNEY promised the Chairman that it was no detail. It involved a question of principle, which affected the whole Police Force, and it particularly involved the hon. gentleman's administration of the Police Department.

The HOME SECRETARY rose to a point of order. If the hon. member was allowed to pursue this course, there was nothing to prevent hon. members raising questions relating to every subdepartment in the department. The Chairman had already ruled that that could not be done.

Mr. MACARTNEY wished to bring up a matter which affected the policy of the Government in connection with the Estimates. The Police Department would come on five or six votes further on. The hon. gentleman would keep them sitting there till 12 o'clock, and this material point connected with his own administration was not to see the light of day. Was that the attitude the hon. gentleman took up?

Mr. LESINA: That is his object.

Mr. MACARTNEY trusted that the Chairman's sense of justice would allow him to proceed to indicate the nature of the matter which he wished to bring forward. He should certainly fight for his rights.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. member will not be in order if he wants to bring up a matter connected with the police vote, and it should be deferred until that vote comes before the Committee. The discussion so far has been confined to the items in this vote. The hon. member will be in order if he wishes to discuss the Chief Office, but, if he wants to discuss the Police Estimates, he will not be in order.

Mr. MACARTNEY said that he was not going to discuss the Police Estimates.

The HOME SECRETARY: No, the police superannuation vote.

Mr. MACARTNEY was going to discuss a definite act of administration on the part of the hon. gentleman and of the Government, which affected the whole Police Force in regard to their superannuation allowances.

[*Mr. Reinhold.*

The HOME SECRETARY rose to draw the attention of the Chairman to the fact that the hon. member was defying the ruling of the Chair which had been given twice.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the hon. member for Toowong will not pursue this matter. I have already ruled that it is not relevant to the vote before the Committee. The usual practice is to discuss such matters on the police vote.

Mr. MACARTNEY: He was not going to discuss the police vote. The Chairman knew him well enough to know that, when he made a statement, it could be relied upon. He was not going to discuss any vote that came under the heading of the Police Department, but a definite act of administration of the Chief Office of which the hon. gentleman was the administrator, and regarding which the hon. gentleman signed the minutes.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member was simply setting the Chairman's ruling at defiance. He could discuss the whole of those matters with perfect propriety on the police superannuation vote.

Mr. FORSYTH: Who is in charge of the Committee?

Mr. MACARTNEY: As he proceeded the Chairman would discover whether he was in order or not.

The CHAIRMAN: I have already ruled that the hon. member, in my opinion, is not in order. If he objects to my ruling, he must take the proper course.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Then the Chairman had decided against him without hearing him, or knowing what his point was.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is wrong. The hon. member has already announced that he wants to discuss some item in connection with the police superannuation allowance, which, I think, will better come on under the police vote.

The HOME SECRETARY: The police superannuation vote.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will see that, if I allow him to bring forward a matter of that kind, I must allow every other hon. member to do the same thing, and the result would be that we should discuss on this vote everything that should be brought up on the subsequent votes.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The Minister was particularly anxious to shut his mouth on this occasion.

The HOME SECRETARY: Not at all.

Mr. MACARTNEY was sorry that the Chairman should have formed an opinion which tended in that direction. It would only take a word or two to show what the case was. It was the first case—

The HOME SECRETARY rose to a point of order. The hon. member was evading the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the hon. member will not try to evade my decision.

Mr. MACARTNEY: This was the first time in the history of the discussion of the Estimates that the general discussion of the administration of a department had not been permitted to take place on the first vote.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MACARTNEY did not wish to evade the Chairman's ruling, but it was evident that the Chairman did not understand the nature of the discussion he wished to initiate. If, as he proceeded, the Chairman found him out of order, then was the time to call him to order. The

matter he wished to bring up was a material point in connection with the administration of the Home Secretary's Department.

Mr. KERR (*Barcoo*) rose to a point of order. The Chairman had ruled that the hon. member was out of order. Was he in order in persistently disobeying that ruling?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is decidedly out of order.

Mr. KERR: Why not deal with him? If it was me, I would be dealt with. (Laughter.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order! I have already ruled that the hon. member for Toowong is out of order in going into details on the police vote. That is the general procedure.

Mr. MACARTNEY: He was not going to discuss the question as to whether that was in accordance with the general procedure or not, nor did he wish to treat the Chairman unfairly or disrespectfully. The case he wished to refer to was a decision by the Minister, and not by any officer of the department.

The CHAIRMAN: I warn the hon. member to discontinue his remarks on that subject. I have ruled that the discussion of that matter is out of order.

Mr. MACARTNEY: If the Chairman would allow him to state what he desired to refer to, he would then be in a position—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is defying the Chair, and he must not defy the Chair.

Mr. MACARTNEY: He insisted upon his right to discuss this matter. It was his duty as a member to do it, and he was going to uphold his rights. The Minister was anxious to prevent him referring to the matter, and the leader of the Labour party was anxious to prevent him discussing it, so that there must be some particular reason for burking discussion of the matter, which was one of principle, and not one of detail.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must have heard the ruling I gave early in the sitting, soon after the opening of Committee, in reply to the hon. member for South Brisbane. The hon. member for Clermont also brought the matter up afterwards, and I pointed out that it was not in order to discuss items connected with subdepartments now. I do not wish to treat the hon. member in any other than a fair way, but no matter whether a point of order is raised by the Minister, or the leader of the Labour party, or any other hon. member, I shall do my duty according to my lights.

Mr. MACARTNEY: He was quite prepared to believe that the Chairman was doing his duty on those lines, but he had never yet during his experience in the House heard of a general discussion being refused on the first vote. They could take up *Hansard* reports for year after year, even for the present year, and they would find that matters which were applicable to subdepartments were allowed to be discussed on the first vote. The Chairman had expressed his opinion a little impatiently, and he thought it would be a mistake if he found the following day that he had been hasty or wrong in the matter, and that he (Mr. Macartney) had been deprived of an opportunity of discussing a matter of very material importance, not only to one man, but to the whole of the Police Force in the State. If they took this particular vote, they would find that the first name on it was that of the Home Secretary, and he wanted to discuss, not an act of an officer of a subdepartment, but an act of the Minister, or of the Cabinet; and he asked

the Chairman whether, on reconsideration, he did not think he should have an opportunity of initiating the discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is at liberty to discuss the whole department so far as general principles or general administration are concerned, but I understand that the hon. member desires to discuss a detail in connection with the Police Force, and, as I have already ruled, that is not in order. I hope the hon. member will not continue to argue with the Chair. I have already ruled that the hon. member is out of order, and have ordered him to discontinue his speech, and the hon. member persists in defying the Chair.

Mr. MACARTNEY: If the Chairman would allow him to say this—the Chairman said he understood a certain thing, and that he was going to discuss a matter in opposition to the ruling of the Chair. He wanted to make his position clear so that the Chairman should have definite grounds before him before deciding against him. The point he wanted to raise was one of principle, not of detail. It was the only instance in the State where the pension of a police officer had been reduced by the Government.

The HOME SECRETARY rose to draw attention to the fact that the hon. member for Toowong was defying the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member wishes to discuss a matter of general principle I shall not rule him out of order, but the hon. member is not doing that. He is bringing up a detail in connection with the police vote, which he can discuss when that vote is before the Committee. The hon. member will have an opportunity of bringing that matter up later on, so that he is not being deprived of any right by my ruling.

Mr. MACARTNEY: If the Chairman would allow him a few minutes to state his case, he could indicate that it was a general principle that he wished to discuss; but, as the Chairman would not allow that opportunity, he could not indicate that. That was the trouble.

The CHAIRMAN: I warned the hon. member to discontinue his speech on that subject. If he does not do that, I must ask him to resume his seat.

Mr. LESINA: Without specifically referring to the case mentioned by the hon. member for Toowong, he thought they could discuss the attitude of the Government in doing certain things. Perhaps it would be better to discuss this particular matter when they get to the vote to which it was related, and, though it was a very important matter, as far as he could ascertain, he would refrain from dealing with it till a later stage. The hon. member for Toowong, the hon. member for North Brisbane (Mr. Forrest), and other hon. members had appealed to the Home Secretary to explain on what system the Government gave increases in salary, or made reductions, or made reinstatements of salary, but the Minister had not offered any satisfactory explanation to the Committee. The Government appear to have adopted a happy-go-lucky system in dealing with an important question like that of the salaries of civil servants, which amounted to an enormous sum of money annually. What was the system adopted? Did the Government put the names of civil servants in a hat, like little boys put the names of Cup horses in a hat, and then pull out one and give a rise to that officer? Or were increases given according to the predilections of Ministers? Because a Minister liked a man personally, did he put that man down for a rise? There should be some intelligent system adopted under which rises would be given to officers, exactly as was done in ordinary commercial establishments. The hon. member for Carpentaria had pointed

Mr. Lesina.]

out that in an ordinary well-regulated business firm having a number of employees, at the end of the year they went through the list of employees and put down this man for a rise and that man for a rise, another man for reduction, and another for dismissal. Surely the Premier, as a trained business man of long, extensive, and peculiar experience, should be able to devise some scheme whereby public servants would be able to get increases in accordance with some practical principle. It was no use to appeal to the Home Secretary, because he had no business experience, and when he was asked for information on the subject, he simply sat there like a graven image. He hoped the Committee would be given some information as to the scheme adopted by the Government—if there was any scheme.

HON. R. PHILP said he had waited an hour and a-half to get a reply from the Home Secretary to the questions he had asked with regard to Mr. Ryder and other officers. The hon. gentleman admitted that Mr. Ryder was a splendid officer, and that he had no fault to find with him. Still, £50 was taken off that officer's salary, and another officer in the same department was given an increase of £50.

THE HOME SECRETARY: I dealt with the whole question.

HON. R. PHILP: The hon. gentleman did not. The hon. gentleman said that the salaries of Under Secretaries in New Zealand were £600 per annum. Why did he not go to New South Wales, where the salaries were £900 and £1,000 per annum? Mr. Ryder had been forty-four years in the service, and had risen to his present position by sheer merit, never having had any influence behind him; and there was no member of the House who would not say that he was the most courteous Under Secretary we had. Then there was Mr. Musgrave. What that officer had done, he (Mr. Philp) did not know, but he had had £50 taken off his salary. The Minister said the salary paid to him was as much as his present position was worth. If that were so, he ought to give him another position. Then, with regard to the typists, a young lady was put in at £10 less than her predecessor. Miss Woodcock was receiving £70, whereas Miss Graham, whom she succeeded, had been getting £80.

THE HOME SECRETARY: She has only just got into the service.

HON. R. PHILP: She had been in the service at least five years.

THE HOME SECRETARY: She has only just come into this department.

HON. R. PHILP: She ought to get a rise, if it was only £10, so as to make her salary equal to that received by the young lady whom she succeeded. There ought to be some system in giving increases.

THE PREMIER: What was the system you adopted?

HON. R. PHILP: When they could afford it they gave rises.

THE HOME SECRETARY: Whether they deserved them or not.

HON. R. PHILP: No. Did the Minister say that Mr. Ryder deserved to have [5.30 p.m.] £50 taken off his salary? He (Mr. Philp) was sure that there was not a man in the House who believed that.

THE PREMIER: That was all discussed two years ago.

HON. R. PHILP: But the circumstances were different. Then they were reducing salaries, but now the Government were giving increases. He hoped the Minister would get up and say what he intended to do.

[Mr. Lesina.

Mr. FORSYTH would like the Minister to reply to the questions which had been asked. He had said he thoroughly approved of Mr. Ryder, and if he wanted to give the increase he could do so. Did he intend to do it or did he not?

THE HOME SECRETARY: We will disclose all these intentions in due course.

Mr. FORSYTH: The hon. gentleman was not going to get through his Estimates with any degree of celerity by making sarcastic remarks of that kind, and he was making a big mistake. It would be very much better if he would try and meet the wishes of the Committee and state what he was going to do. If he assumed an autocratic demeanour, it would not expedite business at all.

Mr. WOODS: There were two items in the vote which he was very glad to see there—the increase of £50 to the chief clerk, and £20 to the chief messenger. As far as Mr. Ryder was concerned, since he had been a member of the Chamber he had never had any fault to find with the courtesy served out to him in the department. What he noticed this afternoon was that some members had spoken because the increase of £50 was not on the Estimates, but Mr. Ryder would not thank them for the attitude they took up. There had been no more bitter opponents, not only in this Chamber, but on the public platform, than those men who desired to make a point about the £50. He did not think Mr. Ryder had approached any individual member about it.

HON. R. PHILP: He would be the last man to do it.

Mr. WOODS: The matter had been discussed two years ago, and again last year, and he honestly believed Mr. Ryder was very well satisfied, as £700 was a very fair "screw." They had a discussion the other night, when an attempt was made to raise another Under Secretary's salary to the same level, and they found that members who were now trying to get this £50 increase for Mr. Ryder, had tried to prevent the other man from getting the rise. The hon. member for Clermont was one of them. Throughout the length and breadth of Queensland, on every public platform that he had spoken on, no man had been stronger in his condemnation of Mr. Ryder, the Under Secretary, than the hon. member for Clermont. He had told the people that the Minister was a puppet to the Under Secretary. Was that not a libel on the Under Secretary? Now he came here this afternoon and tried to make a point because the Under Secretary had scored over Dr. Stockwell.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order! I must remind the hon. member that he is not in order in discussing the actions of the hon. member for Clermont.

Mr. WOODS was dealing with the hon. member's views as to why the Under Secretary should get an increase. He wanted to show the attitude taken up by hon. members who were making this attempt to get the £50 a year. As far as the two officers who were recommended for an increase were concerned, he thought they deserved them. No one who had had anything to do with Mr. Gall would regret to see an increase in his salary. He thought the Minister should reconsider the position of Mr. Musgrave, and place an increase on the Estimates for him—not an increase but a restoration to an officer who had been so long in the service.

Mr. LESINA: In reply to the hon. member, he wished to say that never in the course of his tours through the country, or anywhere else, had he attacked Mr. Ryder either personally or in connection with the administration. Things were sometimes done in the department which he strongly disapproved of, but they were mostly

done by the Minister and not by the Under Secretary, and if they had been in charge of the Under Secretary they would have ended satisfactorily. It was only where the Minister put in his inefficient spoke that the blunders took place.

HON. R. PHILP objected to the hon. member for Woothakata accusing him of doing one thing one day and another thing the next.

Mr. Woods: I was not alluding to you at all.

HON. R. PHILP: The Chairman ought to have called him to order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would remind the Committee that if hon. members feel grieved at anything which other hon. members say it is their duty at once to draw my attention to the matter.

HON. R. PHILP: It was not worth calling attention to. He understood the hon. member for Woothakata had referred to members who had spoken, and he was the first to speak of Mr. Ryler, Mr. Musgrave, and the typist. It would not help the Minister if he was going to sit down without replying. He had asked him civilly why Mr. Ryder's salary had not been restored like others. If the Minister got up and said he was not going to give him more than £700 they would have to be satisfied. What encouragement would there be for anyone to go into the civil service of Queensland if this was the treatment which was served out? There was some reason for taking £50 off when things were bad, but now there was a surplus, and other men were getting increases, why did not Mr. Ryder get the same as he was getting before? If the position which Mr. Musgrave was occupying now was not worth more than £200, give him a better position, as he had been twenty-eight years in the service, and the young lady who had been five years in the service and taken the position of a girl who was getting £90 a year ought to get an increase. The Minister ought to say why this was not done.

The HOME SECRETARY: He rose not so much in answer to the leader of the Opposition with regard to this particular rise in salary as to draw his attention to the fact that the typist was transferred to the Home Department, not at the salary she received previously, but at a rise. She received £60 before she was raised to £70. With regard to the Under Secretary, he could only repeat what he said before, that they were of opinion that the salary of £700 was a fair remuneration. Possibly when the time came they might be able to treat more poorly paid members of the service better first, and then they might be able to deal more generously still with other members of the service. He thought a man getting £700 a year was not doing so badly.

HON. R. PHILP: What about Mr. Musgrave, who had been twenty-eight years in the service? The Minister said the work he was doing was not worth any more; then why not give him something better?

Mr. MACARTNEY desired to say that he had consulted authorities on the Standing Orders who had experience for years and years in the House, both members and others, and he understood it had been the universal practice to discuss matters of administration on the first vote, and it was a convenient practice. The matter that he wanted to refer to was one purely of the general administration of the Home Secretary. He had no desire whatever to contest the Chairman's ruling; as if it came to a vote of the Chamber as against the ruling, the votes of the large majority of members on the Government side would not be given on lines of justice and fair play, and so he had nothing to hope in that direction.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not justified in bringing on this matter again, and he must discuss the question before the Committee. If the hon. member wishes, under the Standing Orders he can move that he be further heard.

Mr. MACARTNEY: He desired to enter his indignant protest at the treatment he had received. It was unfair—most unfair.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

HON. R. PHILP: He had some further inquiries to make under this heading. In the last three or four weeks he had had three letters from some of the patients in the lazaret complaining of the treatment they had received.

The HOME SECRETARY rose to a point of order. The hon. member was discussing the administration of one of the subdepartments, and was transgressing the Chairman's ruling.

The CHAIRMAN: I was engaged with the Clerk just at that moment, and I did not catch the member for Townsville's remarks.

HON. R. PHILP: He was discussing the administration of the Home Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN: I will hear what the hon. gentleman has to say before I rule whether he is out of order.

HON. R. PHILP: He was saying that he had received three letters from two of the patients in the lazaret during the last two or three weeks, and they complained of the treatment accorded them by the Home Secretary and his officials. He had been asked—

The HOME SECRETARY rose to a point of order. Was the hon. member for Townsville not transgressing the Chairman's ruling in discussing the administration of one of the subdepartments?

HON. R. PHILP: Mr. Jackson,—

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member for Townsville take his seat. An hon. member must take his seat when another hon. member rises to a point of order. I shall listen to what the hon. member for Townsville has to say; and, if he transgresses my ruling, I shall have to call him to order.

HON. R. PHILP: He would like to know if he had the permission of the Home Secretary to get up and speak.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order! I hope the hon. member is not reflecting on the Chair by making an observation of that kind, and asking whether he has the permission of another hon. member to speak.

HON. R. PHILP: On two occasions the Home Secretary got up and interrupted him, and that was why he said what he did. He wished to say that during the last three or four weeks he had received three letters from two of the patients in the lazaret, complaining of their treatment.

The PREMIER: Why cannot you discuss it when the lazaret vote comes on?

HON. R. PHILP: He was talking to the Chair, and when the Chairman told him to stop it was time enough for him to do so. He referred the matter to the Home Secretary, and the Home Secretary went down there. The Home Secretary spoke to them nicely, but since that time there had been no difference in their treatment. If there were any people in Queensland they ought to be generous to it was these unfortunate people in that lazaret, and yet they said they were not properly treated.

The PREMIER rose to a point of order. Was the hon. member for Townsville in order in discussing details that should properly be discussed when the lazaret vote came on?

Hon. W. Kidston.]

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member for Townsville is referring to a particular case of ill-treatment at the lazaret the hon. gentleman will be out of order, but I am not prepared to say at this moment that he is out of order if he desires to make some general observation on the administration of the Home Secretary's Department. If the hon. member goes into details I shall have to rule him out of order. Hon. members can see that this is a matter of relevancy in connection with the discussion on the general vote, and it is possible that some other Chairman might rule differently to me on this point. The Chairman has got to be guided by what is relevant. There is no standing order dealing with this matter, and I am giving my ruling according to what I think is right. I am not prepared to call the hon. member for Townsville to order for making a general observation, but if he proceeds to bring forward details, then I shall rule him out of order.

Mr. MACARTNEY: If you allow him to proceed, will you allow every hon. member the same privilege?

HON. R. PHILP: He had been in the House for a number of years, and the practice had always been to discuss the administration of the department on the first vote of the department, and he was particularly discussing the Home Secretary himself.

The HOME SECRETARY: You could discuss every sub-department on the same plea.

HON. R. PHILP: It would save time if that were done. Let them have all the discussion on the first vote. That had been the custom since he had been in the House. The Chairman could give his ruling as he pleased, but he (Mr. Philp) was not aware that he had offended the rules. He did not speak as often as he might do in the House, nor as often as he ought to do, in order to allow the Government to get through their business. They had two leper stations in Queensland, one at Thursday Island and one at Dunwich, and two of the lepers at Dunwich wrote to him complaining of the very bad treatment now being accorded them. He mentioned the matter to the Home Secretary, and the Home Secretary went down there, but these men were not getting any better treatment since he had been down there. He never yet heard any member of the House complain of the amount spent on the leper station.

The HOME SECRETARY rose to a point of order. Was not the hon. member for Townsville out of order in transgressing the Chairman's ruling. The hon. member was deliberately dealing with the details of the administration of one of the subdepartments—the lazaret. He drew the Chairman's attention to the fact that that ruling of the Chairman had debarred the member for Toowong from speaking, and the member for Toowong now very pertinently asked if the hon. member for Townsville was allowed to proceed might he not also be allowed to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN: I have already pointed out that the hon. member for Townsville will not be in order in bringing details into this debate. The member for Toowong was bringing in details.

Mr. MACARTNEY: You did not know what I was going to say.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

Mr. MACARTNEY: I say you did not know what I was going to say; you did not give me a chance to say it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: You will get chucked out.

[Mr. Jackson.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I am quite prepared to be chucked out on that. I did not get a chance—

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The hon. member for Toowong is out of order in persistently making interjections while the Chairman is giving his ruling. I told the hon. member for Townsville that he would be out of order if he discussed details, and he has disregarded my ruling. I know it has been the custom to allow a discussion on the first vote, but I think that the discussion on this vote should be confined to general administration. The hon. member can see the difference between a discussion on the general administration and bringing up details that can be discussed when the special department to which he refers is brought on. The hon. member will have another opportunity of discussing the matter.

HON. R. PHILP: The chances were that they would be asked to discuss the subdepartments at 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning. He thought the Minister should tell them what he was going to do for these unfortunate people.

The HOME SECRETARY rose to a point of order. He drew attention to the fact that the hon. member for Townsville was transgressing the Chairman's ruling.

The CHAIRMAN: I would remind the Home Secretary that I have already pointed out that the hon. member for Townsville is in order in discussing the general administration. I would also remind the hon. member for Townsville that he will have another opportunity of discussing this matter later on.

HON. R. PHILP: He was glad to say that so far the Chairman had been well behaved in his rulings, but two Ministers got up and repeatedly said that he (Mr. Philp) was out of order. Let the Home Secretary get up now and assure the Committee that he would give these people generous treatment. At present they complained that they were badly treated.

The HOME SECRETARY: There is plenty of time for that.

HON. R. PHILP: Who was the Chairman? Was the Home Secretary Chairman? The custom of the House had been to discuss all the items on the first vote, and that was a good custom. But if the Chairman said that was not in order, then he had no wish to be out of order. It was a fair thing for the Home Secretary to get up and make a statement. The other night, when he brought the immigration matter before the Minister, the Premier made a statement. This might be a small thing to the Home Secretary, but it was a living death to the unfortunate men in Dunwich at the present time. He only wished to see that these people at Dunwich were properly treated. They complained that they were not properly treated; that the food they received was not fit for lepers.

The HOME SECRETARY rose to a point of order, and asked the Chairman's ruling again as to whether the hon. member was in order.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think the hon. gentleman is out of order.

HON. R. PHILP: The Home Secretary was continually interrupting. Was there something that he wanted to hide in the matter? The Committee should receive an assurance from the Home Secretary that these men would be treated better in future, and that inquiry would be made into their cases.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is now discussing details.

HON. R. PHILP: It was hard, in discussing a matter of this kind, to separate the general principle from the details.

The PREMIER: You know when the proper time comes you can say what you like about it.

HON. R. PHILP: He objected to the Premier trying to bully him. He was not going to bow to the Premier every time he said "Yes" or "No."

The PREMIER: Well, you ought to do it. (Loud laughter.)

HON. R. PHILP: He would not do it. (Laughter.) He objected to the Premier trying to bully him. He was not going on his knees to the Premier though his (the Premier's) followers might do it. The honour of Queensland was at stake in this matter, because one of these men—an educated gentleman—said he intended to publish the details all over the world unless something was done. Let the Home Secretary get up and say that he intended to treat those men better than they had been treated in the past. In every country in the world the greatest care and attention was given to lepers, and they were treated as they ought to be, mercifully and generously. But in this case they were not so treated, and his informant asked him to bring the matter before the House. He had brought their case before the Home Secretary; but they received no satisfaction.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

HON. R. PHILP: He was talking as temperately as he could.

The PREMIER: Disregarding the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman is repeating details in connection with the lazaret before that vote is before the Committee.

HON. R. PHILP: He did not wish to disagree with the Chairman's ruling.

The PREMIER: You simply want to keep the discussion going till 7 o'clock.

HON. R. PHILP: He intended to say all he had got to say about the lazaret. If he waited for his turn, he might have to wait until 2 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. WOODS: Everyone else has the same rights as you.

HON. R. PHILP thought the Committee should thoroughly understand what were to be

considered principles and what were to be regarded as details, as it was very difficult at times to draw the

line between the two. It would save a great deal of time if they were allowed to discuss the whole of the Estimates on the first vote in the department. He only wished to refer to one or two matters altogether, and would not require more than a quarter of an hour to do so, but he understood the Home Secretary was going to force all his Estimates through before they rose.

The HOME SECRETARY: No; you are quite wrong.

HON. R. PHILP: The Premier forced the Chief Secretary's Estimates through in two nights, and the second night he kept them there till nearly 3 o'clock in the morning. If the Home Secretary would tell them how far he wished to proceed that evening, it might facilitate business.

The PREMIER: Will three days be sufficient for the whole department?

HON. R. PHILP: Quite. So far as he was concerned, three hours would suffice; but if he were to take up three hours, he would have the Premier and the Home Secretary rising to call him to order. They had done that five times that evening, and they had been ruled out of order themselves. He would like to know how far the Premier wanted to go to-night.

The PREMIER: There was not the slightest desire on the part of the Government to rush through the Estimates. Allowing full time for discussion, that evening, to-morrow, and Tuesday should be sufficient for the whole department.

Mr. MACARTNEY: How far are you going to-night?

The PREMIER did not suppose the Home Secretary wanted to sit late. He (Mr. Kidston) certainly did not.

The HOME SECRETARY: Last year the Estimates of the Home Department occupied three nights, and, if they took the same time this session, no one should have any reason to complain.

Mr. P. J. LEAHY: How many votes do you want to put through to-night?

The HOME SECRETARY: Say down to "Insanity"—(laughter)—but not including that.

HON. R. PHILP: There were eighteen votes altogether, and the hon. gentleman wanted them to pass the "Chief Office," the "Advertising Board," "Dunwich Benevolent Asylum," "Electoral Registration," "Health," "Hospitals and Charitable Institutions," and "Industrial and Reformatory Schools."

The HOME SECRETARY: That is what we did last session.

HON. R. PHILP: Last session the hon. gentleman was more courteous than he was this session. He was dour and dogged, and would give no information at all. He thought three nights would be ample for the department. He remembered when it took Sir Horace Tozer six, eight, and ten nights to put the department through.

The PREMIER: And I sat here one night when you put the great bulk of the Estimates through without any discussion at all.

HON. R. PHILP: The hon. member was what the hon. member for Leichhardt called "intriguing" then—not with him (Mr. Philp), but with somebody else. It would be far better to allow a general discussion on the whole of the votes to take place on this first vote.

The HOME SECRETARY: The same practice was pursued last year.

HON. R. PHILP: He had been a member of the House for twenty years, and the rule hitherto had been to allow a general discussion on the first vote.

The PREMIER: Why not drop all this and get on with the business?

HON. R. PHILP maintained that he was getting on with the business. They were not school children to be talked to by the Premier.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am permitting the leader of the Opposition to make his remarks in connection with the business of the Committee, as is my usual custom; but I think the hon. gentleman is taking advantage of the latitude that is extended to him. It is customary to allow the two leaders a latitude in discussing the business of the House that is not accorded to other hon. members.

HON. R. PHILP asked how they were to distinguish between what was principle and what was detail? Every now and then they were called to order. He had been called to order five times in ten minutes by the two Ministers. That was a most unusual thing. Unfortunately, they could not censure the Premier if he committed a breach of the rules. He was allowed to do what he liked.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The PREMIER: That is very unfair.

HON. R. PHILP: The hon. gentleman and his colleague had been very unfair to him in

Hon. R. Philp.]

wanting him called to order. If they were to speak for five hours he would not rise to ask that they should be called to order unless they used bad language—which they were quite capable of doing. His language was always temperate, courteous, and he regretted very much that they had tried to call him to order. It would conduce to the passage of the Estimates if they were allowed to have a general discussion on the first vote. If that was done, three nights up till 11 o'clock would be quite sufficient for the department, otherwise he was afraid it would take a great deal longer.

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out to the leader of the Opposition that I have not taken any different attitude to-night to the attitude I have taken up in previous years. It would not be possible for me to stop hon. members from speaking on the votes for the various subdepartments if they were permitted to discuss those votes on the first vote. The practice has been—and I am not contending for anything different now—for hon. members to refer to the subdepartments; but that is a different matter to discussing details connected with those subdepartments on this vote. I think that is not allowable.

Mr. MACARTNEY took it that, without breaking that ruling, he would be at liberty to refer to the matter he wished to bring up in the afternoon. He promised he would not be very long and that he would not go outside the Chairman's ruling. He had certain correspondence addressed to the Home Secretary, who sat in the chief office of the Home Department, and received correspondence, and, by medium of his officers, sent replies. He had several letters addressed to the hon. gentleman, and several replies, and those replies were not of a satisfactory nature, and naturally enough he wished to refer to them. He could not mention those letters unless he incidentally mentioned what they were about, and to that extent he must mention the subject matter of the correspondence. The circumstances arose out of the retirement of a police officer on the certificate of medical men that he was entitled to retire.

The HOME SECRETARY rose to a point of order. Was the hon. member in order in discussing details connected with a matter which concerned the Police Investment Board, and which could be discussed on that vote?

Mr. MACARTNEY said that it did not refer to the Police Investment Board at all.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to point out to the Home Secretary that the hon. member has stated his case somewhat differently to the way in which he did in the afternoon. He has pointed out that the matter he wishes to bring up does not refer to the Police Investment Board. It is only fair that I should allow the hon. member to proceed further before I decide that he is transgressing my ruling.

Mr. MACARTNEY thanked the Chairman for his ruling. He was sorry there should have been any misunderstanding that afternoon, but that was entirely due to the attitude the Home Secretary took up. If the hon. gentleman would allow him to state his case and then took his point of order, he could understand it, but the hon. gentleman was endeavouring to stop him. If the hon. member was to be allowed to interrupt him every few minutes he must make allusion to the fact. The correspondence he was referring to related to a case of a police official retiring from the service under the provisions of the Police Act. In the ordinary course of administration his case was brought forward for the consideration of the Home Secretary, and was referred to the Cabinet. Subsequently the

Cabinet decided to adopt what was an entirely unusual course. It was a fact, which the Minister had admitted to him personally, that this was the first time in the history of Queensland when an official who was retiring on a pension had that pension—

The PREMIER rose to a point of order. If this kind of thing—

Mr. J. LEAHY: What is the point of order?

The PREMIER: The point of order was that the hon. member was discussing something which was not the question before the Committee. The question before the Committee was that a certain amount be granted for the Home Secretary's Head Office. The reasons advanced by the hon. member for Toowong as to why he should be permitted to discuss that matter on this particular vote—

Mr. J. LEAHY: You cannot discuss his reasons.

The PREMIER: The reason advanced as to why he should be permitted to discuss this particular matter on the vote for the head office would permit any hon. member to discuss any question that came up on this vote. The simplest thing was to take the votes in the order in which they appeared on the Estimates.

Mr. J. LEAHY: What is the point of order?

The PREMIER: His point of order was that the Chairman had already given a ruling that to go into details in regard to a certain matter was out of order on this vote, and he asked whether the hon. member for Toowong was transgressing that ruling?

Mr. J. LEAHY: Before the Chairman gave his ruling—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Let him give his ruling.

Mr. J. LEAHY: With regard to the point of order—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS rose to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! As hon. members are aware, the Chairman may invite the opinion of hon. members on a point of order. If the Chairman makes no protest when an hon. member rises to speak on a point of order, it may be taken for granted that he is willing to listen to that hon. member.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is a practice which has never been followed in this House.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It appears to me that the hon. member for Toowong is trying to bring in a detail that he endeavoured to bring in this afternoon, when I ruled the hon. member out of order. If hon. members will consider the matter for a moment, they will see that it is not advisable for hon. members to raise details on the first vote of a department. For instance, the matter which the hon. member rose to discuss is connected with the Police Department. I take it that when the vote for that department is before the Committee the Minister will have the officers of the department present to give him any information he may require. It would be very inconvenient to allow details to be discussed on the first vote, as the Minister may not have the information concerning those details. But, apart from that aspect of the question, I think it is irregular to raise details on the first vote. I have given my ruling on the matter—that it is not relevant to the question before the Committee. I think the hon. member for Toowong should leave this detail till we come to the police vote.

Mr. J. LEAHY: With regard to the point of order, he should just like to say a word.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no point of order. I have ruled that the hon. member for Toowong is not speaking relevantly to the vote.

Mr. J. LEAHY: The Premier had raised a point of order, and he should like to know whether the Chairman had given a ruling on that point of order or not.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the Premier chose to make use of the expression "point of order," it is not for me to interfere, but the question raised was a question of relevancy, and I gave my decision on the question of relevancy.

Mr. J. LEAHY: He wanted to know whether the Chairman gave a ruling on the question raised by the Premier, because if he did there was a way of dealing with that ruling.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Order, order!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The question is a question of relevancy.

Mr. J. LEAHY: There was a point of order raised, and if the Chairman said it was not on the point of order that the Premier raised that he gave his ruling, he should resume his seat, but if the ruling was on that point of order he claimed the right to move that the ruling be disagreed with.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The question is that £3,127 be granted for the Chief Office, Home Secretary's Department.

Mr. MACARTNEY: He wished to refer to a case where a serious life-long wrong had been done to a police officer in the State, and that man had written to the Home Secretary three times.

The HOME SECRETARY rose to a point of order, and asked whether the hon. member for Toowong was not again transgressing the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. J. LEAHY: What is the point of order?

The HOME SECRETARY: A question of relevancy.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the hon. member for Toowong will not disregard my opinion on the question of relevancy. I asked him to leave this matter over till we come to the police vote.

Mr. MACARTNEY: If the Chairman had given him an opportunity of stating his point he would have known whether he was in order or not, but he had not been given that opportunity. If that was to be the condition of things in the House, the sooner they went out the better. He was referring to the hon. gentleman at the head of the Home Secretary's Department, and he wanted to refer to his action. Surely, the man who was administering the department was entitled to be criticised on the chief vote, and he was going to do it if he had the right to do so, and he believed he had.

The PREMIER: Do it at the proper time.

Mr. MACARTNEY: This was the proper time.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Strictly, it is not the proper time.

Mr. MACARTNEY: He did not know. It appeared that the practice was one thing one year and another thing another year.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask the hon. member to discuss the vote before the Committee, that £3,127 be granted.

Mr. MACARTNEY: He wished to discuss that vote, but apparently he was not allowed to do so. If he was to be continually interrupted, he could not perform the duties he was sent here to perform.

The CHAIRMAN: Order: If the hon. member has a general principle to discuss, he will be in order; but if the hon. member is going into details, he will not be in order.

Mr. MACARTNEY: He had told the Committee the matter he wanted to discuss. It was a wide principle, and if he was not allowed to give expression to what he had to say, neither the Chairman nor hon. members generally could judge whether it was a matter of detail or not. It was a matter of vital principle to the policemen of this State, more than to the individual immediately concerned.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You know that this is not the time to discuss the matter.

Mr. MACARTNEY: He claimed the same protection from the Chair that other hon. members received.

The PREMIER: You are disregarding the Chairman's ruling.

Mr. MACARTNEY: This officer had been treated in a way that no officer of police had ever been treated in the history of Queensland.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the hon. member has a general principle to discuss he can discuss it, but otherwise he is out of order.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The Chairman would not allow him to start. The subject-matter of the correspondence to which he was going to refer was that a substantial wrong had been done to a police officer. That man addressed himself to the Home Secretary on the subject, and the Home Secretary acknowledged his letter; he again addressed the Home Secretary, and the Home Secretary again acknowledged his letter; he again addressed the Home Secretary, and the Home Secretary again acknowledged his letter.

The HOME SECRETARY rose to a point of order. Was this a matter of detail, or was it relevant to the vote before the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is out of order in pursuing the subject he has been discussing, and I again ask the hon. member to discontinue his speech on this Estimate.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The matter he was referring to was a matter of principle. The correspondence was, perhaps, a matter of detail, but it was a detail connected with the vote before the Committee—a detail for which officers on this vote were paid for doing. Officers mentioned in the vote were paid for writing letters of that sort, and he submitted that he was in order in referring to it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I order the hon. member for Toowong to take his seat and discontinue his speech. If the hon. member disregards my instruction now, I shall be compelled to take further action and report the hon. member to the House. I do not wish to do that, but still there is that alternative. I have warned the hon. member half a dozen times, and I now again order him to discontinue his speech.

Mr. MACARTNEY said he regretted to say that his rights as a member of this Chamber—

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Order, order!

Mr. MACARTNEY: He intended to uphold his rights.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Order, order!

HON. R. PHILIP moved that the Chairman's ruling be disagreed with.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no ruling.

HON. R. PHILIP moved, under Standing Order 134, that the hon. member for Toowong be further heard.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not in order in moving that motion now. I told the hon. member for Toowong this afternoon that he had a right to move that he be further heard, but he did not take advantage of that right.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I apparently have no rights, anyhow.

Mr. P. J. LEAHY: Mr. Jackson—

Mr. P. J. Leahy.]

The CHAIRMAN : Order ! A messenger has been sent for the Speaker, and it is irregular for a member to address the Committee under those circumstances.

Mr. P. J. LEAHY : There was no man more willing than he was to bow to the ruling of the Chair, but he contended that he was entitled to speak to the main question, and unless the Chairman said he could not do so he would speak to that question. If the Chairman said he was not in order in doing so, he would sit down.

The CHAIRMAN : I do not think it would be in order to discuss the main question now at this particular stage. I am not [7.30 p.m.] aware that there is any Standing Order bearing on the point, but I think it would be irregular. I have never seen any discussion take place after the Speaker has been sent for.

Mr. P. J. LEAHY : If the Standing Orders did not prohibit him from doing a particular thing, he had a right to do it, and he claimed that right. To his mind what they had to deal with at the present time—

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS : Order, order !

Mr. P. J. LEAHY : What they had to do was to decide a particular item. There was an item to the Under Secretary, an item for the chief clerk—

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS : Order, order ! Sit down ! Chair !

Mr. P. J. LEAHY : It was not unlawful for him to move the reduction of any one of the items which he pleased.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS : Order, order !

The CHAIRMAN : Will the hon. member resume his seat. I shall remain on my feet to preserve order.

The House resumed.

SUSPENSION OF MEMBER.

The CHAIRMAN (addressing the Speaker) : I have to report the hon. member for Toowong for disregarding the ruling of the Chair. I called the hon. member to order several times during the afternoon and several times since tea. The hon. member continually disregarded my instructions to resume his seat, and I have no alternative except to report him.

Mr. J. LEAHY : You refused to put the question that he be further heard.

Hon. R. PHILP : I moved that he be further heard.

The SPEAKER : Order ! The Chairman reports the hon. member for Toowong for disobeying the authority of the Chair.

Mr. LESINA : I rise to a point of order.

The PREMIER : Mr. Speaker—

Mr. LESINA : I have the Chair. The point of order is this : In reporting a member from the Committee of the House to the whole House for disorder, is the Chairman in order in sending for the Speaker before calling the member by name ? The Chairman did not call upon the hon. member for Toowong by name.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

Mr. LESINA : The rule I refer to is Rule 166.

The SPEAKER : It appears to me that the Chairman was well within the Standing Orders in reporting the hon. member for Toowong for disregarding the authority of the Chair. The Standing Order to which the hon. member for Clermont refers relates to a disturbance created by an hon. member while another hon. member is addressing the Chair. Under Standing Order 118, the Chairman is empowered to report an hon. member for disregarding his ruling.

[*Mr. Jackson.*]

The PREMIER : In consequence of your finding, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. member for Toowong, Mr. Macartney, be suspended from the service of the House for the remainder of this sitting.

Mr. P. J. LEAHY : You might make it next session.

Hon. R. PHILP : The Home Secretary is the man who is to blame.

The SPEAKER : Order, order ! The question is that the hon. member for Toowong be suspended from the service of the House for the remainder of the sitting.

Mr. MACARTNEY : I rise to ask on what Standing Order that motion is based ?

The SPEAKER : If an hon. member disregards the authority of the Chair, and the Chairman reports the matter to the House, it is quite optional for the leader of the House to move that the hon. member be suspended from the service of the House for the sitting. Hon. members will distinctly understand that it is the Chairman's province to maintain order in Committee, and if he—

Hon. R. PHILP interjected.

The SPEAKER : Order ! I must ask hon. members to allow me to proceed without interruption. It is the Chairman's province to maintain order in Committee, and if he calls upon any hon. member to resume his seat, that hon. member should either comply at once, or move that he be further heard.

Mr. J. LEAHY : He refused to put the question that he be further heard.

Mr. LINDLEY : Are we not allowed to speak on this motion ?

The SPEAKER : No.

Question—That the hon. member for Toowong be suspended from the service of the House for the remainder of the sitting—put ; and the House divided :—

AYES, 33.

Mr. Airey	Mr. Land
" Barber	" Mann
" Barton	" Maughan
" Bell	" McDunnell
" Blair	" Mitchell
" Bowman	" Mulcahy
" Brideses	" Murphy
" Burrows	" Norman
" Cowap	" O'Brien
" Denham	" O'Sullivan
" Fudge	" Payne
" Grant	" Reinhold
" Hamilton	" Ryland
" Hargreaves	" Smart
" Hawthorn	" Turner
" Kerr	" Woods
" Kidston	

Tellers : Mr. Fudge and Mr. Reinhold.

NOES, 19.

Mr. Campbell	Mr. Lesina
" Cribb	" Lindley
" Forrest	" Macartney
" Forsyth	" Mackintosh
" Fox	" Paget
" Hanran	" Paull
" Jenkinson	" Philp
" Keogh	" Somerset
" J. Leahy	" Stodart
" P. J. Leahy	

Tellers : Mr. Paget and Mr. Paull.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER : I must now ask the hon. member for Toowong to retire from the House.

(Mr. Macartney then left the House, amidst Opposition cheers.)

SUPPLY.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

Mr. P. J. LEAHY wished to resume his observations—

Mr. LESINA rose to a point of order. Was the hon. member for Warrego in order in discussing the vote before the question had been put? Question put.

Mr. P. J. LEAHY: On one occasion some hon. member—he was not sure which, but it was probably the Home Secretary—used words to this effect—

Let observation with extensive view
Survey mankind from Dunwich to Barcoo.

(Laughter.) He did not intend to make any comprehensive survey of that kind, because he had the strongest possible desire to observe the Standing Orders; he had not had occasion to fall under the Chairman's displeasure more than once, and for that reason he desired to confine himself to the main question as far as it was possible to do so. The question was to vote a certain sum of money, and before they could decide whether an officer ought to get his money, they ought to know whether he was discharging his duties; because if he was not, there would be a just cause for not voting the money, and he hoped he would be in order in referring to that aspect of the question without going into detail with regard to other votes. The Under Secretary, whose salary was included in the vote, was a very excellent man, and probably "ran the show," consequently, if there were any police grievances they must more or less have come under his notice. He was not going to refer to any particular officer, but there was an opinion abroad that a great many officers under the Home Department had suffered greater injustices during the last two or three years than they had since we had responsible government. If that could be shown, then it was a very good reason why they should strike out some item in that vote. If they could strike out a portion of the Home Secretary's salary, it would be a proper thing to do; but they could not do it. But they could strike out the whole or portion of any salary that was put down for some other officer—the Under Secretary, for instance. He did not say that they ought to do it, but they could do it. Without desiring to go into details, as he did not want to be called to order, he ventured to say that he could enumerate more grievances that officers had suffered than he had fingers on his two hands. It was a proper thing that these grievances should be rectified and remedied so far as it was possible for the Home Department to do it. If the Home Secretary gave up the whole of his time to his duties, instead of indulging in the gratification of his poetical leanings, it would be better. The Minister ought to be responsible for all the sins of neglect and for all the sins of omission and commission in the department. He entered his emphatic protest against the administration of some of these departments.

HON. R. PHILP: In going through the vote of two years ago, at the time the £50 was taken off Mr. Ryder's salary, he remembered that he protested against it, and the Home Secretary, after paying a tribute to the abilities of Mr. Ryder, said—

Officers whose salaries were reduced on the recommendation of the board were exempt from the operation of the special retrenchment. If they took $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. off £750 they got £56 5s., so that instead of losing £50 reduction the Under Secretary would have lost £56 5s.

Now that the retrenchment has worn off, and there had been a great number of increases on the Estimates, Mr. Ryder should be considered.

1906—5 E

There was not a member in the House but would admit that Mr. Ryder was a competent officer—(hear, hear!)—and it was a poor return for long service given to the Government to have his salary reduced at the present time.

Mr. LINDLEY: Anyone knowing the Home Secretary's Department, and having to do business there, would admit that it was most unfair that, while the chief clerk and accountant received an increase of £50, nothing was given to Mr. Ryder. No one regretted the increase given to the chief clerk: but every member of the House would agree that Mr. Ryder was one of the most straightforward, conscientious Under Secretaries in the service, and it was only reasonable and right, when the good things seemed to be going round and everything seemed bright and prosperous, that he should be placed on the same footing he formerly occupied.

Mr. J. LEAHY: Two or three years ago everything connected with the police went through the Under Secretary, and he would like to know if it was the same now, or did the Commissioner for Police approach the Minister directly?

The HOME SECRETARY: There is no change.

Mr. J. LEAHY: Was the Under Secretary responsible, or did everything go direct from the Commissioner to the Minister?

The HOME SECRETARY: There had been no change in the functions of the Under Secretary in regard to the administration of police affairs.

Mr. J. LEAHY: But what is the position now?

The HOME SECRETARY: The position was the same as before. Matters of routine went through the Commissioner and Under Secretary to the Minister.

Mr. J. LEAHY: That was not exactly the point. What he wanted to know was this: the Under Secretary had a certain amount of responsibility with regard to police affairs. Did the Under Secretary have that responsibility with regard to police affairs that he had with regard to the details of the Home Secretary's Office, or were these responsibilities shared by the Commissioner approaching the Minister direct and relieving the Under Secretary? Was the Under Secretary still responsible?

The HOME SECRETARY: The Under Secretary has just the same responsibility now that he always had. There has been absolutely no change.

Mr. J. LEAHY: It was satisfactory to know that. They were going to vote the salary of £700 for the Under Secretary, who was a very excellent man. With regard to the administration of police affairs, he wanted to know whether the Under Secretary had made proper representations or proper minutes, so that it could be seen that he understood the functions of that position.

The HOME SECRETARY: Very ingenious. (Laughter.)

Mr. J. LEAHY: He wanted to know something about a matter of public interest, if the Home Secretary would tell them. It was in connection with a certain policeman, and he wanted to know if the recommendation in regard to that man came through the Under Secretary—if the action taken by the Government in that case was recommended by the Under Secretary whose salary they were now asked to vote.

The PREMIER: You can ask that on the police vote.

Mr. J. LEAHY: He wanted to know if the Under Secretary was responsible.

The HOME SECRETARY: No. The Home Secretary is responsible.

Mr. J. LEAHY: He had got the information he wanted, and that was that the Under Secretary had nothing to do with it, as the Home

Mr. J. Leahy.]

Secretary took the full responsibility. He could tell the Committee candidly that he had not intended to discuss these matters, but if they wanted discussing he would do it, and he would find the means of discussing them at the proper time. He just rose to show that it could be done, and if it was necessary he would rise at the proper time and do it. As he had no grievance to ventilate regarding the police affairs there was no occasion for him to do it. The Government had said repeatedly—they said it all over the country and on different platforms—that the civil servants had been restored to their proper salaries, and they had got an interjection from the Home Secretary that it was “nearly all” or “practically all.” On looking at the schedule which accompanied the Minister’s estimates, he found there was a very good officer whom he had some experience with, and members of the House had some experience with him. He referred to the telegraph man.

The HOME SECRETARY: I knew you were bringing that along.

Mr. J. LEAHY: Then the hon. member knew more than he knew himself half an hour previously. He had been a very

[8 p.m.] long time in the service, and was regarded as a good man. Mr. Musgrave had never asked him to bring his case up, and he brought it forward as a glaring instance in which a salary had not been restored. Mr. Musgrave had been twenty-eight years in the service; he occupied a responsible position, and his salary had been cut down from £250 to £200. That was not right, and it was not in accordance with the promise and the boast that had been made so frequently by Ministers that all salaries had been restored. The Government were entitled to give some explanation to the Committee.

The HOME SECRETARY: It was done before tea.

Mr. J. LEAHY: If the explanation had been given when he was not present that was his fault, and he would not press the matter. He would inquire from his friends on that side—whose word he could take—as to what the explanation was, and if it was not satisfactory he would take another opportunity of referring to the matter before the vote passed.

Mr. LESINA: Another matter that wanted ventilation was with reference to correspondence. He had been to the department on several occasions to see the papers connected with an application by an old man in his constituency for an old age allowance, and he had not been afforded an opportunity of seeing the papers. Recently the Home Secretary stated in that Chamber that he (Mr. Lesina) had not taken any action in the case. He knew the statement at the time to be a lie, and he knew it to be a lie now.

The CHAIRMAN: Do I understand the hon. member charges the Home Secretary with stating what was a lie?

Mr. LESINA: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Then the hon. member must withdraw that statement.

Mr. LESINA: As it was unparliamentary he would withdraw it; but the statement was incorrect, utterly groundless, and absolutely without foundation.

The HOME SECRETARY called the Chairman’s attention to the fact that the hon. member was discussing a detail connected with the administration of Dunwich. He had no objection to discussing it at the proper time.

The CHAIRMAN: I understood the hon. member for Clermont to complain that he was not permitted to see certain correspondence in the chief office. I think I should not be justified in ruling the hon. member out of order for bringing a matter of that kind before the Committee.

[Mr. J. Leahy.

Mr. LESINA: The Home Secretary was as full of points as a porcupine. The correspondence in question had vanished, and he could not see it. For weeks past the hon. gentleman had had that correspondence in his own office, and he could not see it unless he invaded the hon. gentleman’s office. He could see the correspondence in connection with any other application for relief, but not in this case. It was wrong that the hon. gentleman should keep that correspondence in his own office for weeks. He had been to the department eighteen months ago in connection with the same case, and it was only an attempt on the part of the hon. gentleman to make the paltry point against him that he neglected one case out of about 500 during the last two years. He had as much right as any other hon. member to see correspondence affecting constituents, and he indignantly protested against the Home Secretary monopolising that correspondence and keeping it from him. He had a right to see the correspondence to refresh his memory regarding the facts, so that, when they came to the Dunwich vote, he would be in a better position to defend himself against the hon. gentleman’s charges. If the Minister would do such a thing as that, it was quite possible he would do other things.

Question put, and as the CHAIRMAN called for the “Noes,” Hon. R. PHILIP rose.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is too late. I called for the “Noes,” and, as there was no response, I then declared the result of the voices, and the hon. member has lost his right to speak. If he rose to address me before I called for the “Noes,” of course he could speak.

Mr. J. LEAHY: It is before you declare the voices—not before you call for the “Noes.”

The CHAIRMAN: When I call for the “Noes” and am declaring the result of the voices, it is not in order for an hon. member to speak.

Question stated.

HON. R. PHILIP: This precious Public Service Inquiry Board had recommended that Mr. Ryder’s salary should be reduced by £50, that Mr. Gall’s salary should be increased by £50, and they also recommended that Mr. Musgrave’s salary should be reduced from £250 to £180. The Home Secretary had told them that the work Mr. Musgrave was doing was not worth £250. When a man who had been twenty-eight years in the service filled a position that was not good enough, was there no other position which would entitle him to a higher salary? The answers that had been given were not satisfactory. Two years ago the Home Secretary pretended to be Mr. Ryder’s friend when he took off the £50—he contended then that he was really giving him more money. That contention could not be used now, because there was no Special Retrenchment Act in force. The hon. gentleman, to be consistent, should tell them that Mr. Ryder was not worth more than £700. If he did, no one would believe him, because every hon. member knew that Mr. Ryder was one of the best Under Secretaries in the service.

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Moreton*) asked the Home Secretary whether there was any provision on the Estimates for the erection of police buildings at Terror’s Creek. He was unable to discover any vote for that purpose.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is in the Works Department.

Mr. CAMPBELL had asked about it in the Home Secretary’s Department, and he was not informed that it was under any other department. He understood that the Commissioner of Police had been considering the matter, and he was also told that he had considered it favourably. The recommendation would have to go from

the Commissioner through the Home Department, and, as he could find no provision for it on the Works Department, he wished to know why no sum was placed on the Estimates for the purpose.

The PREMIER : It is provided for in the general vote on the Works Estimates.

Mr. CAMPBELL : Surely the hon. gentleman did not know what the Home Department were doing in a matter of that kind ! He wanted to know from the Home Secretary why no provision had been made.

The HOME SECRETARY was informed that a recommendation had come from the Commissioner, in which case it would be sent on to the Works Department.

Mr. CAMPBELL : That answer was not satisfactory, because he already knew that much himself. He heard that from the department long ago, and he was told that it rested with the Minister. It must have come under the hon. gentleman's notice.

The HOME SECRETARY : Hundreds of cases like that are brought under my notice every week.

Mr. CAMPBELL : The officers of the department, who were in the lobby, should know something about it. A very large petition had been sent in asking for provision to be made. There were some hundreds of people living in the neighbourhood, which was 12 miles from North Pine, and frequently on Sundays there were great disturbances there.

Mr. REINHOLD : There is £6,000 for new police buildings on the Works Estimates.

Mr. CAMPBELL : Could the Home Secretary assure him that this building was included in that vote ?

Mr. REINHOLD : It does not specify the particular buildings.

Question put and passed.

ADVERTISING BOARD.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £4,340 be granted for salaries and contingencies in connection with the "Advertising Board." There was an increase of £20 in this vote—£10 to the Secretary, whose salary was increased from £200 to £210, and £10 to the clerk, whose salary was raised from £90 to £100.

HON. R. PHILP : At one time the secretary to the Advertising Board received £220 a year, but on the recommendation of the Public Service Inquiry Board his salary was reduced to £200. Was there any reason why it should not now be restored to the original amount ? Mr. Smith had always been looked upon as a good officer, and it was a gross injustice that he did not get back his old salary now when other officers in the service were receiving large increases.

The HOME SECRETARY : The Government were of opinion that £210 about covered the value of the work performed. It did not follow that because certain things took place some years ago at the instance of the Public Service Inquiry Board the Government were now obliged to restore salaries to their *status quo*.

HON. R. PHILP : The Public Service Inquiry Board stated in their report that—

We also made a comparison of the salaries paid to officers in other States with those paid to public servants in Queensland.

After very earnest consideration, we have formed the opinion that the public service of this State is not overmanned to any serious extent, and that the standard of remuneration is not excessive.

The officer in question was formerly getting £220 a year, and he certainly thought that at a time when other officers were receiving advances Mr. Smith's salary should be restored to £220.

With regard to the item of £4,000 for advertising generally, would the Minister tell the Committee how that money had been expended last year ? It had been customary for the Minister to give that information to the Committee.

The HOME SECRETARY : If any hon. member wished to know the amount paid to any particular journal, he would give the amount, but he hardly thought it necessary to read the whole list. He would place the list on the table, so that any hon. member who desired to peruse it could do so.

Mr. J. LEAHY : The hon. member for Clermont will read it.

Mr. LESINA : You bet.

Mr. PAGET asked what amounts were paid for advertising to the *The Worker*, Brisbane *Truth*, the *Warrego Watchman*, the *Daily Mail*, the *Toowoomba Chronicle*, and the *Warwick Argus* ?

The HOME SECRETARY replied that the total sum paid to the *Daily Mail* was £223 4s. 4d. ; to the *Warrego Watchman*, £42 16s. ; and to *Truth*, £32 16s. He did not think the *Warwick Argus* was on his list. However, the list was on the table, and hon. members could read it for themselves.

Mr. LESINA did not remember any previous occasion since he had been in the House when the Minister in charge of the Home Department Estimates declined to read out for the instruction of hon. members and the information of the electors the details of the money expended on advertising. *Hansard* would show that previous Home Secretaries had read the list, and that a long discussion had taken place on it, in which nearly every Labour member took part, and pointed out how public money was being poured in a veritable stream into the coffers of the capitalistic journals, while sterling democratic journals like the *Eagle*, the *Worker*, and *Gympie Truth* were simply starved. He noticed that according to the list now laid on the table the *New Eagle* received 8s. 6d., while the capitalistic *Daily Mail* received £223, and the *Worker*, which had a circulation of about 15,000, received a comparatively small sum. A sum of £125 was expended upon the "Year Book of Australia," £50 on the *Australian Mining Standard*, and £55 on "Australia To-day." Money had been spent in advertising in New Zealand, in Dunedin, in Sydney, in Melbourne, in Newcastle, and in Casino. The paper which the Minister for Lands was supposed to be interested in—the *Dalby Herald*—got £29, and the *Dalby Leader* got £71, and neither of those papers had a large circulation.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : I hope you will notice that the paper which does belong to me got £60 less than the other.

Mr. LESINA : There was a sum of £40 put down for the *Miner*, Gympie ; £39 for the *Gympie Times* ; and £30 for *Gympie Truth*.

Mr. JENKINSON : Read the whole list ?

Mr. LESINA : Very well, he would read the list. It was as follows :— "Guardian," Allora, £12 16s. ; "Barron Valley Advocate," Atherton, £7 7s. 6d. ; "Delta Advocate," Ayr, £14 9s. ; "Western Champion," Balcaldine, £55 6s. 9d. ; "Despatch," Beaudesert, £19 6s. 6d. ; "Herald," Beaudesert, £11 2s. 3d. ; "Barcoo Independent," Blackall, £37 9s. ; "Fassifern Advocate," Boonah, £27 2s. 9d. ; "Fassifern Guardian," Boonah, £20 12s. 3d. ; "Independent," Bowen, £11 6s. ; "Port Denison Times," Bowen, £39 3s. 3d. ; "Courier," Brisbane, £245 18s. 4d. ; "Telegraph," Brisbane, £216 15s. 9d. ; "Observer," Brisbane, £3 5s. 3d. ; "Daily Mail," Brisbane, £223 4s. 4d. ; "Moreton Mail," Brisbane, £30 4s. 6d. ; "Logan

Mr. Lesina.]

and Albert Advocate," Brisbane, £21 1s.; "Poultry Guide," Brisbane, 4s.; "Country Life," Brisbane, 7s.; "Dairy and Farm Journal," Brisbane, 7s. 6d.; "Queenslander Herald," Brisbane, £2 12s. 6d.; "Mail," Bundaberg, £50 14s. 10d.; "Star," Bundaberg, £37 3s. 10d.; "Argus," Cairns, £44 3s. 2d.; "Post," Cairns, £34 11s. 10d.; "Trinity Times," Cairns, 6s. 6d.; "Times," Charleville, £46; "Northern Miner," Charters Towers, £148 12s. 4d.; "Evening Telegraph," Charters Towers, £51 6s.; "North Queensland Register," Charters Towers, £9 12s. 8d.; "New Eagle," Charters Towers, 8s. 6d.; "Miner," Chillagoe, £15 5s. 6d.; "Isis Recorder," Childers, £39 17s.; "Peak Downs Telegram," Clermont, £28 19s.; "Despatch," Clifton, £35 3s. 3d.; "Advocate," Cloncurry, £36 0s. 6d.; "Independent," Cooktown, £23 7s.; "New Endeavour Beacon," Cooktown, £21 10s.; "Mining News," Croydon, £6 4s.; "Mining Record," Croydon, £10 12s. 6d.; "Record," Crow's Nest, £216s. 6d.; "Warrego Watchman," Cunnamulla, £42 16s.; "Herald," Dalby, £29 10s.; "Leader," Dalby, £71 16s. 9d.; "Star," Emerald, £48 7s. 3d.; "Record," Esk, £22 15s.; "Mundic Miner," Georgetown, £22 13s.; "Sentinel," Geraldton, £18 8s. 6d.; "Observer," Gladstone, £25 15s.; "McIntyre Herald," Goomdiwindi, £30 15s.; "Times," Gympie, £39 14s. 1d.; "Miner," Gympie, £41 2s. 6d.; "Truth," Gympie, £32 1s. 6d.; "Wild River Times," Herberton, £35 2s. 9d.; "Observer," Hughenden, £25 1s. 6d.; "Northern Planter," Ingham, £26 13s. 6d.; "Herbert River Express," Ingham, £17 0s. 6d.; "Queensland Times," Ipswich, £73 12s. 9d.; "Moreton Leader," Ipswich, £65 10s. 1d.; "Lockyer Star," Laidley, £61 17s. 3d.; "News," Longreach, £26 18s. 3d.; "Mercury," Mackay, £26 16s. 6d.; "Standard," Mackay, £33 3s.; "Chronicle," Mackay, £18 17s.; "Chronicle," Maryborough, £77 2s.; "Colonist," Maryborough, £1 3s. 6d.; "Wide Bay and Burnett News," Maryborough, £80 4s. 8d.; "Champion," Mossman, £4 17s.; "Chronicle," Mount Morgan, £16 5s. 9d.; "Argus," Mount Morgan, £14 12s. 9d.; "Times," Mount Perry, £27 3s.; "Chronicle," Nambour, £46 17s. 3d.; "News," Nanango, £43 16s. 3d.; "Norman Chronicle," Normanton, £42 16s. 6d.; "Despatch," Nundah, £52 14s. 3d.; "Herald," Oakey, £1 11s. 9d.; "Sentinel," Pittsworth, £14 2s.; "Record," Port Douglas, £17 5s.; "Guardian," Proserpine, £5 4s.; "Mining Journal," Ravenswood, £16 9s. 6d.; "Record," Richmond, £24 14s. 6d.; "Morning Bulletin," Rockhampton, £83 17s. 8d.; "Daily Record," Rockhampton, £62 2s. 10d.; "Capricornian," Rockhampton, 10s.; "Critic," Rockhampton, 14s.; "Star," Roma, £48 15s. 6d.; "Maranoa Advocate," Roma, £79 2s. 7d.; "Standard," St. George, £17s. 18s. 9d.; "Balonne Beacon," St. George, £14 3s. 6d.; "Logan and Albert Bulletin," Southport, £44 7s. 9d.; "Border Post," Stanthorpe, £55 17s. 9d.; "Herald," Thargomindah, £38 4s. 3d.; "Torres Straits Pilot," Thursday Island, £9 11s. 6d.; "Torres Straits Pearler," Thursday Island, £9 15s. 6d.; "Chronicle," Toowoomba, £77 13s. 3d.; "Darling Downs Gazette," Toowoomba, £66 5s. 6d.; "Bulletin," Townsville, £45 4s. 6d.; "Star," Townsville, £59 15s. 3d.; "North Queensland Herald," Townsville, £7 4s.; "Argus," Warwick, £45 16s. 3d.; "Examiner," Warwick, £62 3s.; "Herald," Winton, £28 6s. The "Charleville [8.30 p.m.] Times," he believed, was owned by the hon. member for Warrego. Did that item account for some of the mysterious lapses of silence the hon. member had fallen into of late?

Mr. P. J. LEAHT: They got good value for the money.

[Mr. Lesina.

Mr. LESINA: Out of a total of £4,091, inclusive of a few small sums paid outside the State, spent last year in advertising, only about £100 was the share of the Labour Press of Queensland. He did not know who

[8.30 p.m.] was responsible for the advertising; but supposed each Minister had a hand in it. He understood that the people interested in the *Trinity Times*, of Cairns, waited on the Government, as a deputation, to get advertisements. He reckoned they ought to be "shook up" over that.

Mr. CAMPBELL: What did the *Worker* get?

Mr. LESINA: He did not see any mention of the *Worker* in the list. Nor was there any mention of the £50 paid by the Premier to the *Daily Mail* for a special illustrated account of his recent trip. Did the hon. gentleman pay it out of his own pocket? Where was the cheque? Who signed it? The money might have come out of contingencies, or it might be included in the large sum of £219 paid to the *Daily Mail*. He did not object to the *Mail* getting that money, or any other paper that could exercise sufficient influence on the Cabinet. It was purely business, and if the expenditure was justifiable at all it could only be justified on business lines. He (Mr. Lesina) was now only carrying out his traditional policy of carefully scrutinising the expenditure by the Advertising Board. The amount involved was large, though probably not larger than ought to be spent for the purpose. The only other point he wished to mention was that, in the expenditure of the advertising fund, a more generous treatment should be accorded to the democratic papers of the State, of which there were a dozen or more. There were many advertisements which ought to be inserted in the Labour papers, and it should be remembered that many people read Labour papers only.

Mr. MANN: When the vote was before the Committee in 1904, the senior member for Charters Towers, Mr. Burrows, and himself talked in very much the same strain as the hon. member for Clermont had spoken to-night. They got on to the Government pretty strongly for not giving Labour papers something like a fair share of advertising. The hon. member for Clermont had accused him of owning the Labour paper at Cairns, and also made insinuations against the hon. member for Charters Towers, Mr. Burrows. At the risk of being tedious, he would read the hon. member's speech on that occasion, reported in *Hansard* for 1904, on page 1905—

Mr. LESINA said the hon. member for Charters Towers had picked out the various Labour papers which "boost" the policy of the Government, and seemed to expect that they should get a share of Government advertising. What title had the *Critic*, of Rockhampton, or the *Worker*, or the *Eagle* at Charters Towers to get a larger share of political "boodle" than they did? An advertisement in a daily paper would be brought under the notice of many more people of the type it was desired to reach than it would if inserted in a paper noted merely for its peculiar brand of politics. For instance, an advertisement with respect to lands, or an advertisement calling for tenders, would probably reach a larger number of the persons it was desired to reach if inserted in the Rockhampton *Bulletin* or the *Record* than it would if inserted in the *Critic*. The Advertising Board must be guided by the class of paper and the class of people they wished to reach in selecting the newspapers in which they would publish particular advertisements. It was a notorious fact that under the late Administration public money was simply poured in a golden stream into the coffers of wretchedly small rags like the *Street* or *Saturday Night*, merely because they boomed the Government policy. Let the Home Secretary take warning by the awful example of the fate which befel the late Government, and—if he had any control over this £4,058—see that it was distributed evenly and justly among the radical papers published in Queensland. The paper said to be owned by the Secretary for Lands got a larger share of Government

advertising than the rival paper in Dalby owned by a person named Dillon, who got nothing at all for advertising.

Mr. LESINA: That is true.

Mr. MANN: He felt very strongly on this matter. There were some classes of advertisements which it was better to put into a weekly paper than a daily paper. For example, poor miners like those in the constituency of the hon. member for Clermont could not afford to get a daily paper and pay postage on it, and in many outside places there was only a weekly delivery of the mail, and they only got the weekly paper. It would be much better, therefore, if the lists of persons qualified to vote were published in a weekly paper. He had brought the matter before the Advertising Board himself. Many farmers who were not close to the railways did not get a daily paper but only a weekly paper. In the North the papers they saw were such as the Charters Towers *Democrat* or *Register*, the Townsville *Herald*, and the weekly local papers. Those were all the papers they saw, so in case the Minister for Lands or the Under Secretary threw open lands for sale or selection it was better to advertise in a weekly paper. The advertising should be largely restricted to the Northern weeklies, because they had a larger circulation than the dailies published in towns like Cairns, which very rarely got beyond the confines of the town or the various "pubs" in the townships. No one living at a distance away from the railway would bother to buy them, as they had not time to go to the railway station for the daily paper, and the mail was only delivered once a week. The Government must study which papers were likely to give them the best value for the money. He should be astonished at the hon. member for Clermont if he did not know that the hon. member was continually changing his front. The hon. member wanted to get all the advertising for *Truth* and papers of that description.

Mr. BOUCHARD (*Brisbane South*) asked the Minister whether the expense of advertising the electoral rolls was included in the vote? With regard to the salary set down for the clerk referred to, he noticed from the Blue Book that that officer had been in the Government service since 1876. It simply went to show that there was not much inducement for any person to enter into the public service. The same remark applied to various other officers, some of whom appeared to have been a very long period without an increase. There should be some system whereby the officers should receive increases at certain periods. That system prevailed in other States. An officer might be doing good work, but he might not be in favour with the head of the department, which might account for his not getting an increase.

The HOME SECRETARY: With regard to the expense of advertising the electoral rolls, he would call the attention of hon. members to the fact that the allotment of advertising was made by the Advertising Board. They did not do it haphazard, but had a system to go on. They acted entirely irrespective of the political views of any paper, which he was convinced never entered into their consideration. The general rule had been that in towns where there were daily and weekly papers the daily papers should take precedence; but it had been discovered that in certain parts of the State there were weekly papers which had an extensive circulation, and might be said to command an extensive *clientèle*—such, for instance, as the *Queenlander*, the *Week*, the *Capricornian*, the *North Queensland Herald*, and the *North Queensland Register*. On account of the extensive circulation of these papers they were also to be placed on the advertising list.

Mr. P. J. LEAHY: The Home Secretary was right in stating that the Advertising Board was a non-political body, and whilst he (Mr. Leahy) might think that in some cases some papers got more than they ought to have got, still the newspapers which were opposed to the Government were in most cases treated as fairly as those which supported the Government. He attributed that to the fact that the Government had nothing to do with it, and that a non-political board had to do with it. He should like to disabuse the minds of members of an erroneous idea that they had got that he had something to do with the *Warrego Watchman*. He had no interest in it at all.

Mr. LESINA: With regard to the inconsistency which the member for Cairns appeared to have discovered in his (Mr. Lesina's) remarks, he admitted that at times he was inconsistent. (Laughter.) But there was a distinction between his inconsistency and that of the hon. members for Bundaberg or Cairns, and it was this: In consistency in small men was a vice; in great men it was a virtue. The apparent inconsistency in his remarks two years ago and now was not an inconsistency at all. He admitted that last year he said there was an expenditure in the papers which boomed the Government policy, but the *Critic* and other papers began to see the writing on the wall. They saw that the doom of the Government was pronounced; they knew that the Government was tottering to a fall, so they were not seeking any advertisements now but were condemning the Government instead. With the single exception of the *Trinity Times*, practically all these papers had turned dog on the Government. How much did the *Worker* get this year? He did not see anything at all in the list. It was a coincidence that this marvellous falling off in the Government's advertising generosity was coincident with the change of policy in the *Worker*. The moment that paper started to howl down the Government then the Government advertising began to fall off. On the other hand, newspapers that became enthusiastic in their support of the Government, such as the *Daily Mail*—(laughter)—were getting a large supply of Government advertisements. He did not wish to accuse the Advertising Board of having any political bias, but somehow or other the money got into the coffers of those newspapers which were prone to sing the praises of the Government, and papers that did not do so did not fare so well. There were two exceptions—the Charters Towers *Eagle* and the paper at Trinity Bay—the *Trinity Times*. These papers had barracked their very souls out for the Government, and the amount of Government advertisements which they secured amounted to 8s. 6d. in one case, and 6s. 6d. in the other. Members would admit that that was inadequate payment for the heroic services performed by these papers on behalf of the Government.

Question put and passed.

DUNWICH BENEVOLENT ASYLUM.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £43,625 be granted for the "Dunwich Benevolent Asylum." This was an increase of £3,136, as compared with last year. The increases included £75 for three months' salary for the assistant superintendent, who was retiring; an increase of £200 in consequence of the appointment of a storekeeper; a decrease of £50 in consequence of the clerk's services being dispensed with; an increase in the head attendant's salary from £90 to £120; increases in the salaries of the three wardsmen, making them now one at £70 and two at £60 each; increases in the salaries of the officers of the female quarters, £60 for a female

Hon. P. Airey.]

cook. The boatmen's salaries had been increased, making one at £60, one at £52, and one at £39. There was an increase of £2,500 in the indigent allowance; an increase of £500 in provisions, medical comforts, and incidentals, making the total increase £3,136.

HON. R. PHILP: With regard to the question he asked before, he saw there was £500 down for the Medical Superintendent, and he understood that the doctor at Dunwich was also in charge of the lazaret. He presumed he was right in saying what he wanted to say on the lazaret at this juncture.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is entirely out of order.

HON. R. PHILP: The Home Secretary was not the Chairman. All the trouble that had taken place arose through the Home Secretary entirely. It looked as if it was because he had something to hide, and he desired to avoid discussion. When the Home Secretary was on the Opposition side he used to get up on his hind legs— (Laughter.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

HON. R. PHILP: He had no wish to stop until 6 o'clock in the morning.

The HOME SECRETARY: You want to keep other people here.

HON. R. PHILP: He was not going to keep any of his people there until 6 o'clock in the morning. Why did not the Premier control his own followers, as they were the cause of the whole trouble.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

HON. R. PHILP: He wanted to know from the Home Secretary what he intended doing with regard to the lazaret. He had two letters complaining about the doctor and

[9 p.m.] the Home Secretary. He had put the case before the Home Secretary, but the men had received no redress. He knew it was a difficult thing to please these unfortunate people, but was the Home Secretary prepared to give them sufficient food and clothing and accommodation, because they said they were not properly treated. They complained, not only of the bad food, but also of the way in which they were brought from Cairns, in a sort of hencoop, where there was not room for more than two men.

The HOME SECRETARY rose to a point of order. Was the discussion relevant? The vote for the lazaret came on at a later stage, and the hon. member's remarks were entirely out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: The leader of the Opposition will be in order in discussing any action on the part of the Medical Superintendent, but he cannot go any further. The hon. gentleman cannot discuss a matter which will come on for discussion at a later stage; but it would be regular for me to allow him to discuss the action of the Medical Superintendent.

HON. R. PHILP: The man he referred to complained of the Medical Superintendent, and the inmates generally said that things should be better than they were. One of the men threatened to publish details concerning the lazaret of Queensland in the continental papers. There had been quite enough said against Queensland already, and that should be prevented if possible. Those unfortunate people should get the best of treatment, and under Sir Horace Tozer they got it. He gave them almost everything they wanted, and said repeatedly that surely they should do their very best for such unfortunate people.

[Hon. P. Airey.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. gentleman is going further than my ruling allows. If he wishes to complain of the action of the Medical Superintendent, he should make some specific charge, but the hon. gentleman seems to be trying to discuss the whole question of the administration of the lazaret. I do not think that is in order, because the vote will be before the Committee later on.

HON. R. PHILP: His correspondent told him that he told the doctor that his stomach revolted at the food supplied, and the doctor's reply was "then get rid of your stomach." There was no member of the House who did not desire that such people should be treated in the best possible manner, and he thought there should be some inquiry into the doctor's attitude. They had a lot of inquiries recently, and expected some improvement. The question was one in which the whole of Queensland was concerned. He quite understood that the inmates of the lazaret would never be entirely satisfied, but they ought to have an assurance from the Home Secretary that he was doing everything he could to make them satisfied.

The HOME SECRETARY had no objection to discussing the whole question on the proper vote; but the hon. member, all the afternoon, had been trying to get on to that question in order that he might get away early, and leave others to carry on the work. That was the plain truth.

HON. R. PHILP: It is not the truth.

The HOME SECRETARY: When the lazaret vote came on, he would quote the dietary scale, and he could assure members that it was liberal to an extent which few of them knew. By way of comparison, take the Diamantina Hospital—

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest to the Home Secretary that he should confine himself to the action of the doctor. I endeavoured to confine the leader of the Opposition to that point, and I think the Home Secretary should do the same. If he goes into the general administration of the lazaret, the leader of the Opposition will be entitled to reply.

The HOME SECRETARY: He only desired to reply to the leader of the Opposition. He had been allowed to make certain remarks, and he thought it would be fair to allow him to reply.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the Home Secretary is well aware that I called the leader of the Opposition to order twice, and I must now call the Home Secretary to order.

The HOME SECRETARY bowed to the Chairman's ruling. As a matter of fact he had discussed the inmates' grievances with the doctor, but if he told the Committee what transpired between the doctor and himself he should be transgressing the Chairman's ruling. The grievance of the hon. gentleman's correspondent was that in his own country of Italy or Austria he had been accustomed to have a bottle of claret and olives every day, and he complained that he was not supplied with claret and olives by the authorities in Queensland. The lot of the inmates of the lazaret was not so much to be commiserated on account of the treatment they received, but on account of the situation of the lazaret. A more unsuitable place could not be devised.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The HOME SECRETARY: He was simply replying to the statements which the hon. gentleman made, but if he was out of order he would postpone his remarks until the lazaret vote came on.

Mr. MAXWELL: As far as the doctor's salary was concerned, it had a slight bearing on the lazaret, but he was not going to deal with it. He only wished to say that he asked the opinion of a clergyman who visited a great number of those institutions as to how the inmates of the lazaret were treated, and he said he had been through a great number of institutions, and he could say that the people down there were well treated. They knew it was impossible to please men in such a condition, but he was satisfied that they were well treated, from his conversation with this clergyman in whose word he had every confidence. Some years ago the present Home Secretary introduced a deputation to the present leader of the Opposition asking for the establishment of a Northern Dunwich. When old people were brought from North Queensland to the South they found the climate very trying. The question had been brought under the notice of the Home Secretary as well as under the notice of his predecessors, and he would like to know if the Government were doing anything in the matter? He did not say that Ravenswood would be the most suitable place for such an institution—he believed the Atherton Tableland would be a much better place—but it was about time the Government took steps to establish an institution of the kind in the North.

The HOME SECRETARY: Dunwich was overcrowded, and, in order to relieve the congestion, they had had to utilise some of the quarantine buildings on Peel Island. But it would be necessary in the near future either to extend the buildings at Dunwich, or to start a new benevolent asylum in North Queensland. He was not in favour of extending the buildings at Dunwich, as he considered it would be a mistake. He thought it would be much better to have a Northern asylum. Then the old folks belonging to North Queensland would have an opportunity of seeing their friends. He hoped to be able, in the course of a few months, to get a scheme formulated, and to get the Cabinet to agree to it, for the establishment of a benevolent asylum in the Northern part of the State. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. GRANT asked whether the inebriate asylum at Dunwich had proved satisfactory?

The HOME SECRETARY: The Government had several proposals before them at the present time with regard to an inebriate asylum. They might either start an asylum under the auspices of the State, or they might get the work done for the first year or two by some body. In the course of the next few weeks he hoped to be able to come to a decision on the matter. He thought it was a great mistake ever allowing the inebriates to go to Dunwich, as it had been productive of anything but good consequences. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. MANN was very pleased to hear the Home Secretary say that he was in favour of the establishment of an asylum in the North. It was a great hardship for people to be brought from the North to Brisbane. He had in his mind a case of a woman from North Queensland who expected to get better shortly, and she would like to go back to the North. But she was afraid she would be stranded in Brisbane unless someone paid her passage back to where she belonged. He hoped the hon. gentleman would urge on his colleagues, in season and out of season, the advisability of establishing an asylum in the North. He did not wish to suggest any site. So long as it was in the North, it would give general satisfaction to Northern members. He hoped the hon. gentleman would be as good as his word, and that the institution would soon be established.

Mr. J. LEAHY wished to know whether there was any intention of increasing the allowance in lieu of entering Dunwich this year? He noticed the amount on the Estimates was increased from £25,000 to £27,500. The Chairman had always taken a great interest in that question. At all events, he used to take a great interest in it formerly. There were no doubt good reasons why he was not taking such an interest in it now, situated as he was.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I hope you will remember that the Chairman sits there impersonally.

Mr. J. LEAHY: Would the hon. gentleman control himself, and await instructions from the Premier, who told him the other night that he was his clerk? Would the Chairman ask the Secretary for Lands to control himself? When the Premier told him the other night he was only a clerk of his, the hon. gentleman did not resent it, but crouched down and submitted to it. And he was the Premier's clerk, and did exactly what he was told.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. gentleman will not reply to the interjections of the Secretary for Lands, and at the same time I would ask him not to refer to me whilst I am in the chair. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. J. LEAHY: He had not referred to the Chairman in any way disparagingly. Hon. members were compelled by the Standing Orders to address the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the hon. member knows that when I asked him not to refer to me, I was speaking in reference to the action I have taken in connection with old age pensions and the indigence allowance. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. J. LEAHY would not do so, out of respect to the Chairman, but he submitted he had a perfect right to refer to the hon. member for Kennedy, if not to the Chairman of Committees.

The CHAIRMAN: It is merely a question of good taste.

Mr. COWAP: He has not got any.

Mr. J. LEAHY: If the Chairman put it in that way, he would have much pleasure in saying he would not refer to him, although he contended he had a perfect right to do it, and was prepared to do so if anyone challenged his right. As no one challenged him, and as the Chairman thought he was going to reflect on him—which he was not—he would make no further reference to him. Three or four years ago this was a matter of great interest, and there was a notice standing on the business-paper year after year asking that the old age allowance should be increased from 5s. to 7s. 6d. a week, and several hon. members expressed their opinions on the subject very strongly. It did not matter who introduced the motion. It was introduced, and it was carried at a time when the Government was not in a position to give effect to it on account of the state of the finances through the bad seasons. He would have been very glad to have been able to give effect to the resolution, but there was a deficit at the time. Now they had good seasons; they had a surplus last year, and for the first four months of the current financial year the surplus was something like £100,000 more than at the same time last year. Under those circumstances, if there was any faith in those hon. members who made such a fuss about the matter when they were sitting in opposition, and whose souls were then pierced with a fellow-feeling for those poor people, how was it that they did not now give some evidence of that faith? They did not hear a single word on the subject now that they had a surplus.

Mr. J. Leahy.]

Mr. KERR: How many 5s. a week persons did you knock off?

Mr. J. LEAHY: He knocked off a good many, and a good many ought to be knocked off. How many did he leave off who should have been put on the list?

The HOME SECRETARY: Nearly 300.

Mr. J. LEAHY: He thought the hon. gentleman would find he was wrong if he would refer to the papers, but in any case he was certain that any that were knocked off were knocked off for very good reasons. The hon. gentleman, when he was in opposition, had supported a proposal to increase the indigence allowance at a time when there were deficits. Now he was in power, and had the means to increase that allowance, and he had a majority behind him who were in favour of increasing it, and what was he doing to carry out the profession he indulged in so liberally a few years ago?

Mr. COWAP: When the hon. member for Bulloo controlled this vote, two old persons in his (Mr. Cowap's) district, one aged seventy-three and the other aged seventy-five, applied for the indigence allowance. The board recommended that they should get it, but for some reason or other the allowance was afterwards withdrawn. They were both very respectable people, against whom not a man in the district had a word to say.

Mr. J. LEAHY: Who were they?

Mr. COWAP: He would not mention names; it was not fair to do so, but he could give them to the hon. gentleman privately. The Under Secretary of the department again recommended their application for acceptance, and the hon. gentleman put a minute on the papers that they should be given one ration, what at that time cost about 2s. 9d., between them. And now the hon. member asked why did not the Labour party force the Government to make the indigence allowance 7s. 6d. per week? Did the hon. member offer that old lady and old gentleman a ration worth 2s. 9d. a week between them, so that they might starve, because they might vote against his party?

Mr. J. LEAHY: He could not reply to the hon. member, because he would not say what the case was. No doubt such a case might have existed. There were a number of people struck off the list altogether, and if the papers were examined it would be found that that action was justified. He knew that many people were getting the allowance whose sons or daughters were in receipt of £200, £300, or £400 a year, and some who were in that position were receiving the allowance now. He did not think that was a proper thing, and he knocked off such cases when they were brought under his notice. If they looked at the papers in the cases which had been knocked off, they would find that there was a very good reason for the action taken, or it would not have been taken. The practice was to ask the police magistrate or the principal police officer in the district to report on a case.

Mr. COWAP: In this case he reported in favour of the allowance being granted.

Mr. J. LEAHY: The hon. member's information must be entirely wrong. He guaranteed that if the Home Secretary went over the papers he would find that in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred he would come to the same conclusion as he (Mr. Leahy) did, and that the principle adopted was a just one. Where cases were knocked off the list it was mainly because they had property, or something else, which was bringing in no income, and which they would not sell, or because they had sons or daughters who, though able, would not support them. There were good honest citizens in the State who

kept their own parents and friends, and the burden should not be cast upon them of keeping the parents of other people who could very well afford to keep them themselves.

Mr. BOWMAN: It is a pity we had not a law to make them.

Mr. J. LEAHY: It was. But if he had committed fifty wrongs that did not excuse hon. members opposite for not increasing the allowance, since they had advocated that it should be increased to 7s. 6d. a week. He believed that the allowance should be given to deserving cases. If they had £20,000 to distribute among cases of this kind, the question was, not whether a man was deserving of more or not, but in what way they could spend that £20,000 to get the best results. It was the duty of the person who had the spending of the money to see that it went to the relief of those who needed it the most. What he wanted to know was what hon. members, who in times of deficits advocated the increase of the allowance to 7s. 6d. a week, had to say now that we had a surplus. What he did when there was a deficit was no argument as to what ought to be done now when there was a surplus. The two positions were very different:

Mr. COWAP: The hon. member for Bulloo said that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred that came under his administration he had a reason for acting as he did. There [9.30 p.m.] must have been some reason for giving those two old people one ration, and if there was reason for giving them one, there was equally good reason for giving them two. They either deserved that or nothing at all.

Mr. PAGET wished to know what the Government intended to do with regard to the establishment of a benevolent asylum in the North.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: That has been promised.

Mr. PAGET: That promise must have been given while he was absent from the Chamber. He was exceedingly pleased that the Minister had made the promise, and that something would be done in the matter.

The HOME SECRETARY: I said I would recommend it to the consideration of the Cabinet.

Mr. PAGET: That was a renewal of a promise made some months back, and, as it had been given, he would say nothing further on the subject. Another matter he desired to refer to was the indigent allowance. He was rather astonished that, in spite of the excellent seasons they had had during the last two years, it was necessary for the Home Secretary to ask the Committee to increase the vote by £2,500. They might have expected to see it decreased as not being necessary. As to the expenditure of that vote they had no information before them. In the report of the Medical Superintendent at Dunwich there was a table showing the districts from which the inmates came. He would suggest that the Home Secretary should, in future years, have a list prepared showing how the money was dispensed in the various districts.

Hon. R. PHILP: There is a list like that now.

Mr. PAGET: It would be a great service to the Committee if the Minister would give the details with respect to a few of the larger districts.

The HOME SECRETARY: The list he had with him was for the month ended 31st August, 1906. In North Brisbane and suburbs the amount dispensed was £189 19s. 9d.; in South Brisbane and suburbs, £66 11s. 9d.; in Townsville, £64 7s. 11d.; in Charters Towers, £102 11s. 8d.; at Mount Morgan, £61 17s. 10d.; at Clermont, £133 8s. 1d.; at Bundaberg, £52 0s. 2d.

[Mr. J. Leahy.]

Mr. BURROWS (*Charters Towers*): From information regarding Dunwich supplied to him, some of the old people were dissatisfied with the way in which they were treated. Many of them had to do certain work—he did not know whether it was very laborious work—which they thought they should not be required to do. He supposed that the medical officer had something to do with the matter, and that no person was compelled to work unless they were fitted to do so. He thought there should be some age limit laid down, beyond which no inmate should be asked to work. There was a rule in the civil service that after the age of sixty-five an officer must retire.

Mr. PAGET: There is no rule in private life.

Mr. BURROWS: He did not like the rule at all—to throw a man on the dust heap when he was sixty-five—but that was not the question just now. Could the Home Secretary state whether there was any age limit at which the inmates could not be forced to work; and, if not, would it be possible to fix one? Some people were more vigorous than others, and might be willing to work, but it might be a very hard thing for others to work after reaching an advanced age. He had seen letters from the inmates complaining bitterly about the matter.

The HOME SECRETARY: Any man in Dunwich who was physically able to work was expected to perform light duties. He would draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that a man who was receiving the 5s. allowance out of Dunwich could not get along unless he did a considerable amount of work, and he did not think that a man in Dunwich should have any privilege in that respect over anyone outside. But that was a different thing to saying that the men at Dunwich did hard laborious work in a regular fashion. Anyone down there who was employed in that way received a ration or monetary allowance, or something of that kind. They could not expect that a man who was helping to clean a ward, wash up, or cutting a bit of firewood should receive an allowance for it. With respect to fixing an age limit, the real difficulty was that some men at sixty were more fit to work than others at fifty, and you could only leave it to the doctor to decide. He thought it was very unlikely that any humane man with experience of the world would make a man work if it was beyond his capacity. At all events, if he heard of such a thing, he should put a stop to it.

Mr. RANKIN would like to have seen some increase in the allowance to the aged people who received pensions outside, as he did not think 5s. a week was sufficient to keep body and soul together. (Hear, hear!) The same rate should not prevail all over the State. Though it was possible near the city to eke out a living on 5s. a week, that did not obtain in the North, where the cost of living was necessarily higher; and there was no reason why a hard-and-fast line should be laid down to allow 5s. a week and no more. He had the pleasure of going to Dunwich the other day, when he found that everything possible was done for the comfort of the old people; there was little grumbling or complaint, and he did not think the conditions were at all bad. He was in accord with the hon. member for Bulloo that some of the people who received this old age pension had no right to it at all. During the time he had been a member of the Chamber he had had several applications made to him to recommend people for the pension, whom he found had no right to it. Their own relatives were quite competent to keep them, but many of them though occupying good positions were quite willing to saddle their old people on the State. He hoped the Minister would see his way to give a higher rate in the North and other places, where the cost of living was much dearer.

HON. R. PHILP: In this vote there was £27,500 down for allowances to old people outside Dunwich at the rate of 5s. per week. Hon. members opposite were constantly talking about increasing this allowance, and in 1901 the House, with no uncertain voice, approved an increase to 7s., and now that they had the funds he certainly thought the Government, which had two prominent labour leaders in the Cabinet, ought to carry that into effect. Old age pensions was part of the Labour platform.

Mr. KERR: We are going to get it from the Federal Government.

HON. R. PHILP: They would have to wait a long time. On Mr. Jackson's motion in 1901 to increase the allowance to 7s. a week the then Home Secretary, Mr. Foxton, moved the following amendment:—

From and after the 1st January next, if the state of the public finances will admit.

Surely the finances would admit it now. In speaking on that occasion he (Mr. Philp) said—

I hope very shortly we will be able to bring in a Bill dealing with this matter, and also another Bill alongside of it compelling people who can afford it to keep their aged relatives.

The present Government had been decreasing the hospital vote.

The HOME SECRETARY: We are increasing it this year.

HON. R. PHILP: Yes; the Government were bringing the endowment up to £1 10s. this year—it should never have been decreased—but there was no increase in the old age pension, although the Premier at one time professed to believe in that increase. A motion to grant old age pensions was introduced by the present Chairman last year and in previous years.

Mr. LESINA: And the Home Secretary voted against it last session. It is in *Hansard*.

HON. R. PHILP: What answer had the Home Secretary to make now? He was glad the Minister had restored the hospital subsidy, but why did he not increase the amount of the old age pension? Some years ago, when the Government had no credit balance, the Labour party tried to get an increase of the old age pension out of the Government, but now that they had a Government with a credit balance not a single member of the Labour party had got up to ask for an increase in the amount of the old age pension.

Mr. BOWMAN: There is plenty of time yet.

HON. R. PHILP: All the members of the Labour party were as dumb as dogs. There was not a word out of them, and they could do nothing except vote for the expulsion of a man who—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BOWMAN: You voted for the expulsion of men yourself, and you were responsible for them going out.

HON. R. PHILP: It was a disgrace to this House, and the members opposite knew it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

HON. R. PHILP: He wanted the Premier to get up and say why he had not increased the vote. Why did not the Premier do something which he professed?

The HOME SECRETARY: The vote is increased this year.

HON. R. PHILP: The Home Secretary told them that 5s. was still the amount of the pension, and yet there was a motion brought into the House year after year by the Labour party to increase the amount to 7s. a week. Were the members not sincere in what they said then?

The PREMIER: It is much better now.

Hon. R. Philp.]

HON. R. PHILP: The Premier did not think so himself at one time. At the present time they were pledged to give the unfortunate people who were unable to work an allowance.

The PREMIER: Are you in favour of old age pensions?

HON. R. PHILP: He was in favour of increasing this vote—in fact, he voted for it at the Melbourne Conference, and the Premier voted against it.

Mr. LESINA: Ah! A revelation.

HON. R. PHILP: The Premier did not want to trammel the hands of the Federal Government, but he (Mr. Philp) voted for it. Old age pensions had always been a plank of the Labour party's platform. The late Government introduced it, and it was a much more liberal pension than any of the other States.

The HOME SECRETARY: Then this Government must be more liberal still, on your own showing.

HON. R. PHILP: No; not the present Government. After the way they were treating the unfortunate lepers he was satisfied. He thought at one time that the Home Secretary had some spark of humanity in him, but he now found that he was as hard as iron. He was as bad as the Premier, when he wanted to save money. The Government were supported almost solely by a party who used to speak in this House, and all over Queensland, about the hard Government which only gave 5s. a week.

The PREMIER: Are you concerned about the old people or the Labour party?

HON. R. PHILP: He was more concerned about the old people than the Premier was. The late Government gave 5s. a week, and would have increased it, as they promised, if they had had the revenue and the seasons of the present Government.

Mr. MAUGHAN: We will have old age pensions next year.

HON. R. PHILP: He did not know how the hon. member knew that, seeing that the Bill which the Federal Government tried to get both Federal Houses to pass to take a referendum on did not compel the Federal Government to bring in the old age pensions at all. That was not mentioned in the Bill at all. At any rate he voted for it in Melbourne, and the Premier voted against it.

The PREMIER: You will have a chance of having another vote on it in a few days.

HON. R. PHILP: All that was beside the question, and he would not have mentioned it had not the Premier interjected. Why did the Premier not increase the vote from 5s. to 7s. a week? What about all the talk of the Labour members. Were they not sincere, and were they only playing to the gallery?

Mr. TURNER (*Rockhampton North*): There could be no possible doubt that since the change in the management of Dunwich the

[10 p.m.] inmates were much more satisfied, although there were individual cases in which both men and women complained. He noticed that a sum of £492 had been collected towards the support of some of the inmates. Did that represent funds received from relatives on behalf of the inmates? If so, he regretted that there was no legislation in force compelling children to fulfil their filial duties towards their parents who were receiving relief outside of Dunwich. It appeared to him that there was an undesirable class of inmates sent to Dunwich of whom both the doctor and the matron complained. Some of the persons sent down there gave a great deal of trouble. A few days previous to his last visit one of the female inmates caused much trouble by getting away and wandering about the

[*Hon. R. Philp.*]

island. The warders were searching for her the whole night, and in the morning she was found in a tent not allotted to her at all. The matron thought it very desirable that such a class should be sent to some other institution.

Mr. P. J. LEAHY: The insincerity of members opposite was perfectly sickening. He had listened to them for five sessions, and there had been one unbroken demand as to what the Government ought to do. They asserted that those receiving relief outside should get 7s. 6d. or 10s. a week, and yet now that the time had arrived when they could give effect to their opinions they made no effort to do so. Were they prepared to force the Government to give effect to their wishes? If they were not, then they should hold their peace for ever. If such a thing should have been done two or three years ago, how much greater reason was there for doing it now? Contrast the condition of the country now with what it was two or three years ago, and there was no comparison. The chances were that this year they would have one of the biggest surpluses on record, and yet, notwithstanding those favourable conditions, there was only a miserable £2,000 increase in that vote. All members opposite could do was to blame the late Government for paying small indigence allowances, and reducing others, but they were dealing now with the money to be spent by the present Government, and not with what had been spent by the late Government. It did not matter now whether the late Government cut off a pension which should have been granted, or reduced others. The question was what were the men doing who were in charge of the finances of the State at the present time? He had had a little experience of necessitous cases in the Western country. He had made application for allowances in certain cases, and although he did not always succeed, every case he recommended was a deserving case. As one hon. member had remarked there were a good many receiving indigence allowance in Clermont—but, perhaps, that was on account of a desire to silence the hon. member for Clermont. There was a great deal to be said about one point that had been touched upon—that was, that the cost of living in the remote places was a great deal more than on the coast. While 5s. a week, with a little light labour, might enable a man to keep body and soul together in Brisbane, it was not enough in the districts of Barcoo and Warrego where the cost of living was 50 per cent. higher than in Brisbane. He had no hesitation in saying that, if 5s. a week was the right amount to pay in Brisbane, 10s. a week would not be too much in the Warrego and Barcoo. In the coast towns of the North, of course, the cost of living was very little dearer than in Brisbane, because freights to those towns were fairly cheap. He thought the difference in the cost of living ought to be recognised by the Government, and it was time it was recognised. It had been said that there were very few people in the remote districts who received the indigence allowance. That was another grievance he had. He knew, at any rate, that in the West nothing like the amount was spent in relief that should be spent. He should like the Home Secretary to tell him what amount of money was spent in the electorates of Barcoo, Warrego, and Bulloo?

The HOME SECRETARY: I cannot give the districts, but I can give the towns.

Mr. P. J. LEAHY: Perhaps he would tell them what was spent in the towns of Blackall, Roma, Charleville, Cunnamulla, and Augathella. Those places were fairly representative of the districts. It was true they could not move an increase in the vote; but a precedent was

established a couple of weeks ago, when, in response to the unanimous wish of hon. members, the Premier intimated that he would place an amount on the Supplementary Estimates by way of an increase to the salary of the parliamentary librarian. There was the strongest possible desire on the part of members on his side that the vote for the old age allowance should be increased, and, if hon. members on the other side expressed a similar desire, he was sure that the Premier would not flout their wishes. All hon. members had to do was to say that they wanted the vote increased, and it would be increased. If they did not want it increased, then the whole responsibility must rest on them.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member for Warrego had suggested that the reason why there were so many recipients of old age pensions in the Clermont electorate was that it was intended as a sop to the hon. member for Clermont. Now, the hon. member must be aware that there were large numbers of Western and Northern men in the Clermont district, attracted there by the alluvial goldfields, because they had a chance of getting a few grains of gold on the diggings, which enabled them to eke out an existence with the assistance of the old age pensions. The hon. member for Warrego and the leader of the Opposition had been advocating an increase in the vote. Well, the total amount had been increased by a fairly large sum, and a larger number of people were getting the 5s. a week than formerly. The hon. member for Bulloo had been a little ungenerous towards the Chairman, because every hon. member remembered that the Chairman had introduced a motion a very short time ago, which was carried on the voices, asking that the amount should be increased from 5s. to 7s. a week. Five shillings in the South was equivalent to 6s. or 7s. in the Central and Northern districts. If the Government could see their way to increase the allowance to 7s. a week it would be a very popular thing to do, and it would take away a grievance that hon. members on the other side appeared to have at the present time. Hon. members opposite asked what the Labour party were doing in this connection. They were endeavouring to return members to the Commonwealth Parliament pledged to introduce a Commonwealth system of old age pensions. In New South Wales a person required to be a resident in the State for twenty-five years before he was entitled to receive a pension. Now, a man might have been twenty-five years in the Commonwealth, but he might not have been more than ten years in a particular State. He did not think there was any such restriction in Queensland at present. But, under a Commonwealth system, residence in any part of the Commonwealth for a certain period would be all that was required. The Labour party were in favour of a uniform system of old age pensions.

Mr. P. J. LEAHY: And in the meantime men die.

Mr. J. LEAHY: You have said that for four years.

The HOME SECRETARY: In reply to the hon. member for Warrego, he desired to say that the amount expended in the form of indigence allowance in Blackall was £4 6s. 8d. per month; in Roma, £18 8s. 4d. per month; in Cunnamulla, £7 11s. 8d. per month; and in Charleville, £11 7s. 6d. per month. A great deal had been said against the Government for exercising drastic economies in certain directions. Whatever might be their shortcomings, the Government had not been ungenerous in this respect. If an old age pension scheme was the law, it would have some drawbacks which hon. members would have to clearly recognise. At present

a man might get an old age allowance at the age of fifty, or he might get it before he was fifty if he was really infirm. In New South Wales, where they had a regular old age pension scheme, he understood that no man could get it under the age of sixty-five. While the initiation of an old age pension scheme in Queensland would benefit a number of recipients very considerably, it would carry with it a certain amount of deprivation to other people. It was perfectly true that they were not increasing the 5s. a week allowance, but it was not true to say that they were not considerably increasing the amount expended upon this particular matter. He wanted the Committee to clearly understand that the Government did not consider that they had arrived at finality in this particular matter. The Government did not look upon 5s. a week as being the end of the old age allowance by any means; and, as times improved, it was possible that they might be able to be more generous than they were at the present time. He congratulated their friends on the other side of the House on the very kindly feeling they had displayed in this matter, and on—he could not call it conversion, but the unanimity with which they agreed with members on the Government side on this particular question. To show that the department had not been what might be called sparing in this matter, he might mention that during the last twelve months there had been granted no less than 609 additional old age allowances, which was the greatest increase that had taken place in any year since the system was instituted. The number of persons in receipt of the allowance on the accession to power of the present Government was 1,466. When he came into the Home Secretary's office the number was 1,655. The number in receipt of the allowance on the 30th June 1906, was 2,357, so that during the régime of this Government there had been an increase of something like 900 in the number of persons receiving old age allowance. With regard to the actual amount of money expended for this purpose, in 1900-1901 the amount expended on old age allowances was £14,375; last year the amount expended was £24,813; so that it had gone up by something like £10,000 in the course of those six years.

Mr. LESINA: That is due to the price of rations.

The HOME SECRETARY: The price of rations had absolutely nothing to do with it. The expenditure had nearly doubled in the course of six years. During the last three years the Government had expended on Dunwich and indigence allowance £12,000 more than was expended during the previous three years. In the face of those facts, hon. members must admit that, although the Government had not increased the old age allowance beyond 5s., it could not be said that they had been, by comparison with their predecessors, stingy or remiss in extending the allowance to deserving cases. But he was strongly of opinion that whoever administered this vote would have a number of unpleasant things to do. Cases came under his notice week after week, and month after month, in which people who were able to support their poor relatives took advantage of this system, and shelved their responsibility on the State. They said: "There is the indigent allowance system; why should I help my father or my mother? Let the State do it." He did not mention this as an argument against old age pensions, but as a contingency which we had to recognise. It was possible that the Federal Parliament might provide for old age pensions, and it was possible that the State might have to do it, but when it was taken up hon. members would have to recognise when the new system came into vogue it would not be an

Hon. P. Airey.]

unmixed advantage. They would have to recognise that there were possibly some hundreds of old persons at present receiving that allowance in Queensland who, if any such scheme as that in force in New South Wales or Victoria was introduced, would not get the old age pension. At present, although the Government were not doing all that hon. members might desire, yet they were doing on the whole a fair thing, and had shown a substantial increase in the expenditure under this vote during the past three years.

Mr. FORSYTH: The hon. member for Barcoo told the Committee that he was going for the federal old age pensions, and was sending men down to the Federal Parliament to push that matter through the House. The Home Secretary, however, pointed out in effect that the policy adopted by Queensland in this matter was infinitely more liberal than any old age pension scheme in Australia.

The HOME SECRETARY: I did not say that. I said in one respect.

Mr. FORSYTH: The hon. member said it was superior in this respect, that if a man was infirm, no matter what his age might be, he got the allowance, whereas under an old age pension scheme only persons of a certain age would get a pension. He (Mr. Forsyth) thought that if the indigence allowance were increased from 5s. to 7s. a week, that would be infinitely better than an old age pension. With regard to the report of the medical superintendent of Dunwich, it was of a very meagre character, much more meagre than the report of last year. It merely gave the number of inmates, and the amount expended for the year, which was £16,337. There was nothing in it about the condition of the buildings, about sanitation, about any trouble respecting the water supply.

The HOME SECRETARY: There is a new superintendent.

Mr. FORSYTH: He had been there from February to June, and surely he should be in a position to give some information on the points he had mentioned. In the report for the previous year they were told that—

Cases of pulmonary tuberculosis are now located in tents on the point of land beyond the female division. A water supply has been laid on, and a kitchen and dining-tent erected for their special use. The change from the former consumptive ward in the centre of the asylum is beneficial both to the consumptives themselves and the other inmates.

There was a recommendation about employing female nurses. The Committee were [10.30 p.m.] quite in the dark as to whether that had been carried into effect. Then there was the experiment of cultivating a certain area of land on Peel Island by some of the inmates of Dunwich. There was not a word about that in the report. There was also a complaint about the quality of the butcher's meat supplied.

The HOME SECRETARY: That has been rectified.

Mr. FORSYTH: That might be so, but they had to extract the information from the Home Secretary. In spite of the apparent liberality of the Government, it appeared to him that the Dunwich inmates were getting squeezed down all round. Although the number of inmates had increased by about sixty, the amount spent was practically the same as last year. Then, with regard to outdoor relief, in spite of the fact that the country was in a more prosperous condition than it had been for many years they were asked to vote an additional sum of £2,500, and the vote for that purpose was £13,000 more than it was a few years ago. With regard to indigent persons who had near relations well

able to support them, he hoped the Government would, if they had the power, compel them to do so. Two or three cases of that kind had been brought under his own notice, and he had no doubt the Government were often imposed upon. It did not say much for people who were well-to-do to throw the burden upon the State of maintaining their indigent parents or other near relations. He trusted that next year the Government would give them more information with regard to Dunwich and the outdoor relief account. Under present conditions, members had themselves to go to Dunwich, perhaps surreptitiously, to ascertain how the inmates were being treated.

The PREMIER: You must remember that this year the Medical Superintendent is a new man.

Mr. J. LEAHY: He is evidently a very old hand at making reports. He won't give himself away.

Mr. FORSYTH: He stated that he did not know anything that happened before he came there. They wanted the Minister to tell them the actual position of things there now. Was Peel Island a success or not? If the Home Secretary wanted to have less discussion in the future he would give them a great deal more information. He hoped they would not have such a report placed before them again, as it was no credit to the Government. When he was down at Dunwich recently he had made a little inquiry amongst the inmates, and he heard very few complaints. He happened to be there at the time they were having meals, and he found that the meat and the bread were excellent. The dinner he had was just the same as that of the old people, and if they always got such good fare they could never complain. It was as good as any reasonable man could expect.

Mr. BOWMAN (*Fortitude Valley*): He had not heard one hon. member who had spoken say anything in connection with the recent inquiries respecting Dunwich. Twelve months ago he brought the matter up, which was the means of leading to the inquiry in reference to the conduct of the matron, the chemist, and the doctor. He for one, as a member of the House, desired to say that he thought the Government deserved the highest credit for purging Dunwich of some of the worst officers who were ever in that institution.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: Cases of drunkenness, neglect, cruelty, and immorality had been perpetrated there, and the Government had done a wise thing in getting rid of such people occupying responsible positions. It had cost the State a considerable sum of money, but it was well expended. Hon. members on the opposite side, and particularly the leader of the Opposition, seemed to think that we had lost all sense of feeling for these old people in reference to the question of an increased allowance, but he thought that every member desired to see the amount increased. He himself did, and would vote for it any time, no matter what the fate of the vote was. While changes had been made at Dunwich, they heard from many sources that complaints still existed in connection with the administration; but it would be a very difficult matter to control the institution without some complaints from the old people who were there. He thought there had been a vast improvement, but there was still room for more. His own idea, after the inquiries and Supreme Court cases we had had, was that we should have a different system altogether at Dunwich. The institution should be controlled by a layman, while the doctor attended to the needs of the old people from a health point of view. He did not know whether it was

the intention of the Government to change the system which had existed so long, but there were men of considerable experience in different parts of the State—men with a keen knowledge of the running of such institutions—who recognised that a medical man was not always the best administrator. He had taken a very keen interest in Dunwich, and he was going to continue to do so. He thought everyone interested in the old men and women there should make periodical visits, investigate any complaints made to them, and see that things were kept up to the mark. In the past complaints had been made by the inmates, and departmental inquiries had been held, and the reports had been brought back stating that there was nothing wrong at all. When the junior member for Brisbane South, Mr. Reinhold, and himself went to Dunwich, they were preceded on the Monday by the Home Secretary and the Minister for Agriculture, with several officials; and the doctor at that time, on inquiries being made by the Home Secretary—who asked whether he had seen any goings-on in connection with the then matron—distinctly told the Home Secretary that during his four and a-half years' experience in Dunwich he had never seen or heard that that woman was guilty of intemperate habits. But when Mr. Reinhold and himself went there the very first thing they were told by the doctor was that he had found her in a state of intoxication, and that he was going up on the boat to report it to the Home Secretary. Evidence was given that day to Mr. Reinhold and himself by seven women, four of whom were prepared to swear on oath that for the last four years the matron was drunk and absented herself from duty once a month; and any member who had heard the pitiful tales of these old women must have felt in their hearts that one of the grandest things which had been done was to put the humane woman over these unfortunate creatures in Dunwich whom we had there at the present time. She was an entirely different woman to the former matron, who told some of the inmates that she would "do them in before Christmas." With regard to others she would say, "What? Not dead yet. Why can't you die like old men?" The thing was monstrous! And the doctor—the man who had charge of that institution—the man who complained that the right thing had not been done by this Government—that same man "winked the other eye" time after time against the injustices that were going on—against the drunkenness and against the immorality. That doctor knew that drunkenness and immorality was going on there, and he never lifted his hand to stop it. He admitted that he never saw any drunkenness.

Mr. REINHOLD: He admitted the immorality.

Mr. BOWMAN: And the evidence taken before Mr. Ranking, P.M., was evidence of the fact that the doctor was guilty of immorality himself. That was a nice state of affairs! If those things were true, then that man should be in St. Helena instead of being free to-day. In the evidence he (Mr. Bowman) had at the present time, which he had copied from the report, he had a statement, which was sworn to on oath, that that man had been guilty of misconduct with an unfortunate woman in that place.

Mr. J. LEAHY: I think the commission exonerated him on that charge.

Mr. BOWMAN: There was no doubt about it. When the case was first brought before the court by the doctor anyone who watched that case and heard the cross-examination of Mr. Feez—the judge himself was a man who was practically taking notice of it—but the admissions that the doctor made himself were that

he knew that immorality was going on there. Seven weeks before his inquiry took place one of the inmates from Dunwich came to his (Mr. Bowman's) place and gave him information that that doctor was the first man that seduced that unfortunate woman Mary Boyle. That man had no right to be at large to-day if that was the state of affairs that existed in Dunwich. With regard to the present doctor, it was true that they had only had him for a short time, but from what he had heard of him he was a man of good repute. He was a man who he (Mr. Bowman) believed would see that things were carried on properly from a moral standpoint. He believed also that the chemist was a man they could trust. With regard to the matron, Mrs. Cardew, he was sure that she was one of the finest women they could ever get to look after these old people. But he knew that at the present time there was a feeling that there was altogether too much work for a man in the position of Medical Superintendent to look after the whole administration of that institution.

Mr. J. LEAHY: He cannot do it.

Mr. BOWMAN: Then, if he could not do it, the sooner a system was adopted whereby he could attend to the needs of these poor old people from a medical standpoint alone the better it would be. The doctor should confine his work to the medical branch, and let someone else take up the general superintendence. He had evidence that in the wards where unfortunate men were lying maggots were found in the mattresses having come out of the bed sores of these old people. It was a most cruel thing.

Mr. J. LEAHY: There was only one case of that kind.

Mr. BOWMAN: Two cases, a white woman and a Chinaman. They knew from the evidence of women that the greatest cruelty had been perpetrated upon these old people—that neglect had occurred time after time on the part of those whose duty it was to look after the institution. He was one who felt that they could not make the end of these old people too happy. (Hear, hear!) The question of expense should never be considered. For the sake of £2,000 or £3,000, what did it matter if it was going to add a little comfort to any of these old people? (Hear, hear!)

Mr. PAYNE: Pioneers of the country.

Mr. BOWMAN: They were men and women who were the pioneers of the country—the men and women who made this State, and made it possible for the people to enjoy what they were having to-day. While they thought that possibly these old people should get more than they did get, they knew that there were difficulties at times. He would say this of the Home Secretary, of the Under Secretary, and the men associated with them: that in all cases where there had been distress in connection with the indigent allowance, on almost every occasion it had been granted. He knew that a lot of old people had come to him—in fact in the Home Office they had christened him "the member for the old people." He had old people calling on him from all parts of Queensland, and he did not mind going out of his way in trying to secure them the pension. At the same time, he felt it altogether unfair that these old men and women should have to make application for an old age allowance when they had married sons and daughters who, in many cases, refused to help them. He thought it was the duty of the State to see those old people did not suffer because of the refusal of their sons and daughters to keep them. (Hear, hear!) He did not know whether the Home Secretary would be able to do anything this year, but a law should be brought in to compel those who were able to support their

Mr. Bowman.]

parents. The member for Bulloo mentioned one case to-night where a son was getting a very high salary. He (Mr. Bowman) knew of one case where the son in the Government service was getting £400 a year, and yet the father and mother of this man came to him (Mr. Bowman) and asked him to fill up an indigent form for them. That should not be. He considered that such a man should be sacked out of the civil service. That was the position he would place such a man in.

Mr. J. LEAHY: I made some who were in that position pay up.

Mr. BOWMAN: The 5s. a week was very little for those who got it. A lot had been said about the matter by Opposition members; whether it was said in the way of taunting the present Government because they had not increased it he did not know, but he knew that many of those who had spoken realised that the amount was not enough. Every member of the House, if he spoke what he felt, could mention the difficulties that these old people had to live, and how they prized that 5s. a week. He remembered the case of a man who had occupied a high position in South Australia, and this old man was reduced to bread and water for a week at a time. He did not have a bite of meat or a drink of tea. They could imagine the feelings of that man, who at one time had actually ridden in his carriage years ago. That was the kind of thing that compelled every member to take an interest in these people, and implore the Government to do more for them than they are doing at the present time. He thought that 7s. 6d. a week would be little enough. And even if it meant increased expenditure, was there a man or woman in Queensland who would complain about that amount being voted when they knew that the object of it was "to keep the wolf from the door."

Mr. J. LEAHY: It depends on whether you can afford to give it. Just now you can.

Mr. BOWMAN: The question was that 5s. a week was not enough, and they should give these old people enough to enable them to live in decency. They knew that there were complaints from some of the old people in Dunwich, and they would sooner have the 5s. a week than be there. It had been argued—very reasonably argued—by Mr. Ryder that some of these very old men of between seventy and eighty years of age had very little hope of getting any work outside. Some of them were able to go out into the bush and work, and in such cases they should be allowed to go and also receive the 5s.

[11 p.m.] indigence allowance. The old age pension was one of those things which appealed to the humanitarian side of one's life. Nothing could be more sad than the pleading of some of those old people for the 5s. a week allowance, and when they got it they were almost as grateful as if it were £5 a week. He was prepared to vote for a larger indigence allowance, and he believed that no man or woman in Queensland who was in the enjoyment of good health and strength would object for one moment to an increase in the weekly allowance now made.

Mr. PAGET noticed by the report that three inmates of Dunwich were South Sea Islanders. Were arrangements being made to keep those people at Dunwich, or would they be deported?

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. gentleman raised a delicate question. There were South Sea Islanders at both Dunwich and St. Helena, and it was under consideration at present what steps should be taken regarding them. As far as those at St. Helena were concerned, he thought the best thing they could do

was to let them go back to their homes, unless there were special circumstances showing that such a course was highly undesirable.

Mr. BARBER (*Bundaberg*) thoroughly agreed with a great deal that had been said as to the need for legislation to compel relatives of some of the old people at Dunwich to assist in their support. Some members commented on the fact that, despite the good seasons, it had been found necessary to place a larger amount on the Estimates for indigence allowance; but he would point out that it was almost as impossible for a great many people to give anything towards the support of their relatives now as it was two or three years ago. Many of those people got behindhand in their payments, and, although the seasons were now more prosperous, they had to meet obligations incurred in bad times. If a man was earning £1 15s. or £2 a week and had three or four children, after paying rent and lodge money, there was very little left. At the same time, he thought the Government should take action to compel those who were able to support their parents to do so. As far as the old age allowance was concerned, he was of opinion that the amount was too small altogether. There were between two and three thousand recipients, yet it was a very difficult matter for them to keep body and soul together. Although food was cheaper than it was some time back, yet, after paying rent, they had very little wherewith to buy food. He agreed with the hon. member for Carpentaria that the report was altogether too meagre, and should be enlarged upon. He had always been of opinion that it was impossible for the medical superintendent to effectively carry out the ordinary administration of Dunwich in addition to his medical duties, and he was of opinion that the appointment of a lay superintendent was essential, even if it cost £600 or £1,000 a year. In regard to the food supply of the institution, he had been a frequent visitor to Dunwich, and had been there at meal times, and he must say that the food was very good indeed. But it was impossible to satisfy all the old people. Many of them consisted of old miners and stockriders who, all through their lives, had known nothing of discipline. When such men were sent to Dunwich, and were brought under some discipline, it got on their nerves, and they did not like the system. But it was very necessary that there should be some discipline in order to carry on the institution. It used to be the practice of one or two hon. members to criticise the institution very severely, and the cost per head had been characterised as very meagre. During the recess he had written to the secretaries of the different Labour parties in the Commonwealth and New Zealand, and, where he did not succeed in getting the information he required from them, he wrote to the officials of the departments, who were good enough to furnish him with the reports of the benevolent institutions. A careful study of the information received led him to the conclusion that the treatment meted out to the inmates of Dunwich in regard to food compared very favourably with the treatment in any of the other States. He had not got the reports from South Australia and Victoria, but in the report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into old age pensions he found just the information he required. The cost per head in Western Australia was somewhat higher than in Queensland, owing to the greater cost of living in that State. In Western Australia the daily allowance of bread was 18 oz., meat 10 oz., potatoes 12 oz., oatmeal or maize meal 2 oz., butter $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. weekly, pearl barley 3 oz. daily, rice $1\frac{1}{2}$ oz. daily, vegetables 4 oz., milk 5 oz., tea $\frac{1}{2}$ oz., sugar $1\frac{1}{2}$ oz.

[Mr. Bowman.]

In Tasmania they got 1 lb. of bread daily, meat $\frac{3}{4}$ lb. three days a week and $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. four days a week, potatoes 8 oz. three days and 6 oz. four days, oatmeal or maize meal 2 oz. daily, butter 1 oz. three days and 2 oz. four days, rice 3 oz. three days a week, vegetables 12 oz. four days a week, 8 oz. three days a week. In New South Wales the leading articles of diet were bread 14 oz. daily, meat 14 oz. daily, potatoes 12 oz. daily, oatmeal or maize meal 2 oz. four days a week, butter nil, 1 oz. jam or treacle in lieu thereof. In New Zealand the principal items were bread 16 oz. daily, meat 12 oz. daily. In addition to that they had a system of issuing rations to outdoor patients. The average cost per head was about 7s. 11d. a week. In Queensland the inmates received 16 oz. of bread in the case of employed patients, and 14 oz. in the case of unemployed patients; meat, 14 oz. and 12 oz. respectively; vegetables, 14 oz. and 12 oz. respectively; and so on. The cost per head was 5s. 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per week, or 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per day. In Victoria, the officer in charge of the department stated that it only cost about 2s. per head per week for food, while the actual cost to the State was about 5s. per head per week. In South Australia the cost was about 5s. 11d. per head. Their rations were about the same as in Queensland. They also granted an outdoor ration, which was valued at 2s. 6d. a week, in the city, and from 3s. to 3s. 6d. a week in the country. In Western Australia they had four institutions. In the Old Men's Home, Perth, the cost was 8s. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per head per week; in the Old Men's Home, Fremantle, 7s. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.; in the Old Men's Home, Geraldton, 11s. 10d.; whilst, in the Women's Home, the cost was 9s. 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. Of course, that covered everything, including salaries, clothing, and medicine. In Tasmania, the cost was about 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per head per day. They had two large institutions in Tasmania, and the food given to the old people there was something like that which was given in Queensland. The cost per head in New South Wales seemed to be higher than it was in Queensland, but in the Liverpool institution, which housed 405 patients, the sum of £431 per year, or over £1 per head, was spent on alcoholic stimulants. The cost per head for rations, including tobacco, was at Liverpool, 3s. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per week, or 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. per day; George street, 2s. 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per week, or 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per day; Macquarie street, 2s. 10d. per week, or 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. per day; Rookwood, 3s. 1d. per week, or 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per day; Newington, 2s. 4d. per week, or 4d. per day; Cottage Home, 4s. 8d. per week, or 8d. per day. The average cost for the whole of those institutions was 3s. 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per week, or 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per day. So that on the whole Queensland showed very favourably as compared with the other States. He was at Dunwich a few weeks ago, and saw the class of food which was served to the inmates, and he must say that it looked to be of an excellent quality. He was pleased that the Government had made an alteration in the administration of the institution. There were still some complaints, but he thought the Government had done their best to improve the conditions of the old people who were compelled to resort to Dunwich.

Mr. MITCHELL (*Maryborough*): It was a pleasure to hon. members on that side of the House to hear the speeches made by members opposite on this subject. It was the first time during the three years that he had been in the House that he had heard such arguments from those hon. members in connection with old age pensions, and while listening to them he wondered how much he was responsible for the attitude taken up by them. When the Financial Statement was being discussed, he spoke strongly in

favour of increasing the indigence allowance from 5s. to 7s. 6d. a week. The hon. member for Bulloo at the time made an interjection about a small sum of £50,000, and said it was not worth considering. He (Mr. Mitchell) said that if £50,000 was not worth considering in connection with an institution like Dunwich, then it was certainly less worth considering a sum of £20,000, which would be sufficient to raise the old age allowance to 7s. 6d. per week. This question should be dealt with as a non-party question. It had been whispered that in advocating the increase of the old age allowance members on the other side were only making electioneering speeches, but anyone who knew the hon. member for Bulloo would never think that he would be guilty of such an act. He (Mr. Mitchell) did not favour the present system of the old people being congregated at Dunwich, and he thought some plan should be initiated whereby the aged people, instead of being sent to Dunwich, could get the indigence allowance in the towns in which they were living. Such a concession would be greatly appreciated by the old people. At present, when they were sent down to Dunwich, they were separated from all their old associations—even husband and wife were separated and kept entirely apart from each other for several weeks at a time. He was pleased to hear of the cleansing and purification which had gone on at Dunwich during the administration of the present Government, but hoped that they would not stop there, but that they would make an effort to increase the indigence allowance to 7s. 6d. In some of the other States it was as high as 10s., but in Queensland, with its superior climatic conditions, they could make a good start with 7s. 6d. If the allowance were increased to that amount, it would be one of the best things that any Government had ever done for the old people of Queensland. In Switzerland, and some other continental countries, the system of cottage homes was largely adopted. Comfortable homes were built for the old people, and they got an allowance in the towns in which they lived. The only qualification that should be necessary to get the indigence allowance should be the qualification of need. Wherever it was found that an aged man, or an aged woman, or an aged couple were in need of the allowance, nothing should stand in the way of the Home Secretary granting the allowance straight off.

Mr. J. LEAHY: If that was so they would come here from all parts of the world.

Mr. MITCHELL: At Maryborough the instructions were that no one who required rations should go without them. If that was the condition laid down, the other condition of need should be the only one required as a qualification for getting the allowance. Those were little points he should like the Home Secretary to look into. They had the money, [11.30 p.m.] and the prospect of a better season than had been known for many years past, and it was only right that, under such circumstances, the old people should have the first consideration.

Mr. HAMILTON (*Gregory*): He, too, hoped the indigence allowance would be increased. Several old fellows at Dunwich came out, and he assisted them to get the 5s. a week; but, after being out for some weeks, they were compelled to return, as they found that it was impossible to live on that money. As to the difficulty of getting the allowance for persons in need, he had had no refusal in any *bonâ fide* case from either the present Government or their predecessors. Dr. Stockwell's name had been mentioned, and he did not wish to drag him in unnecessarily; but he did not think Dr. Stockwell was fitted for the position. He was too old to do the necessary

Mr. Hamilton.]

superintendence, and his training did not make him sympathetic enough with the old people. He had seen it stated that the ration allowance had been decreased. He had made it his business to go down to Dunwich and make inquiries, and he found that, on the contrary, there had been an increase in the ration allowance. The only complaint about the food—and it was common to every charitable institution—was that there was not sufficient variety, and that the potatoes, which were purchased through the Government Stores Department, were often bad. As to the fresh meat, anyone could inspect it on board the steamer as it went down, and they would not see better meat in any butcher's shop in Brisbane. He trusted the Government would be able to see their way to establish a similar institution to Dunwich in the North. The removal of men from the far West and the North to Moreton Bay was not conducive to their health, and men who had lived a great many years in the North would be far better if they could remain in the Northern climate. The financial position in the past had not enabled the Government to go in for it, but now there was a surplus he hoped the question would not be lost sight of.

Mr. REINHOLD: It could be easily understood that an institution of this kind must be one of the most difficult of all institutions to manage. There was bound to be a lot of grumbling where so many old men and women were gathered together, and there was a large percentage whom nothing could satisfy; but some attempt should be made to obviate that. The Home Secretary had described the changes which had been made, and from the complaints he had heard in different ways it appeared to him that the old people had a dread of anything like the word "Goodna" down there. He did not know whether it was because the medical superintendent came from Goodna, and it was desirable that the Home Secretary should let them know how many officials had been removed from Dunwich since the first inquiry took place, how many were brought into the institution, and how many of the new ones happened to come from Goodna. A case had come under his notice recently of an inmate who gave so much trouble to the officials that she had to be expelled from the institution. She was sent away from the institution without any provision whatever being made for her when she arrived in town. He happened to be on the same boat, and he drew the attention of the Home Secretary to the matter, when he immediately made provision for her until she should hear from her friends. He thought some attempt would have to be made to find a solution of this difficulty. With regard to the vegetables used at Dunwich, he thought some one might be appointed to travel among the farmers on the Downs to buy vegetables for this institution as well as others. He had seen sweet potatoes down there which had been kept too long, and which when cooked were simply like pulp. They should be supplied more frequently and in smaller quantities; and he thought that farmers would only be too glad to grow potatoes for the Government, knowing they would have such a good market. Some hon. members seemed to think that the old age pension of 5s. a week should be on the decrease, because of the good seasons, but good seasons did not make old people young or relieve them of the necessity for getting this allowance.

Mr. PAGET: No, but it might help those connected with them to keep them.

Mr. REINHOLD: There were many cases where the children of the old people appeared to be in a position to help them, when they were really not so, because although they were work-

ing for three or four weeks running, they might then be out of work for a time; but they were put down as earning a certain amount because they were getting it when the policemen came round to inquire. A son-in-law who had five or six children, and who earned £2 a week and was paying rent, or perhaps paying a house off, had not got much to spare. He had several complaints from Dunwich lately, but it was admitted by the bulk of the inmates that things were much better than they had been. One thing that annoyed the inmates was that since the change in superintendence they had to submit to a small amount of discipline, and they did not like it. Some discipline was wanted in the direction of making the inmates keep themselves clean, and, if the doctor succeeded in that, it would have a beneficial effect on Dunwich. He understood that those who did any work outside household duties got paid for it. He would like to know if there was any reason for making the "Otter" start from Brisbane at 6 o'clock in the morning instead of 7 o'clock, as heretofore.

The HOME SECRETARY: Just for departmental convenience.

Mr. LESINA: A good deal that had been said with regard to Dunwich was perfectly true, as there was a more general feeling of satisfaction than there had been for some time past. But he had had an interview with a man who had been there six months, and who had been keeping an observant eye on everything, and he pointed out where half a dozen little improvements could be carried out. The overseer was a little bit faddish in his idiosyncrasies. He was a poultry fancier, and he asked the men to put up a poultry-yard for him. In order to keep out rats and snakes, he put fencing-wire around it; but he had the broad mesh at the bottom, which snakes or rats could get through, and the small mesh at the top. That was a sample of the overseer's capacity for his duties. Then the pigyards were erected on the slope of a hill, and water had to be pumped up to it, while the yards might more advantageously have been placed near the creek. Then the lighting should be better. At present one solitary tallow dip was placed on the mantel-piece, and shed its glimmer over the ward occupied by forty or fifty men. Since the new Medical Superintendent had gone there, he brought with him men who had been associated with him at Goodna, and in some instances these young men thought they were still dealing with lunatics instead of old men and women, most of whom had been living all their lives in the bush, and did not like the irritating interference of these men. For instance, if they wanted to have a lie down in the afternoon, which they had been accustomed to, they were made to get up. He believed that some discipline should be exercised, but it should not be an irritating, red-tape, martinet-like interference. In reference to the men employed in scrub-cutting, fencing, and well-sinking on Peel Island,

he observed that they received 8s. a [12 p.m.] month, or 3d. an hour. That was entirely inadequate, and the pay should either be increased or abolished altogether. Another matter which had long been agitated for was separate accommodation for old couples at Dunwich. It was a travesty on our alleged humanitarian feelings that they should permit the continuance of a system which divorced people in their old age, and he strongly advocated the erection of a few small huts where these old people could spend their remaining days together.

At three minutes past 12 o'clock,

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon the hon. member for Rockhampton, Mr. Grant, to relieve me in the chair.

[Mr. Hamilton.]

Mr. GRANT took the chair accordingly.

Mr. LESINA : He was inclined to think that the question of old age pensions was better left in the hands of the Federal Parliament, but in the meantime the Government would be carrying out the expressed wish of the House if they increased the indigence allowance. No action which they could take would do more to rehabilitate them in the eyes of the country. Most of the reforms which the Labour party advocated were more or less academic to the workers who were getting old, and who could not hope to see them realised, but the payment of 7s. a week to every deserving old man and woman in the State would satisfy them that the Labour party were on the right track. The large number of recipients of assistance in the Clermont district was due to the fact that large numbers of men passed through Clermont and Emerald on their way to the North and West. Another reason was that Clermont was a poor man's field, and old men were able, with the aid of the 5s. a week, to make ends meet. The system of relief should be extended. At times he had had difficulty in getting an allowance granted, and in some cases he had not succeeded in getting it. He was very pleased to hear the Home Secretary say that it was much easier to get the allowance now than hitherto; but that was simply a matter of justice, and no one was entitled to claim credit for it. The only reason for granting it should be the need of the applicant. He thought the report was too meagre. He hoped the Government would seriously consider the advisability of establishing an institution in North Queensland. The sudden change of climate from North to South Queensland affected the old people very seriously, and the saving in steamer fares alone would pay the cost of the institution in the course of a few years. Then the time would come when an institution should be established in Central Queensland. The employment of the old people at Dunwich was deserving of some consideration. They could not compel them to work, and the rate of pay given to those who did work should also receive consideration.

Mr. BOWMAN : With regard to the meat supply, during a recent visit to Dunwich the Medical Superintendent pointed out that they laboured under some disability in having to get the carcasses down from town instead of on the island. If the contract had not been made for a specified time, it would be a good thing for the Minister to make arrangements for the supply to be obtained from the island.

The HOME SECRETARY : The matter will receive consideration.

HON. R. PHILP : The Stockwell case had been mentioned by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, who used language in connection with it which was not fair to a man who could not defend himself. It was proved before a judge and jury that the Government had unjustly treated Dr. Stockwell. The doctor got justice from the judge and jury, and then the matter was taken to the Full Court, where he got law.

Mr. BOWMAN : I reckon that the judge who tried the case was the most biased judge who has ever tried a case in Queensland.

HON. R. PHILP : Mr. Justice Cooper had been a judge in Queensland for twenty-five years, and had a reputation for impartiality and integrity. The general opinion in Queensland was that Dr. Stockwell had been most unjustly treated by the Government. The hon. member for Fortitude Valley had said the doctor had been guilty of an act of immorality, and ought to be in St. Helena. It was a very strange thing that all this happened under a Labour Government.

Mr. BOWMAN : They existed under your Government.

HON. R. PHILP : He did not believe it. He was satisfied that if they had existed, they would have been found out by the Labour [12.30 a.m.] members, who went about as detectives to discover what they could against the Government. If the present Ministry wanted to shift Dr. Stockwell, why did they not give him six months' notice, instead of resorting to despicable means to get rid of him? He wanted to ask the Home Secretary what was the amount paid in law expenses in the Stockwell case?

The HOME SECRETARY : He could not tell the hon. member at present; they had not got all the bills in yet.

HON. R. PHILP : The case was over, and no doubt the lawyers had been paid long ago. The present was the time when they ought to get the information.

The HOME SECRETARY : He had abstained from discussing the Stockwell inquiry, because whatever failings the late superintendent might have he was now out on the world, and what he said would get into *Hansard* and do him damage. But the hon. member had just asserted that those particular scandals never occurred under his Government.

HON. R. PHILP : I never heard of them.

The HOME SECRETARY : That was a very different matter. With regard to what were called the administrative buildings, of which complaint was made, he had a minute by Mr. Foxton dealing with the very same thing. Another charge was the gross laxity in the distribution of liquor. Into that also Mr. Foxton caused an inquiry to be made, and found that gross negligence existed. Immediately after Mr. Denham became Home Secretary he heard rumours about the gross misconduct of the matron, and there was no doubt it had been going on for years. Perhaps the most shameful thing was the misconduct of an official with an epileptic woman. That was reported in August, 1903, before the advent of the present Government. The case of the man Richards occurred in April, 1903. What had the present Government done? They found a drunken matron and turned her out. They found a drunken and immoral dispenser and turned him out. They found a system of disgraceful neglect and stopped it. They found the old ladies neglected, and provided them with one of the best and kindest matrons in Queensland. Whatever might be said about Dunwich, there was nothing in the whole transaction that the present Government had any need to be ashamed of.

HON. R. PHILP pointed out that the late Government had never heard of these things. If they had they would have stopped them. The hon. member for the Valley, Mr. Bowman, had brought Dr. Stockwell's name up first, and would be very sorry that he had done so. He had understood the Home Secretary to say that Dr. Stockwell was out on the world, but he thought he was earning his livelihood, and his name ought to be left out altogether. He got a verdict from a jury on the facts, but the Full Court and the High Court decided that the law was against him, and he had to suffer, and he believed the bulk of the people who read the evidence thought he was badly treated. He thought until Dunwich was put under a strong man, who had charge of the whole place, it would not be controlled satisfactorily. If the buildings were bad three years ago they were bad now, and what had the present Government done towards fixing up the buildings? They could afford to make them better now.

Hon. R. Philp.]

Mr. BOWMAN: The leader of the Opposition seemed to be enraged because he brought up the question of Dr. Stockwell. He did not regret it, because he believed the doctor was one of the most negligent men who was ever over an institution. He had gone through the evidence taken before Mr. Ranking, P.M., and if the man was guilty on the evidence in that report, he should be punished more severely than by losing his position. He had done his duty in bringing this matter before the people.

Mr. REINHOLD: In connection with the 5s. indigent allowance, he must say that in almost every case he brought before the Home Secretary and his officers the allowance was granted. He had heard of cases where married couples received 7s. 6d. indigent allowance, and he did not think it was enough.

The HOME SECRETARY: We usually give them 10s.

HON. R. PHILP: It was agreed in 1901 to increase the indigent allowance to 7s. a week when funds permitted. Funds permitted last year and this year, and still it was not done.

Question put and passed.

ELECTORAL REGISTRATION.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £3,470 be granted for "Electoral Registration." The Principal Electoral Registrar, Mr. Lawson, was now transferred to the Commonwealth service, and only £100 was provided for "Principal Electoral Registrar" this year. Mr. Cole was acting as Principal Electoral Registrar, and if he proved efficient he would get a further increase in his salary. There were increases of £10 each for the electoral registrars of Brisbane South and Brisbane North and for several other officers of the department.

HON. R. PHILP hoped the Premier would tell the House what he intended doing about an election, as the country was anxious to know when it would take place.

The PREMIER: I do not know. I will let them know as soon as I know myself.

HON. R. PHILP: There must be an election in August, but the Premier ought to go to the country before that, and the sooner the better.

Mr. REINHOLD: The electoral registrars of Brisbane South and Brisbane North should have got a bigger increase than £10 each, seeing the extra work they had to do owing to the increased rolls.

Mr. PAGET hoped the Minister would see that the work was kept up to date in view of the election next year, and the increased work caused by the rolls having twice the number of names on them.

The HOME SECRETARY: If necessary he would provide for extra assistance.

HON. R. PHILP thought there was no cause for complaint by the electoral officers [1 a.m.] for North and South Brisbane because the same work was done elsewhere for nothing. He thought they should have some information as to when the general election would be held.

Mr. REINHOLD held no brief for the officers mentioned, but pointed out that their work had been doubled.

Question put and passed.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £13,147 be granted for the "Health Department," which was an apparent increase of £4,439. The Health Officer's salary was now included in that

[Mr. Bowman.

vote, as well as that of the inspector previously paid from plague expenses. There were various small increases to salaries. The Government Analyst's Department was now included in the Health Department, and his salary had been increased as well as those of his assistants. An analyst has been specially appointed for assay work. In the Bacteriological Institute the salaries of assistants, clerk, and messenger were increased. There was a decrease in the vote for Lock Hospital, and there were small increases in connection with the lazaret.

HON. R. PHILP noticed that the salary of the secretary to the Health Department was increased by £10 only. It had been decreased by the Public Service Inquiry Board. Why had it not been restored to the full amount? That officer was at one time in the Home Department, and if he had stayed there would probably have been chief clerk by this time. He thought his salary should be restored in full.

Mr. PAGET contrasted the salaries paid to the assistants in the Bacteriological Institute with those paid to the assistants in the Government Analyst's Department. The work done in the former was of a much more dangerous character, and the work performed was just as much professional work as that done in the Government Analyst's Department. He hoped the Minister would make provision on the Supplementary Estimates for a further increase to those two men.

Mr. MANN: During the debate on the Financial Statement the hon. member for Bundaberg complained about the leper who was brought from Cairns not being allowed to see his son. For weeks before the man was taken away he lived within a few miles of where his son worked, and there was nothing to prevent his son seeing him. On the day the boat was leaving this man refused to go, and the police officer, after taking the other lepers into town, returned for him. As the boat was just about to sail, the police officer told him he had not time to see his son. The officer in question, Acting-sergeant Smith, was one of the best men in the service, and he was sure that, if the leper was asked, he would admit that Smith had treated him most humanely. He did not know who was responsible for putting the men on board the schooner without medical comforts, but, whoever it was, should have been kicked out of the force.

Mr. BARBER still thought that it was hard that the man should not have been allowed to see his son, and the father felt it very keenly. Another matter he felt very strongly about was that a letter in which he complained of the treatment that had been meted out to him was merely acknowledged by the department. The men had not been treated with humanity when they were boxed up in a bit of a dog kennel on board the schooner. He hoped the Home Secretary had made some alteration in the dietary scale of the lepers, who complained that their food was not sufficiently varied. The Italian gentleman asked to be supplied with wine and olives—articles to which he was accustomed in his own country—and he did not think the cost would have been increased, as a reduction could have been made in other kinds of food. He did not think people would growl even if it cost £1 a week to keep those poor people. Everything possible should be done to make them comfortable.

The HOME SECRETARY: A great deal of the suffering, which unfortunately resulted in the case referred to, was caused by the fact that the journey, which should have taken only six or seven days, was, owing to bad weather, prolonged to twenty-eight days. Instructions were wired to the officer at Cairns to see that proper

accommodation was provided for the lepers, and it was owing to his laxity that the accommodation provided was insufficient.

HON. R. PHILP asked why the salary of the secretary to the Commissioner, which had previously been reduced from £250 to £230, had not been reinstated, instead of being only increased to £240. With regard to the transfer of the Government Analyst from the Mines Department to the Health Department, he thought it would have been better to have retained that officer in the Mines Department. The Health Commissioner and other departments got all the work they required done while the Analyst was under the Mines Department, and so far as he knew the arrangement was satisfactory. With reference to the lepers on Peel Island he had had letters from three of them complaining most bitterly of the treatment they received. It was not an extravagant thing to ask for a bottle of claret and some olives every day. A bottle of claret would cost only about 1s.—or about £20 a year—and the leper who asked for it believed that it would assist in curing him. He was a very old colonist, having gone to North Queensland nearly thirty years ago, and opened up some country there, where there was now growing a valuable grass which he or his friends claimed to have planted. Whoever was responsible for the manner in which he was brought to Brisbane should be hauled over the coals. They should do all they could to make the condition of those unfortunate people as easy and comfortable as possible.

The HOME SECRETARY: The salary of the secretary in the Commissioner's office had been increased by £10, and it had not been increased to a greater extent because the Government thought that the work performed by that officer was not worth a bigger salary. With respect to the Government Analyst, it was the opinion of Dr. Ham and the Analyst himself that he would be able to do better work if he were under the Health Department. Mr. McDonald was quite content with that arrangement so long as an analyst was set apart for his own particular work, and they had been able to arrange for that. He visited the lazaret the other day, and asked the particular individual referred to what his complaints [1.30 a.m.] were. His main complaint was that he did not get a bottle of claret a day. He inquired into the man's complaints about the food, and found that they were absolutely incorrect. The dietary was a most liberal one.

Mr. HARGREAVES complained that the Health Board confined their attention to the centres of population, instead of being directed to every part of the State where abnormal conditions of health prevailed. Every year, in parts of his own electorate, there was an epidemic of fever, yet the Health Board had never expended one shilling there to ascertain whether it could be prevented. They could not be ignorant of the fact that the fever existed, and it was their duty to endeavour to ascertain the cause, and, if possible, to devise a remedy.

Mr. WOODS: He could bear out the remarks of the hon. member as to the prevalence of malarial and other fevers in some parts of the North. He had seen men landed from New Guinea at Cooktown, and dying on the wharf before any assistance could be obtained. In cases of epidemic diseases the department ought to extend the same consideration to the North as to the South, especially as there were only three Government medical officers in the whole of that extensive territory.

Mr. PAGET: The Home Secretary had not given any reply to his query about the assistants at the Bacteriological Institute.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes; I think they deserve consideration.

Mr. PAGET: The report of Dr. Ham stated that in addition to the routine work done by the Bacteriological Institute, research work had been pursued, and that if any doubt existed as to the valuable services which the institute was rendering to the public health it ought to be speedily dissipated. It appeared that 17,062 examinations were made by the institute last year. There were twenty-two cases of leprosy, as compared with nineteen the year before, twelve of which were kanakas. He strongly urged on the Home Secretary not to let Polynesians who were suffering from this disease to deported.

Mr. REINHOLD: Judging by the report of the Commissioner for Public Health, the amount of £13,000 was very well spent. It appeared from the report that the adulteration of food was becoming much less prevalent in the State, which he thought was mainly due to the vigilance of the department. He thought, with other members, that the two assistants in the Bacteriological Department were not looked after as well as they should be.

Mr. LESINA: This department was one of the best in Queensland, and in the Commissioner for Public Health we had one of the ablest and most industrious officers in the service of the State. The report was a model of concise arrangement, and full of information. He was pleased to see the increases in the department, and only hoped that more money would be spent as time went on. Dr. Ham was doing excellent work in making Brisbane a healthier place. Perhaps the best work done was the prevention of adulteration of our food supplies. Mr. Pound, of the Bacteriological Institute, was also a valuable officer.

HON. R. PHILP: With regard to the boy leper from Normanton, he understood the Government were offered a steamer berth for him for £35 to bring him to the lazaret at Dunwich, but instead of that they brought the unfortunate boy overland to Longreach, and thence to Brisbane. He was sure that that must have cost more than £35.

Mr. MURPHY: He hoped the Home Secretary would give some explanation in connection with this matter, as the Premier promised a deputation at Normanton that he would inquire into it when he got to Brisbane, to see why the boy was brought overland.

The HOME SECRETARY: The offer made was to take the boy to Friday Island for £35, but they could not take him there as it was a leper station for coloured people. Instructions were then given to bring the boy overland, and he understood that he was to be driven, but it appeared that he was brought on horseback to Longreach, and his legs and ankles were quite raw with riding that distance. He regretted that the police did not bring him in a vehicle.

Mr. MANN asked what arrangements were being made to bring two lepers from Cairns?

The HOME SECRETARY: They were making arrangements for them. One trip with lepers from the North cost £300, so they had to consider gravely what they were doing. There was no justification for the scare about leprosy, as there were scores of people suffering from consumption in Brisbane, and that was far more dangerous.

Mr. LESINA: If they were going to have lepers every year they should adopt some system to segregate them quickly. The boy at

Mr. Lesina.]

Normanton was segregated in a tent in a paddock, and a Chinaman was left to look after him. He trusted that the case of the leper boy

would not be paralleled again in [2 a.m.] Queensland, for his treatment would make the public think that there was something radically wrong in the administration of the Home Department. In reference to the bill of fare quoted by the Home Secretary, it had only come into force in July, and as to the demand made by one of the lepers for a few little luxuries in the shape of wine and olives, considering that lepers were nothing more than sick people whose freedom was sacrificed for the good of the community, he thought that no expense whatever should be spared in supplying their wants.

The HOME SECRETARY, in reply to the leader of the Opposition, said that there were thirty coloured lepers on Friday Island, and a number awaiting in the South an opportunity to be transferred. There were sixteen or seventeen white lepers. A total sum of £3,519 was expended last year on the lazaret.

Mr. LESINA asked how it came about that the expenditure on the Lock Hospital had been reduced.

The HOME SECRETARY presumed that the people were becoming more virtuous.

HON. R. PHILP did not think £3,500 excessive expenditure, considering that there were sixty lepers, and that that amount included the cost of transference. At one time a Government steamer was employed in transferring lepers up and down the coast, and he did not see why that arrangement could not be reverted to. He hoped the Home Secretary would give further consideration to the request he had made on behalf of one of the lepers, to be supplied with claret.

The HOME SECRETARY explained that the dietary scale was under the control of the medical superintendent, who should be able to say what was the right thing for any disease. If that officer recommended any change in the dietary, he (Mr. Airey) would certainly agree to it.

HON. R. PHILP: This man believed that he could be cured if he could get wine and olives, and, even if it cost the country £100 to make the last few years of this man's life comfortable, the expense should be incurred. He would ask the hon. gentleman if he would allow the man to have wine if he (Mr. Philp) could get people to send it to him?

The HOME SECRETARY: I have no objection if the doctor raises no objection.

Mr. LESINA thought the unexampled generosity of the Home Secretary in making such a statement should be made known. If they deprived a man of his liberty in the interests of the community, they should not deprive him of comforts he was accustomed to. It was a scandalous piece of parsimony.

Question put and passed.

HOSPITALS AND CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £79,389 be granted for "Hospitals and Charitable Institutions." There was an increase of £14,539, which was made up of a slight increase to the Diamantina Hospital, grants of £1,000 to the Rockhampton and Townsville hospitals as base hospitals, while the general vote for hospitals was increased by £12,500. The amount on the Estimates was not sufficient to raise the endowment to £1 10s. When the amount was put on the Estimates it was expected that it would be sufficient, but the local contributions had increased to such an unprecedented extent that it

[Mr. Lesina.

would only amount to about £1 7s. The Government, however, intended to place an additional amount on the Supplementary Estimates to raise the endowment to £1 10s., and the endowment paid on the first quarter of the year was on the basis of £1 10s. He did not think anyone would grumble at the increase in the vote. The condition of many of the hospitals under the reduced endowment was a striking proof of what could be done when people had to rely upon their own resources. The public had found more money, and in many of the districts, such as his own and Clermont, the struggle was pretty keen. He was glad the Government were able to restore the endowment, and he trusted the hospitals would be able to extend their sphere of usefulness.

HON. R. PHILP was sure that hospital committees would be gratified to know that the subsidy to hospitals was to be restored to £1 10s. in the £1. He should like to know what was the present position of the Brisbane Hospital, and what were the terms with regard to the repayment of the loan from the Government?

Mr. PAULL wished to know if the proposed alterations to the Diamantina Hospital included a separate ward for epileptic children, and whether provision would be made to give rheumatic patients a separate ward, so that they should not suffer from the cold winds in winter?

Mr. PAGET: If everybody did their duty there would be no need for a hospital endowment. Still, the increase in this vote would be a great relief to a number of hospitals, and would be the means of compelling people who would not subscribe to hospitals to contribute something through taxation. The new vote of £1,000 to each of the hospitals at Rockhampton and Townsville as base hospitals was likely to cause jealousy and friction in other coastal towns. The Cooktown, Cairns, and Mackay hospitals were practically base hospitals for the districts immediately to the west. He had received a letter from the secretary of the Mackay Hospital, stating that the daily average number of indoor patients for the month of September was 50, that the daily average for 1904 was 38, and for 1905, 35; whereas the daily average for Rockhampton was only 46 in 1904, and 47 in 1905. The outdoor patients at Mackay were 666 in 1904, and 661 in 1905. A large number of the patients treated in the Mackay Hospital were practically travellers, and that and the other two hospitals he had mentioned were practically base hospitals.

Mr. PAULL: The same remark applied to the Charters Towers Hospital, only to a larger extent, as the daily average number of patients there was, speaking from memory, nearly ninety. There was no hospital in the State that deserved greater help as a base hospital than the Charters Towers Hospital.

Mr. BURROWS: He had heard complaints from rheumatic patients in the Diamantina Hospital, that they suffered severely from being subjected to draughts in the general ward. He

would suggest the provision of a [2.30 a.m.] closed-in ward in which such patients could be placed. He would also suggest that inquiries should be made as to the curative qualities of bore water in cases of rheumatism.

The HOME SECRETARY: He had heard no complaints from the rheumatic patients, and in those matters they had to be guided by the medical officer. It would be necessary in the near future to enlarge the Diamantina Hospital, and before then he would talk the matter over with the officials, and if it was possible to do

what the hon. member suggested, he would endeavour to carry it through. With regard to base hospitals on the coast, there were many places which had quite as good a claim as Mackay. The hon. member for Townsville had asked what was the position of the Brisbane Hospital. They got their £3,000 as a base hospital, and the ordinary allowance of £1 10s. on the contributions of the people. They owed something like £10,000 to the Government; the period of redemption was to extend over ten years from the 1st of July last, and interest was to be at the rate of 4 per cent. The repayment was being secured by quarterly deductions of £309 from the subsidy.

Mr. HARGREAVES: Last year he advanced the claims of the Cook district to be treated as a base hospital, as they received patients from over a larger area than any other hospital in the State. There was no nearer hospital than at Port Douglas on the one side and Thursday Island on the other, and they received patients from New Guinea. He hoped the Minister would give the matter serious consideration.

Mr. WOODS said that there were several patients from his district in the Diamantina Hospital, and they all said that they were never better treated in their lives. With regard to providing extra accommodation for rheumatic patients at Diamantina Hospital, he might point out that there were hot springs about 20 miles from Herberton, to which rheumatic patients could be sent with more benefit. If the Government erected some buildings there, they would not only benefit the sufferers, but also advertise the resources of the State in this direction, and he hoped they would seriously consider the matter.

HON. R. PHILP: Like the hon. member for Woothakata, he thought they might send rheumatic cases to some of the springs referred to. There were not only springs in Northern Queensland, but there were some along the railway lines in Southern Queensland. Instead of making the Diamantina Hospital larger, it would be better to put up a building near these hot springs or bore water. Touching the vote for the Townsville base hospital, he did not deny the right of other places to base hospitals too, but the Townsville Hospital got patients from all over Queensland, because it was near the sea. He understood from the doctor that the £1,000 would not pay them, but he was glad that they had since accepted it. He would like to know what was being done at the Dalby Sanatorium. He agreed with the Home Secretary that consumption was the most serious danger they had to face.

The HOME SECRETARY: On the 30th of June, 1905, there were twenty-seven patients in the sanatorium. Since then eighty-one were admitted and seventy-nine discharged. Two died, and that left twenty-seven still there. Those who were discharged were either cured or improved. Some got well, and others became worse and went back again. They would have to take into consideration increasing the accommodation at Dalby, and also the segregation of incurables, as consumptives going about spread disease wherever they went.

HON. R. PHILP was pleased to hear that the sanatorium was doing so well.
Question put and passed.

INDUSTRIAL AND REFORMATORY SCHOOLS.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £5,169 be granted for "Industrial and Reformatory Schools." There was a net [3 a.m.] decrease on the vote of £465. The salary of the matron at Westbrook was reduced by £25, as the duties were nominal;

one warder had been transferred to the asylum, and contingencies had been reduced by £200. As against that there were increases in the case of the Clayfield institution for girls and a similar institution at Nudgee, while there was a decrease for maintenance at Riverview.

Mr. TURNER had recently paid a visit to Westbrook, and the superintendent complained that it was false economy to reduce the number of attendants. He thought the boys might have additional duties assigned to them. It must be remembered that the boys were children of misfortune rather than fault, but he had been shown a number of extracts from letters of employers who spoke very highly of the boys hired out. The superintendent thought if he could get a piece of land close to the reformatory, and some more dairy cattle, the institution would in a couple of years be self-supporting. He was also very anxious for a supply of ammunition to encourage the boys in rifle shooting. A few shillings spent in that direction would be money well spent.

Mr. PAGET asked the number of boys at present in the reformatory and what arrangements were made to apprentice them? He would also like to know if progress reports on their conduct were received from employers?

The HOME SECRETARY: There were eighty-seven boys in the reformatory. As their time approached expiration, they were either sent back to their parents or hired out to the surrounding farmers. On the subject of their behaviour when hired out, the member for Cambooya could speak with more authority than he could. He had recently received a large number of extracts from reports showing the progress and behaviour of the boys, and generally speaking they were very favourable. There was an occasional scamp, but generally speaking the period of residence at Westbrook was entirely to the advantage of the boys. The great secret was that they were kept busy. He had transferred one of the warders, because he thought the institution was rather overstuffed before.

Mr. MACKINTOSH was in a position to give a great deal of information regarding the institution at Westbrook and its usefulness. The Government which established the reformatory there and appointed the present superintendent were deserving of credit. The boys were well cared for and likely to grow up good citizens. When they reached the age of twelve years they were let out to neighbouring farmers of good repute. They were taught the rudiments of education, and they also received a military training. He had had several of the lads in his employment, and was highly satisfied with them. One boy had been placed in charge of his dairy business, and another was likely to turn out just as well. He only had one who was an outlaw. He believed it would be advantageous to let out more of the boys, for the sooner they went to work the better for themselves. Everything was carried on like clockwork in the institution, and the superintendent was going in for farming and dairying in order to reduce the cost of the institution. The boys were paid the amount fixed by regulation, and the money was put into the Savings Bank, and when they reached the age of twenty-one they got possession of the money. Some of the boys had upwards of £50 when they left him, and he thought they would be more successful than the boys who were forced into the Gatton College. He noticed that the chief warder and assistant teacher was down for £156, whilst there was a teacher with a salary of £100 only. A teacher, as a rule, was an educated man of a refined disposition, and he ought to be worth more than a warder.

Mr. Mackintosh.]

Mr. PAGET: He is getting £36 a year more than the warder.

Mr. MACKINTOSH was glad to hear that, and would merely add that the institution was an excellent one, and well maintained and well managed.

Mr. REINHOLD thought it necessary to enter his annual protest against this vote. On other occasions he had pointed out that the vote provided for a teacher who did not teach, and a matron who never went inside the institution. Some time ago the Public Service Inspector paid an official visit to the institution, and made a report, which was replied to by the superintendent. He had never been to the institution, but after reading those reports he was prepared to say that its value as a reformatory was nil. He gathered that the sanitary conditions of the place were not as satisfactory as they ought to be. The warder's quarters were described as dog kennels. They were badly ventilated, and an open drain from the urinal ran alongside them. This drain also ran past a window in the officers' messroom, and at the time that he referred to this matter before, when there was a cook who would not cook for the warders, they had to do their own cooking in that messroom. There was not sufficient attention to cleanliness. The great crime of those boys was that they were truants from school, and the first

[3.30 a.m.] thing should be to make up that loss. Instead of that they were put to all sorts of work and left the institution unable to write their names. The sum of his investigations was that the place was not what it ought to be.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member for South Brisbane admitted that he had never visited Westbrook. He (Mr. Kerr) had been there on several occasions, and he could assure the Committee that what he saw was creditable to all concerned; and he was certain, from the cheerful and healthy appearance of the boys, that good work was being done at Westbrook. Certainly, the boys were being taught something that would be useful to them in after life. He had no suggestion to make to the Home Secretary. More land should be taken in. There was plenty of labour, and, with a dairy, it could be made a paying concern.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: He had been to Westbrook on many occasions, and always unexpectedly. He had always found the dormitories of the boys very clean; and the only fault he could discover was that instead of iron bedsteads they had wooden ones, which were more difficult to keep clean. As far as the sanitary conditions were concerned, they were as well looked after as could be expected in a place of that description; and the institution was carried on in as perfect a manner as he could wish.

Mr. BARBER: Personally, he had received some very favourable reports at second hand from gentlemen who had some of these lads working for them, and, speaking from experience, any little hardships they had to endure helped to make them better men.

Mr. REINHOLD: He had verified the statements he had made, and was satisfied that they were perfectly correct. He thought some inquiry should be made.

Mr. LESINA: Hon. members might be inclined to doubt the statements of the hon. member for Brisbane South, but they were sufficiently serious to justify the Minister in making inquiry. He had been in a similar institution for three years, and it was very easy for visitors to be deceived when they visited these places.

At eight minutes to 4 o'clock,

[*Mr. Mackintosh.*]

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. LESINA: If only a tithe of the charges made by the hon. member for South Brisbane were true, in the interests of the boys there should be some investigation.

HON. R. PHILIP: Who was telling the truth? They had the assurance of the Minister how well the boys were getting along at Westbrook, and the hon. member for South Brisbane got up and made those charges. They had the assurance of four members who had been to Westbrook, and their evidence was against the statements of the hon. member for South Brisbane.

[4 a.m.] When a member heard such serious stories as those repeated by the hon. member, he should certainly have informed the Home Secretary, and given relief to the unfortunate boys at Westbrook, instead of storing up his sensational tit-bits until the Estimates were discussed. On the whole, as far as he knew, the boys of Westbrook had turned out well—quite as well as they did from Lytton, when Mr. Wassell had charge. If they were not well treated the hon. member had failed in his duty in not letting the fact be known.

Question put and passed.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that the Chairman leave the chair, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

HON. R. PHILIP: He did not think it fair to move that motion. They had been kept there all night, and might as well go on until daylight. It would be far better to go on until 6 o'clock, when there would be trains and trams running. They had done two days' work in one sitting. The Home Secretary could not say that his Estimates had been stonewalled, and it was not fair to turn members out at 4 o'clock in the morning.

The HOME SECRETARY: He had not the least objection to going on, but he had promised that he would stop when they reached the "Insanity" vote. If he had known that the hon. member was so bent upon a longer sitting, he would not have fixed that limit. The hon. member must admit that a considerable part of the sitting had been wasted by malice aforethought.

HON. R. PHILIP objected to that remark. The Home Secretary was alone to blame. He (Mr. Philip) spoke for ten minutes before tea, and he was interrupted three times by the Home Secretary and twice by the Premier rising to points of order. If he had known it was intended to adjourn now, he would have spoken longer on the last vote.

The PREMIER: If members had been put to inconvenience, he was not to blame. They might have just as well done their business in a rational way, and finished it in reasonable time. It had been intimated that three days would be devoted to the Home Secretary's Estimates, and it was announced early in the day that they would proceed until they reached the "Insanity" vote. Now they had done that, and he was satisfied. It was no use discussing who was to blame. Everyone knew that a great deal of time was wasted. Personally, he preferred to get the business done early and go home, but if it was not done early it must be done late. The Government had no intention of going any further at this sitting. He might just say that, in spite of the temper which the leader of the Opposition had shown, he had also shown a very good spirit in attending until this hour of the morning. He thought a great deal more of the hon. gentleman than he did of many men who had gone to their beds.

HON. R. PHILP: I do not value your opinion a bit.

The PREMIER: That was his opinion, perfectly frankly expressed. He had more respect for a man who attended to his business—whether he agreed with the way in which he did business or not—than for the man who made trouble in the early part of the sitting and then went home.

HON. R. PHILP did not think it fair to ask the House to sit until 4 o'clock in the morning when no attempt had been made to stonewall the Estimates. The Opposition had tried to facilitate business; but, when they asked questions, the Home Secretary would not reply. The Premier would do more business if he sat till 11 or half-past 11 o'clock, instead of saying he wanted so much business done before the House rose.

Question put and passed.

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

The House adjourned at twelve minutes past 4 o'clock.