

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 22 OCTOBER 1929

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 22 OCTOBER, 1929.

The SPEAKER (Hon. C. Taylor, *Windsor*) took the chair at 2.30 p.m.

QUESTIONS.

RETIREMENT OF ACTING SERGEANT P. BRADY.

Mr. WINSTANLEY (*Queenton*), for Mr. BARBER (*Bundaberg*), asked the Home Secretary—

“Will he detail the circumstances under which Acting Sergeant P. Brady, lately stationed at Kuranda, was retired from the Police Force?”

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. C. Peterson, *Normanby*) replied—

“In January, 1923, Acting Sergeant Patrick Brady, then at Cairns, reported on his condition of health, and laid special stress on the fact that he was subject to severe headaches, and that his eyesight was defective. He was later examined by Drs. Clarke and Jamie-on, two legally qualified medical men appointed in accordance with the provisions of the Police Acts, and they certified that he was unfit for service in the Police Force. Representations appear to have been then made favouring the temporary retention of the acting sergeant in the Police Force, and this course was followed. Subsequently, in August, 1929, this matter again came up for review, and the Commissioner, who had a personal knowledge of the acting sergeant and his infirmities, recommended that he be retired from active service, and his formal retirement was approved in August, 1929, subject to the terms of leave of absence, on pay, to which he was entitled.”

DUCHESS TO MOUNT ISA RAILWAY.

Mr. WINSTANLEY (*Queenton*): I desire to ask the Secretary for Railways whether he has an answer to the following questions, which I addressed to him on the 16th October:—

“1. What is the distance from Duchess to Mount Isa?”

“2. What was the cost per mile for construction of Mount Isa Railway?”

“3. What was the cost of station buildings, water supplies, etc.?”

“4. What was the total cost?”

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. Godfrey Morgan, *Murilla*) replied—

“1 to 4. The hon. member can obtain most of the information he desires on page 35 of the Commissioner's annual report. The figures given include station buildings, water supplies, etc., not yet complete.”

PAPERS.

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

Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the Manager of the Agricultural Bank for the year ended 30th June, 1929.

Thirteenth Annual Report of the State Government Insurance Office for the year ended 30th June, 1929.

Report of the Provisional Forestry Board for the year ended 30th June, 1929.

Fifth Annual Report of the Prickly-pear Land Commission for the year ended 30th June, 1929.

SUPPLY.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE—NINTH ALLOTTED DAY.

(*Mr. Roberts, East Toowoomba, in the chair.*)

HOME SECRETARY'S DEPARTMENT.

CHIEF OFFICE.

Question stated—

“That £8,611 be granted for ‘Home Secretary's Department—Chief Office.’”

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH (*Mackay*): When the Committee adjourned on Thursday last, I had raised certain questions on these Estimates on which I asked for information. The first question I raised was as to the reasons which actuated the Home Secretary, in the first instance, in declaring his intention to have an inquiry into a certain unfortunate case, and the reasons which actuated him or the Cabinet later in reviewing that decision. The Minister, by interjection, said that he could mention a hundred cases where similar action had been taken. I pointed out that I did not think that was so; but, even if it were so, it did not absolve the hon. gentleman from the duty of making a statement to this Committee. I pointed out earlier in my speech that the usual practice was for the police to make a report and recommendation, and for the Home Secretary to proceed upon them.

I also raised the question that certain clergymen had visited the Home Secretary and made certain recommendations. I pointed out that the Attorney-General, on his Estimates, had declared that those clergymen had had the opportunity of seeing the papers, and they had agreed that, in the public interests, no inquiry should be held; but that I had read in Thursday morning's paper that those individuals had contradicted the Attorney-General, and said that they had never seen the papers or agreed that no inquiry should be held. I repeat that the question of whether an inquiry should be held or not can be decided only after a full perusal of the reports concerned. Not having read the papers myself, I am not in a position to say whether that inquiry should be held or not; but I feel perfectly confident that henceforth the Minister will no doubt appreciate the wisdom of conducting his department in such a way that he will be perfectly sure of his ground before he commits himself to any definite line of action.

Another matter I discussed was the question of the Minister's omission to receive certain deputations. I have received certain communications from the Trades and Labour Council of Queensland, in which that body makes certain complaints.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have availed myself of the privilege of reading the remarks

of the Leader of the Opposition prior to the adjournment on Thursday, and I am, therefore, in a position to say that he is now only repeating those remarks. Consequently, I see no reason why he should proceed on those lines, and I ask him to desist.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: Sometimes in public speaking it is necessary to emphasise a point by repeating it more than once; and, if, Mr. Roberts, you note the manner in which I set out my speeches, you will find that I frequently adopt that method. I have received certain letters from the Queensland Trades and Labour Council complaining that the Minister has refused to receive deputations. The letter I hold in my hand now is dated 21st October, and runs—

“Dear Sir,—By direction of the above council I have to write you drawing your attention to the position taken up by the Home Secretary in regard to a request from this council to meet deputations. I enclose correspondence to and from the Home Secretary, and he even does not, in one or two instances, acknowledge my letters.

“I do not know of any instance where a Minister has ever taken this stand to an important body as the Trades and Labour Council, who represent the industrial movement of this State.

“We trust you will accept this and take whatever steps are necessary to bring the matter under the notice of Parliament and the people of this State.

“I shall be thankful if you will return the correspondence when finished with.

“I remain,

“Respectfully yours,

“(Sgd.) R. J. MULVEY,
“General Secretary.”

The correspondence, first of all, indicates a request by the council for a deputation about the Laydon case; and, secondly, shows that they asked for a deputation about Government relief. The letter was acknowledged, but the matter was not finalised; that is to say, no definite date has been appointed by the Minister on which he will receive the deputation. On 29th July, the secretary of the council wrote to the Home Secretary again—

“My council is anxious to have a reply to their two previous letters re deputations to you.

“I shall be thankful if you will advise me if you intend receiving those deputations.”

On 2nd August, the Under Secretary to the Home Department replied, setting out what had been done in regard to the Laydon case; but the papers appear to indicate that this council has applied for deputations on certain matters, and up to the present has not been able to get a definite reply.

The HOME SECRETARY: You supplied the answer the other day. You said that, if anybody goes in for “stunting,” there is some justification.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: These letters do not appear to be anything in the nature of “stunting.” Ministers must take the responsibility for their own actions.

The HOME SECRETARY: No honourable member opposite can truthfully say that I

have misjudged any deputation. I have always done my best to assist them.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: I am quoting these letters which I have received in order that the Home Secretary might have an opportunity of making a statement upon them. The letters that I have before me, and from which I have quoted, indicate that certain correspondence has taken place. I consider that the proper place to deal with the matter is on the floor of this Chamber so that the Home Secretary might have an opportunity of stating his point of view.

Another matter upon which I should like some information is a rather important one. It arises as a result of an amendment of the Criminal Code providing for the abolition of capital punishment. There are at the present time in the prisons in Queensland certain men serving life sentences. The Criminal Code was amended in the direction of abolishing capital punishment and providing imprisonment for life in place thereof. The question has been raised on two or three occasions as to the advisability or otherwise of imposing upon these life sentence prisoners a determinate sentence. The average period of a “lifer” in gaol is determined very largely by the conduct of the prisoner. It has been pointed out on previous occasions by prison authorities that, if these men were given determinate sentences, it would create an incentive for them in certain directions, and leave with them some ray of hope with regard to the future. From the point of view of the general administration of gaols, one can realise the importance of the attitude of the gaol authorities. They point out that these men have already been sentenced to the supreme sentence impossible by any court, and, consequently, no further punishment that might be imposed to meet any dereliction of duty under prison rules or regulations could act as a deterrent to these prisoners. I know that the ex-Home Secretary, the present hon. member for Mount Morgan, held rather definite views on this matter. I should like to know from the Home Secretary whether he is prepared to consider the advisability of giving a determinate sentence in all these cases after a period of imprisonment has been served.

Mr. BEDFORD (*Warrego*): I wish to mention a case in which the local government functions of the department are distinctly opposed to the health functions of the department. I refer to the case of a necessary water supply for Quilpie, which has been side-tracked for six years, partly by the local authorities. Adavale, the headquarters of the shire of Adavale, has gradually retired into a third or fourth rate town following the opening of the railway to Quilpie and the fact that the Quilpie rail-head also carries with it the distinction of being one of the greatest trucking centres in the country. The Commissioner for Railways has been very good in his attempts to mitigate the difficulty connected with a general water supply at Quilpie; but there comes a limit to the capacity of the pumping plant of the Railway Department to supply local water requirements during times of drought, which, unfortunately, too often recur. Under these circumstances the water supply becomes more of a meat extract than a water supply. Six years ago there was an agitation with the object of inducing

Mr. Bedford.]

the local authority which has its headquarters and most of its voting power and interest at Adavale to sink a bore; but the Adavale Shire Council was against this, mostly by reason of its experience in having a local bore at Adavale, which produced water not generally usable. Finally, when the Health Department moved to force the Adavale Shire Council to retreat from its policy of opposition, it was decided to make a better local catchment area of the Bulloo River and reticulate from that source.

Then the Adavale Shire Council came in after the Health Department had done its proper job in forcing it to supply local requirements, and threw a spanner into the machinery by insisting that Quilpie should bear the whole cost of the installation. This in itself would be unjust, because Quilpie, as a railhead, is supplying and serving, not only the town of Quilpie, but two quite large areas in the Adavale shire. Since then the question of a bore at or near this place—probably resulting in some valueless water supply from a drillhole, as at Adavale—has largely been set at rest by the striking of 500,000 gallons of splendid water at a depth of 3,000 feet at Whynot, some little distance out of Quilpie. I have received this petition which is about to be presented to the Home Secretary—

“We, the residents of Quilpie, which is carrying a population of from 500 and 600 people, have been in urgent need of a healthy water supply, and this matter is more urgent in a time of drought which has existed for the past three or four years. Our present supply is getting very low, and in a month or two will be dangerous for inhabitants, as rain water is practically not in existence.

“We have endeavoured to obtain such a supply by every means, and we now appeal to you for your assistance. Your department, through your health inspector, Mr. Beaver, knows the urgency, while your health officer, Dr. Coffey, has reported on same.

“Our difficulty appears to be money. The Irrigation Department has made out alternative reports—(1) by damming the Bulloo and pumping, and (2) from an artesian bore. Both estimates are in the vicinity of £9,000. Owing to the uncertainty of obtaining good water from a bore, we have hitherto been in favour of pumping the water from the Bulloo. But now the Whynot trust bore has struck flowing water which has proved of excellent quality, we now favour a bore.

“The Adavale Council, our governing body, which governs from Adavale, is not in favour of making the whole shire a benefited area. The country ratepayers of No. 2 division, of which we belong, owing to the drought and heavy taxation, though fully aware of the urgency of an adequate water supply, decline to be taxed for the scheme. The position, therefore, looks as though, through money matters, we are unable to get a water supply.

“We therefore appeal to you most earnestly for your assistance to try and find a way in which we can get a supply.

[*Mr. Bedford.*]

“The extreme heat in summer and thud storms to which we are subject, the disagreeableness of which would be much more cheerfully borne if decent water were available.

“Surely there must be some fund or some Act to help in such an urgent case, such as a trust bore through your department!

“The Government boring plant i working at Whynot, 25 miles away, and should soon be finished. In the interests of unemployment and the short distance for the plant to be shifted, we urge the necessity of starting this bore.

“Trusting to have your sympathy and assistance in this matter,

“We are,

“Yours faithfully,

“CITIZENS OF QUILPIE.”

This petition is signed by—

“James Corones, A. S. Narracott, A. H. Hindmarsh, Thomas Clutterbuck, D. Angus, Mrs. D. Angus, Mrs. H. Angus, N. Conquest, Kevin Gibson, H. Larkins, R. A. Johns, H. Corones, J. O'Neill, P. McCormack, A. L. Smaldon, P. J. Smaldon, O. P. Lapham, E. Lapham, I. Jarley Jones, P. York, R. I. Lyon, T. Power, C. Power, G. Goddard, J. W. Davis, A. A. Bell, W. H. Puller, H. H. Hatten, A. G. Mead, Capper and Company, M. Phelan, R. Stirling, L. McConnell, J. Kursey, W. Paterson, R. Paterson, W. J. Paterson, H. M. Davis, E. Hansen, W. B. Clarke, E. McConnell, R. H. Bignell, L. Preston, W. Eyre, Harold G. Cush, J. G. Dunkley, and B. Ammanuel.”

I trust that the Health Department will be able to see its way to interfere in what is, after all, a local authority dispute. We are keeping up hospitals all over the State, and at the same time the general neglect of health laws, which, if observed, are sufficiently complete to make all the difference in health, is filling our hospitals. So the vicious circle goes on.

The HOME SECRETARY: How long has Quilpie been trying to get this bore?

Mr. BEDFORD: Six years. The local authority has held them up all the time. That has been partly because of jealousy and partly because the Adavale Shire Council insisted on the town of Quilpie being declared a benefited area for the work, thus exempting the rest of the shire from bearing the cost.

In judging these Estimates, it must be considered that this is an apparently unpayable department, because it is engaged in activities from which there is no possibility of revenue returns to any extent, besides which it is engaged in the most thankless of all occupations—trying to impart intelligence to the stupid, trying to teach people not to hurt themselves, as they do by a general disregard of the laws of health, due largely to the inaction of stupid local authorities. It is an extraordinary thing that, on the one hand, we obtain money for hospitals and for the expert scientific investigation for the prevention and the cure of disease, whilst at the same time we permit a continuous crop of those diseases to be grown. There must be some reason besides the actual steam

in the cylinder, that one man can live a hard life and live to be 100 years of age whilst another man, born in better monetary circumstances, can only live until thirty-five years of age, his normal condition during life being ill-health. That reminds me of Bill Wardley, who died the other day, a mere youth of 108! Wardley was one of the first eight-hour day protagonists in Melbourne, and up to two or three months before his death he took on the job of working in a bakery three nights a week. He was very human, of course, because every Friday night he came down amongst the village lads and had his six or eight rums after viewing the funeral procession of people who had never had a drink in their lives. (Laughter.) During the last few months of his life he said to Lewis McDonald, whilst actively engaged drawing bread out of the oven "I don't understand what is coming over these young fellows—they have no independence. There are my two boys; they have both taken the old age pension." When he was asked the ages of the two "boys" he replied that one was eighty-four and the other seventy-nine years of age. Compared with these men, there seems no reason why Australia should not be putting up in better form the great records for longevity that were apparent in the Commonwealth a few years ago and are still apparent in this, the healthiest State in Australia, apparently because of the heat. A great French doctor says that a man lives as long as his kidneys let him, so that apparently the kidneys are the main factors in longevity. It is a fact that in this hot climate of ours the skin takes the work off the kidneys for a great many months of the year, and we have the finest examples in the world of longevity. Another authority has put it that a man is as old as his arteries.

One of the greatest illustrations of the overlapping of authorities and the non-enforcement of the law is the government of this city. Years before its time in point of population this city was presented with a sewerage scheme which Melbourne did not begin to think of until it had a population of 400,000; but, outside of that and outside of the fact that a very ornate and expensive town hall has been provided much before its time—or rather, much before its time because other necessary reforms are behind their time—the fact remains that here the conditions of food and the general conditions of health would disgrace a country town of thirty years ago. It is difficult to find a properly run restaurant. In such a sheltered business as the liquor trade it is difficult to find properly equipped and properly maintained lavatories. It is difficult to find, for instance, in this city anything approaching the system of garbage destruction which any decent city would insist upon. In the cities where civilisation is at its best, the first step is the destruction of flies and rats; yet the system of garbage removal of the Greater Brisbane Council is absolutely the finest so far as working in favour of the retention and spread of these two pests is concerned.

[3 p.m.]

In most places where garbage is properly handled, and, as it will be in time, each house will destroy its own garbage and use the resultant heat for the maintenance of a hot-water service. In decent towns garbage is, by law, forced to be drained—especially the

kitchen refuse—then packed into clean paper and taken to the garbage can, and that garbage can removed, papers and all, in the municipal garbage cart. In decent towns the garbage carts are covered. Here, while we are spending large amounts of money on hospitals and the prevention of disease, open garbage carts go about the main streets of the city distributing diseases; and there still exists in this place a garbage remover called the pig-man. I did not know who the pig-man was, but on investigation I found it was this kind of person: When the garbage in decently run houses is put into these clean papers some odiferous and malodorous attendant carefully unwraps it, sorts all the garbage, and then puts it into a can to fester until the pig-man comes. If there is one point on which the Health Department should insist, it is that it should teach the local Health Department of Brisbane its business. It should insist, too, that the State money is not to be spent, as carelessly as a drunken sailor spends his wages, on keeping up hospitals and going into research for the prevention of disease while all these stupid people are actively engaged in disseminating it. I trust the Minister for Health will do something in this regard.

Mr. BULCOCK (*Barcoo*): I would like to say a word or two in regard to the metropolitan milk supply and the milk supplies of other large cities in Queensland. It appears to me that we have got ourselves into the position now when nobody knows precisely what is being contemplated in regard to the milk supply. There has been some discussion about the Brisbane City Council taking over and discharging certain functions in regard to the Brisbane supply; that the Home Department shall discharge certain other functions; and the Department of Agriculture has very well defined functions that it discharges. We have dual control in our milk supply, and we are threatened with triple control. It would be a most desirable thing if the metropolitan milk supply and the milk supply of all large cities were under uniform control, with one board responsible for the maintenance of a pure milk supply.

The question I more particularly desire to address myself to on this point is the persistent and continuous adulteration of milk by the addition of water. The report of the Health Department shows that this practice, instead of diminishing as the years go by, is continually expanding, and that there is more adulterated milk being sold in Brisbane to-day than ever before. In my opinion, the man who practises that kind of thing is a most contemptible criminal. There can be no doubt that very grave harm results from this practice. It is true that very frequently the man who owns the milk run is the victim of circumstances over which he has no control. I believe these unfortunate people are penalised very frequently owing to the activities of some roundsman that they employ. The whole question is: How are we going to escape the very serious consequences of adulterated milk? From the biological side, the Health Department has done excellent work. The report seems to indicate that we have a purer milk supply in Brisbane to-day than we have had for many years; but we have more water in our milk supply than has been the case in the past. There are certain penalties provided.

Mr. Bulcock.]

It would appear that these penalties are not nearly severe enough, and that the man who deliberately, wickedly, and wilfully contaminates the city's milk supply, thereby wickedly depriving children of the nourishment which they should obtain, and which is absolutely essential to them, should be punished with a good deal greater vigour and rigour than is being meted out to him to-day. This is a question which demands some consideration.

We might argue from the point of view that the principal of a milk run is not responsible, and that he frequently has to carry the responsibility of other people. In this connection, I would suggest one or two remedial measures. In the first place, I think the Home Secretary should take into consideration the question of more severe punishment in certain cases.

The HOME SECRETARY: We have to amend the Act in that regard.

Mr. BULCOCK: It is worth while considering. First of all, I would suggest that the Home Department should endeavour to get greater control over the milk supply; secondly, that greater punishment be inflicted on the individual who wickedly and wilfully adulterates milk; and, thirdly, some protection might be offered or some suggestion made to the principal vendor of the milk to protect him from the activities of certain employees.

I believe it is the practice in some places to utilise a sealed can. When the milk comes from the central depot—the dairy in the case of a warm milk supply—the owner of the dairy is compelled by law to put a padlock on the lid of the can, which must be locked and sealed. The employee takes over those cans of milk, and, if the inspector discovers that the seal is broken when he intercepts the employee on his round, it is the employee who is liable and not the employer.

The HOME SECRETARY: They can put water in after they get the milk.

Mr. BULCOCK: That, after all, is only one side of the question. There are already penalties provided against the man who carries water on the milk cart.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: A man can use it out of his own tap.

The HOME SECRETARY: How would you get over the problem of a perfectly honest milk vendor going around and an employee adding water to the milk? That is one of the drawbacks.

Mr. BULCOCK: You can protect the milk vendor by sealing the can. When the can is sealed, it is obvious that no water can be added to the contents of the can. It is not a difficult matter to seal the can. If water then be discovered in the milk and the seal is broken, it is the employee who is responsible. It may be discovered in a portion of the milk being delivered to the householder, and in that case the inspector would take a sample of milk from the can itself; and, if that were not adulterated, but the milk which the employee was distributing was adulterated, it would be demonstrated that it was the employee who was responsible and not the employer. That would protect the decent employer and sheet it home to the employee. I believe in many cases the employee gets a rough deal in this respect.

[Mr. Bulcock.

There is an incentive to adulterate milk, and we should protect the employer, and introduce regulations whereby we can definitely sheet home the guilt to the culprit. I believe these suggestions are worthy of consideration, and that most dairymen would welcome the general use of a sealed can. We know that the law at present is not much dreaded by the people who adulterate milk.

The HOME SECRETARY: The milkboy may run away and put water in the milk. He may have some milk to deliver to Mrs. Jones, for instance, and, before he delivers it, he may put water in it.

Mr. BULCOCK: If a sample of milk taken from a sealed can were found to contain water, the employee will be liable as the seal must not be broken. The employee cannot introduce water per medium of the tap. A sample of milk from the can would be pure or not pure. If it were not pure, the onus would be on the employer and not on the employee, so that such a provision would protect the employee. It seems to me that that is one way out the difficulty; but where milk is being adulterated—I mean maliciously adulterated—we should have recourse to much more severe penalties than are enforced at present. The general practice in courts in Queensland is to fine a delinquent £1 for every per centum of added water; but I understand that that scale goes on indefinitely—that is to say, if an individual adds 8 per cent of water to his milk, he will be fined £8 whether it is the first or the third offence. That is obviously undesirable and unsound. I think that the department might here link up with the Department of Agriculture and the City Council. The City Council issues dairying licenses, which carry the right to produce and sell milk. A certain fee is payable in respect of the licenses. Why not take advantage of this fact in our endeavour to provide pure milk for the people? For adulteration in other directions we inflict more severe penalties than we do on the man who adulterates milk. Take the liquor trade. If a licensee deviates from the law on three occasions, he may be compelled to "toe the line" in earnest; he becomes a proscribed individual in the trade. It is a much more serious offence to adulterate milk than it is to adulterate spirits. At least it is from my standpoint, although, perhaps, some hon. members will not agree with me. If we had a system whereby individuals convicted for the third time of the offence of adulterating milk, where it was conclusively proven under the system I have outlined that they were doing this for personal gain and were prepared to undermine the health of children in order to attain that end, if the department, acting in unison with the Department of Agriculture and the City Council, had the power to cancel a license for a given period, I think it would act as a very good deterrent. Fines do not cover the needs of the case. Suppose a man is adding 10 per cent. of water to his milk, and it goes on for some considerable time. He is fined—£10, we shall say—and ordered to pay the costs of court—which, I suppose, would be covered by £2. In other words, he is mulcted to the extent of £12 for adding 10 per cent. of water to his milk for some considerable period, and I dare say at the average price of milk in Brisbane—which is 8d. per quart—he has made more than he has to pay.

Very often when these fines are inflicted the employer blames the unfortunate employee; but, if we had a provision that, in the event of three successful prosecutions against a dairyman or milk vendor, his license would be cancelled, I believe that we should do more to purify the milk supply than by any other individual factor that I know of. I would not confine the practice to Brisbane. Possibly we may have in the future a purer milk supply in Brisbane than we have at present, although personally I am very vague as to what the council proposes to do. There is a good deal of talk about pasteurisation and cooling plants. In any case, that applies only to Brisbane. I think that the question of the general supervision of the milk trade of Queensland, particularly in the towns and cities, should receive full consideration. The Minister tells me that it involves an alteration of the Act. Even so, I do not believe that an alteration on the lines I have suggested would take very long to put through Parliament. I believe that fundamentally every member of this Assembly is intensely interested in the preservation of the health standards of the children of our State, and that is really what I am arguing in favour of.

There is another matter that I desire to mention, and it is in connection with the establishment of baby clinics. It is obvious that we are doing quite a lot as a State for the protection of infant life in our community; we are probably doing more than any State in the Commonwealth, and we are probably doing quite as much to-day as New Zealand is doing under its far-famed system of child welfare. Queensland is so situated geographically that we have wide ranges of climate and wide ranges of infantile disability. The western part of Queensland to-day probably presents problems to the individual who is interested in child welfare that the coast does not present. There are records which show that in certain areas the infantile mortality is very high, and for no apparent reason; in a locality adjoining it the infantile mortality may be particularly low, again for no apparent reason. Doctors come and go to these localities, and there must be some reason underlying the matters I have mentioned. We have a system whereby we train nurses in ante-natal and post-natal clinic work and infantile welfare. We have a series of hospitals in the West admirably equipped for maternity cases. Associated with the question of maternity must always be associated this question of ante-natal and post-natal welfare and the care of the very young child. I quite realise that the Minister may not be able to carry out my suggestion immediately, particularly through lack of trainees capable of undertaking this particular work, but I believe that it would be an excellent thing if, in conjunction with our maternity system, we could endeavour later, when trainees are available for the work, to make it incumbent on hospital committees in districts where there is a maternity hospital to have on the staff a nurse who has graduated in ante-natal and post-natal welfare and child welfare work. It has been suggested that individual clinics should be established at certain centres. The trainee would be a member of the general staff, and would be stationed where there were maternity hospitals. I consider that would be an excellent innovation, which probably would lead to the solution of some of those problems of

infant life mortality which are only too prevalent in Western Queensland. The Minister might argue that a travelling clinic is being instituted. That is a very excellent thing in its way, more particularly in connection with small railway sidings where no medical facilities are provided, but in regard to towns that travelling clinic is not likely to be so very valuable for this reason: Assuming that there is an outbreak of summer diarrhoea, which is very prevalent amongst the children of the West, obviously a child cannot wait until a travelling clinic comes along, and obviously, if there were a nurse trained in infantile welfare available, the mothers would be quite pleased to take their children to this little centre. It would not entail very great expense. I believe the funds of the "Golden Casket" could be used in that particular direction.

The HOME SECRETARY: There is a big demand on "Golden Casket" funds.

Mr. BULCOCK: I quite realise that. One thing that I believe justifies the existence of the "Golden Casket" more than anything else is that it provides the necessary funds for the advancement of such schemes as I have placed before the Committee this afternoon. Facilities are offered for nurses to be trained. In the Western areas, where maternity hospitals have been established, the medical evidence sustains the argument of the pioneer of the movement, who said that ante-natal and post-natal knowledge was very necessary on the part of the mothers of our State.

We all subscribe to the opinion expressed to-day that there is a lamentable want of knowledge on the part of mothers. I do not say of all mothers; but all have not the mothercraft, as it were, that is necessary. The Minister knows that to be only too true. This is a difficulty that arises: A doctor in charge of a hospital is an extremely busy man, and frequently has not the time, and sometimes the inclination, to sit down with a mother and discuss the things which, as I suggest, are of vital importance to the child and the mother that a nurse would have who was trained in these particular directions. A doctor in charge of a hospital frequently has a private practice outside which demands quite a lot of his time, care, and attention; and he cannot be expected to go into all the little necessary details with a mother. He possibly goes into detail on the major matters and leaves the rest to chance. I know of a doctor in a western town who, when approached by a mother, says "Go along and discuss that with Granny So-and-So, for she knows more about the rearing of children than I do." If you had nurses trained in child welfare stationed in the western towns, they could give all this information; and, what is better, a nurse trained in the western country would be in a position to give better advice in regard to child welfare than one who is not. I commend the suggestion to the Minister. The women who are prepared to go to the backblocks and there bear children with all the dangers that it entails and rear them should be provided with comforts equal to their more fortunate sisters in the city. The city mother can secure advice from a variety of clinics. The mother in Longreach, Blackall, Barcaldine, or Aramac who desires advice in reference to a sick or ailing baby has to go all the way to Rockhampton to secure advice from the clinic

Mr. Bulcock.]

there. If it can be overcome, then it should. I believe this difficulty can be overcome by the training of sisters in conjunction with the matron of the hospital so that in every centre there will always be a child welfare sister to whom mothers can come for advice.

Mr. HYNES (*Townsville*): I desire to make a few observations regarding the activities of the Home Department. First of all, I would like to make some reference to the splendid work that has been done during the last ten or fifteen years in connection with the reduction of infantile mortality in this State. I have read the report of the director of infant welfare; and the figures disclosed in the table he has published should be read by every citizen in the State. They show what has been achieved in the direction of reducing infantile mortality in Queensland. We find from this table that in the five-year period from 1909 to 1913 the infantile mortality was 67 per 1,000 births, and that in the five-year period from 1924 to 1928 the mortality was reduced to 49.9 per 1,000. Last year, 1928, the figures show that Queensland was in a very fine position as compared with the other States and other countries. The figures were 46.55 per 1,000. That reflects the splendid work that is being done by the Child Welfare Department. I feel sure that the Minister will insist on the carrying on of the good work which the previous Government commenced. By so doing he will receive the thanks of every member of this party and of the people throughout the State.

I would like to make some reference also to the Eventide Home which has been established at Charters Towers. I had an opportunity of visiting this home a couple of weeks ago; and there is no doubt that the departure in this instance from the old method of housing and caring for the aged people in this State is a distinct improvement. I noticed that the huts had water laid on, that little kitchen-gardens were provided for the old men inmates, and that double huts were available in which old couples could live together. Those are very fine innovations, and I hope the Minister will expedite the arrangements so that many old people can receive the benefits as soon as possible.

The HOME SECRETARY: My predecessor had some rule that the institution at Charters Towers would be available only for people from north of Townsville. That is the difficulty.

Mr. HYNES: I have worried both the hon. gentleman and his predecessor regarding applications made by old residents of North Queensland who are to-day in Dunwich. It will be readily understood that those people are really discontented in Dunwich. In the first place, they do not have the liberty in Dunwich that they would have at the new institution at Charters Towers; and, secondly, they have not the same opportunity of communing with friends and relatives by reason of the vast distance between them and the expense incurred in travelling from North Queensland to Brisbane. I understood that it was the intention of the department to allow inmates of Dunwich who had a residence in North Queensland of fifteen years to have an opportunity of being transferred to the Eventide Home at Charters Towers, where there is accommodation for 150 people, and I would ask the

Minister to carry out the promise made by his predecessor in that respect.

I take this opportunity of voicing my protest against the action of the Home Secretary in removing the Government representatives from the hospital board at Townsville. The hon. gentleman's action has caused a great deal of criticism of the Government, not only by Labour supporters, but by well-known adherents of his own party. In Townsville we had the spectacle of three public-spirited men, who had given good service to the Townsville hospital and to the people of North Queensland generally, being replaced by well-known political partisans of the hon. gentleman's party.

Referring to the State Children Department, I offer my congratulations to the director for the very comprehensive and exhaustive review of the work of his department during the past twenty years which appears in the annual report recently published. It would be well if other administrators followed that excellent lead. The director comments on his suggestion of some years ago for the establishment of a home for defective children, which he points out is becoming more necessary with the passage of time. He stresses the fact that at the present time there is a number of State children who might be beneficially treated in such a home, but who are associating with normal children, to the detriment of the latter. I commend the suggestion of the director that these defective children should be segregated, and urge the Minister to take early action in the matter. Of course, there were financial reasons why something was not done in the past, but I hope that steps will be taken to remedy the matter now.

I would also like to make some reference to the orphanage vote. I notice that in recent years there has been a great reduction in the number of children cared for in the Townsville orphanage; and to-day there are only twenty inmates in that [3.30 p.m.] institution. I suppose the expense there is very considerable, and it is mooted that the institution should be transferred to Charters Towers. I notice that the Director of State Children makes certain reference in his report to the humane action of certain public bodies in Townsville who take the orphan children out for a day's holiday. It is admitted that the Labour Council in Townsville at their annual festivities—that is, the commemoration of Labour Day—have a committee who entertain these children and take them out into the country. They hold sports, run races, and give the children a good time generally. I think, as well as the Automobile Club and the Country Women's Association mentioned in the report, they are entitled to some credit for their thoughtfulness in this matter.

I trust my reference to the Eventide Home at Charters Towers will be kept in mind by the Minister, and that as soon as possible there will be an opportunity of transferring some of the old men from Dunwich who have been waiting patiently for some years for such a transfer. I have some friends down there, and they write to me almost every mail asking if they can be transferred to Charters Towers; and I hope the Minister will see the humane side of it. These men cannot possibly be contented in the environment of Dunwich, and in comparison Charters Towers would be a perfect paradise to them.

[*Mr. Bulcock.*]

Mrs. LONGMAN (*Bulimba*): The hon. member for Barcoo has said a good deal about the need for a pure milk supply. Such indeed is very necessary, and it surprises me very much that during the years the Labour Party were in office nothing was done in this connection. The people have been aware that it is necessary. Medical men, nurses, mothers, and the general public have been asking for it continually. Mention was made of the fact that milk is adulterated between the dairy and the consumer. The way out of that difficulty may lie in a sealed container. In more advanced countries than our own this is done, and I think it could be done here without a very great deal of extra expense, and the value of such a system would be inestimable.

Mention has been made this afternoon of the baby clinics. We all realise that the institution of baby clinics has done a very great deal for child life in the State; but we are rather inclined to pride ourselves overmuch, and to say that this is the very best system that has ever been in existence in any part of the world. Of course, similar things are being done elsewhere; and, although we are doing a very great deal, we have to realise that we still need to do more. We are very fortunate indeed in the officials controlling child welfare. At present Dr. Jefferis Turner, of the Infant Welfare Department, is doing excellent work both for the mothers and the babies. We pride ourselves very much on our low rate of infantile mortality, but it is not yet quite as low as it is in New Zealand. Our infantile mortality for the last two years was—

1927	54.5 per 1,000 births.
1928	45.5 per 1,000 births.

whereas in New Zealand last year it was 38.7 per 1,000. We know this is a very variable thing. Some years, owing to epidemics, the rate is much higher than in others. There was a decrease for the last six years from 1922; and I find that in Queensland the average death rate among infants was 51 per 1,000—not quite as low as that of New Zealand, but we are hoping for still further improvement. If it were not for our glorious sunshine, we might not have such good results as we have.

Dr. Turner in that very fine report of his recommends a further extension of the baby clinics. He suggests that, in addition to the centres where clinics are now in existence, we might have around each central clinic branch clinics perhaps of one or two rooms where a nurse might attend one or two days a week and see the mothers of that particular district. That would be an excellent thing, and it would be a very cheap way of extending the work in our cities.

Then in the country districts Dr. Turner recommends that we might have a baby clinic travelling car, and that would, I think, be a most excellent idea. We have to remember that in some of the other cities of Australia public clinics are being conducted though not altogether by the State; but they are well conducted and are doing very fine work, particularly in New Zealand and South Australia. Dr. Turner mentions that there is one respect in which he would like to see the law altered, and that is with regard to notification of birth. At present there is no law for the notification of legitimate births in Queensland, but registration must be effected within sixty days of birth.

Dr. Turner points out that, when nurses become aware of new babies in the community, they immediately visit them; but it is rather late, and very often when they do see them they find them suffering from the mothers' want of knowledge, and it is very difficult to rectify the results of these early errors. I think it would be a good thing if that law could be amended so that we could have early notification.

I also want to speak about mental deficiency. We have said much about it recently in this Assembly in regard to the State schools; but it is a very big question. Looking through the different reports which have come before us of late, I see that mention is continually made of difficulties in regard to the subnormal children in our midst. I notice that Dr. St. Vincent Welch pointed that out in his report, and that the Director of the State Children Department said—

“In 1910 I suggested the establishment of a home for defective children. The necessity for such an institution is becoming more acute. At the present time there are a number of State children that might be beneficially treated in such a home who are associating with normal children, to the detriment of the latter. Some denominational institutions have recently refused to accept any more defective children as inmates.”

Then in the report of the Under Secretary in connection with Dunwich I notice the same thing—

“There we have a fair number of younger women—epileptics and mental defectives—who are a constant source of trouble.”

and so on. Throughout the reports of the different institutions we find that we are up against the same difficulty, and it is time that something was done to remedy it. In 1923 the National Council of Women in this State, together with the British Medical Association, the Health Association, and the Teachers' Union, waited on the then Home Secretary, the hon. member for Mount Morgan, and asked him to introduce a measure dealing with the question of mental defectives. That deputation was received sympathetically. I have a note of the proceedings taken at the time, and it shows that the deputation was favourably received and that the Home Secretary promised to obtain a copy of the Tasmanian Act, which was the only one in force in Australia, and undertook that the matter would receive attention. Things went on thus till 1925, two years later, when, no answer having been received from the Home Secretary, a letter was written asking for a reply. We got no reply, and we concluded that the matter was still receiving consideration or that it had been shelved. This is a most important question. As a matter of fact, I think it is one of the most important questions facing our State. The only State in the Commonwealth that has an Act dealing with this question is Tasmania, and it seems to be a very good one. At present Western Australia, Victoria, and New South Wales are considering the introduction of similar Acts. In New Zealand last year an effort was made to deal with the question thoroughly. The Bill that was introduced was very much mutilated, but it was passed. The trouble there was that many reactionaries were against the introduction of certain clauses, amongst which was a provision that,

Mrs. Longman.]

before persons could marry and reproduce their kind, they must have certificates that they were mentally normal. That, I think, is a very essential thing. It is undoubted that we have in our midst numbers of persons who are sub-normal mentally who are reproducing their kind, and, although it is not suggested that every person of sub-normal mentality is likely to reproduce some form of mental deficiency, there is, nevertheless, some danger of it; and there is no reason why some measure of control should not be introduced. Those who have followed the matter closely have produced ample evidence that the marriage of sub-normal persons has frequently resulted in mentally deficient children. I would remind hon. members of the well-known Jukes and Kallikat families. In one case a man married a woman of feeble mind, and it was found that amongst their descendants was a great number of mental defectives, of criminals, of prostitutes, and of people of very low mentality, and that they put the country to considerable expense in caring for them. It is unquestionable that we want to prevent that sort of thing. We in Queensland are far behind many other parts of the world in this respect. Major Leonard Darwin, president of the Eugenics Society of Great Britain, has said that reliable estimates show that of every 1,000 persons between four and five may be described as feeble-minded, imbecile, or idiots. It is time that we had in Queensland some legislation dealing adequately with the problem. At any rate, the time is overdue when we should investigate it very thoroughly.

Allied with this question is that of the juvenile offenders in our courts. It is a well-known fact that there is a very close connection between low mentality and crime. I notice that in the report of the Director of State Children, Colonel Ferguson, this matter is touched upon—

“In present conditions the juvenile offender cannot be kept entirely apart from the criminal class: it is impossible to help him to any extent when he is confined within prison walls, and in such undesirable associations.

“If there were a separate prison, or a portion of a prison reserve, set apart for prisoners of the ages of seventeen to twenty-five on a first conviction for a crime, other than that of violence, I think beneficial results could be expected.”

In England, where they do not pride themselves overmuch on their social work and on the wonderful things they are doing to help the community, the Borstal system is in force. It was introduced in 1902 and has done excellent work among young children with criminal tendencies. That institution was introduced in New Zealand in 1924, and is doing good reform work. No alteration whatever has been made here in connection with children's courts. The matter has been discussed by social workers and by the department, but so far nothing has been done. I should like to see some alteration made in connection with the places in which children's courts are held. On this matter the Director of the State Children Department says, in his annual report—

“These courts are usually held in the private room of the presiding police magistrate. At times the children have

been delayed for a considerable period waiting for the sitting of the court, and I still maintain that the environment of a police court is not a suitable place for children who must await the sitting of the court.”

I now wish to introduce the subject of women police. I am a fervent advocate for the appointment of women police, because I know the excellent work they have done in other States and in other countries. During the war South Australia introduced women police, and directly after the armistice was signed the Commissioner of Police in that State doubled the number of women police because he knew that the work they had done was invaluable. The superintendent of the South Australian women police, Miss Kate Cox, is doing splendid work in that State amongst women, girls, and children. In that State they had not to fight for recognition as they have had to do in some of the older countries of the world. Nothing has been done in Queensland, the extent of the activity being confined to discussions by social workers and others. South Australia can boast the first Women Police Department officially formed, and subject to the direct control of the Commissioner of Police. The women police are sworn in, have full powers, work the same hours as the male police, and are called upon to carry out the same duties, such duties being confined to women and girls. They search women and girls and take evidence in all cases of child murder, concealment of birth, and attend to minors in court. In some of the other States—in fact, in nearly all the other States of Australia—women have to tell their sordid stories to men. While I do not for a moment say that our police are not a very fine body of men—I have seen them from time to time taking the greatest care of women who have been unfortunate and have fallen on evil days, and I have respected and admired them for it—still we all know that it is a woman's place to care for women in such circumstances. Women police can be found in Glasgow, where evidence of offences against children is heard by the women police. They question children, who are not allowed into court at all. The women police take the evidence and present it to the court. Victoria can boast of eight women police; New South Wales has women police; and everywhere they are doing excellent work. In England in 1922 the number of women police was reduced from 112 to 24 as a measure of economy—which was a great pity—but again in 1924 the Home Secretary decided to increase the number of metropolitan women police to fifty.

When this announcement was made in the House of Commons, it was greeted with cheers, because the members realised what useful work was being done by the women police. It has been considered that teachers would make excellent policewomen, also social workers who have not been too long in one groove. I hope that it will be possible to introduce this system in Queensland before long.

I consider the Home Department to be a most colossal department. I hope that some day it will be possible to subdivide it, and that, as a result, we shall have a Ministry of Health which will deal exclusively with health matters.

[Mrs. Longman.]

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowoong*): I sympathise with the hon. gentleman in charge of this department, as I have always sympathised with the Home Secretary, because I appreciate the difficulties which confront hon. gentlemen holding that position. It is undoubtedly a department where sympathy is absolutely essential. The department deals with measures for the distribution of outdoor relief, and in a great many instances applicants are objected to. It is then that faults are found with the administration. I have had several instances of such complaints; but, on going into the matter with the Under Secretary or the officers in charge of the case, I have found in practically every case that the attitude taken up by the Minister and his officials was perfectly justified.

I particularly rose to take part in this debate because of the remarks made by the hon. member for Townsville in respect to the elimination of certain Government representatives on hospital boards. I have listened to hon. members opposite taking exception to and finding fault with the Government in removing certain members from various hospital boards; but I would like to ask those hon. members how a man whose views are diametrically opposed to those of the Government can be looked upon as a man who will represent the views of the Government.

Mr. HYNES: The people of Townsville returned members of this party to Parliament.

Mr. MAXWELL: It is somewhat late in the day to hear hon. members opposite complaining of this action of the Government. I intend to give them a little ancient history. During the period when Mr. Justice Brennan was Assistant Home Secretary and the hon. member for Mount Morgan was Home Secretary, they deliberately ignored the unanimous representation of the Moggill Shire Council, and absolutely refused to appoint the men selected by that council to the vacancies which then occurred on that body, but, instead, they appointed men of pronounced Labour views and even selected one man who lived at Red Hill; therefore, it is ridiculous to hear hon. members opposite complain of this Government electing as Government representatives to hospital boards men who represent their political views. I do not suppose they did that! At any rate, we have proof that in other instances they have appointed men with pronounced Labour views to positions on local authorities.

The hon. member for Warrego, referring to local authority work, stressed the position of the city of Brisbane. It is most extraordinary to find such a diversity of opinion on the part of hon. members opposite. When it is likely to assist the Labour Party to gain control in the municipal arena, we have hon. members opposite saying that Brisbane is the cleanest and healthiest city in the Commonwealth, and that it can boast of the lowest mortality of any city in Australia; yet to-day we find the hon. member for Warrego criticising the methods adopted by the Brisbane City Council, the inference being that the method of removing garbage was a danger to the health of the community.

Mr. FOLEY: So it is.

Mr. MAXWELL: The hon. member does not know what he is talking about. If it were so, how does it come that the Commis-

sioner of Public Health does not take action? When we were in opposition, hon. members opposite twitted those of us who were associated with local government work because a health officer had not been appointed. Now, however, a health officer is available; but, apart from that, I challenge any hon. member opposite to say that Brisbane is a dirty city. No! As we all know, Brisbane is practically the cleanest city in the Commonwealth. We need only consider the conditions that obtain in Sydney to realise that, because there one has only to go down some of the main streets to view the rubbish tins placed in the doorways, and the stench is such that a pocket handkerchief well sprinkled with scent is a convenience, if not an absolute necessity. Here in Brisbane, however, our system is most up to date, and an efficient incinerator makes short work of garbage.

It is difficult to reconcile the statements of hon. members opposite. Take, for example, the statement by the hon. member for Warrego that the Town Hall in Brisbane is a long way ahead of its time. I remember when hon. members opposite stated that the Town Hall should have been built long ago, but that they also said, owing to the politics of Mr. Wilson, M.L.A. for Fortitude Valley, who was then mayor of the city, they had prevented its being built, at which time it could have been built much more cheaply than at present. The argument of the hon. member for Warrego is on a par with others that have been used by his colleagues.

I congratulate the Minister in charge of the department. In the hon. member for Normanby we have a man who is sympathetic, and who will do his best to assist in every possible way. Further, we have a Government in power who will be prepared to back up the Home Secretary in measures for the relief of suffering humanity.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAXWELL: When the time arrives for the Government again to appeal to the country, I venture to say that it will be said that they have done better than was anticipated.

Mr. DUNLOP (*Rockhampton*): I rise to speak particularly about the Under Secretary of this department; but before doing so I congratulate the Home Secretary—a Central Queensland representative—on his appointment to that important portfolio. The hon. gentleman has been in Parliament for some years, and I only hope that he will follow in the footsteps of his predecessor, the hon. member for Mount Morgan, who has done wonderfully good work, and whose name, as I said at a civic reception to him in Rockhampton, is on record for all time.

Although I congratulate the Home Secretary, I regret that I am forced by the Home Secretary himself to take advantage of the privileges of this House to ventilate a grievance. I wanted to do the right

[4 p.m.] thing outside in connection with the Home Secretary, but, as Mayor of Rockhampton and afterwards as the hon. member for Rockhampton, I am not going to tolerate any Under Secretary trying to disparage me; and this is the place to let those on the Treasury bench know how some of their Under Secretaries carry on. There are Under Secretaries and Under Secretaries. I, as Mayor and the chief citizen of Rockhampton, am the last

Mr. Dunlop.]

one who should have been insulted; therefore, I propose to read the correspondence that has passed between me and the Home Secretary and his Under Secretary, and make a few general observations thereon. On 14th June I wrote to the Home Secretary as follows:—

“Rockhampton,
“14th June, 1929.

“The Hon. The Home Secretary
“(Mr. James Peterson, M.L.A.),
“Brisbane.

“Dear Sir,—

“I have had it brought under my notice by a prominent Rockhampton citizen that Mr. W. J. Gall, who, I am led to believe, occupies the position of Under Secretary for Home Affairs, was in receipt of £1,000 per annum for such position, and that when a Mr. Peirson had to give up the position as Comptroller-General he, Mr. Gall, took this position over as well, and for doing the duties of the position Mr. Peirson occupied he also gets another £300. I shall be glad to know if this is a fact, and if it is, it is a rotten state of affairs and should be immediately remedied, and a procedure which I am strongly adverse to, and if true, will have something to say on the floor of the House. Will you please investigate and let me know the result.

“With kind regards,

“Yours faithfully,

“(Signed) THOS. A. DUNLOP,
“Member for Rockhampton.”

Under cover of a letter from the Home Secretary dated 24th June, I received a minute from Mr. Gall. I shall read the Home Secretary's cover note first as the authority for sending it on; and I blame the Home Secretary for sending it. He must have agreed to it, and he must either uphold his Under Secretary or uphold myself, and this is the place to settle it. So far as I am concerned, there is no ill-feeling between the hon. gentleman and me. This is the Home Secretary's note—

“Home Secretary's Office,
“Brisbane, 24th June, 1929.

“Dear Mr. Dunlop,—

“I am in receipt of your letter of the 14th instant, wherein you complain against the Under Secretary of the Home Department acting as Comptroller of the Prisons of Queensland. I am afraid you have made a mistake in terming this a ‘rotten state of affairs,’ because from my own knowledge I know that Mr. Gall has done very fine work in charge of the prisons.

“I have submitted your complaint to him, and I am enclosing a copy of his reply to myself for your perusal.

“Yours faithfully,

“(Signed) J. C. PETERSON.

“T. A. Dunlop, Esq., M.L.A.,
“Mayor of Rockhampton,
“Town Hall,
“Rockhampton.”

Now here is the bomb which he thought he would put over me as Mayor of Rockhampton, and I now throw it back in the teeth of the Home Secretary—

. MEMO. TO HOME SECRETARY.

“The practice of new members attacking members of the public service on the floor of the House, where they have

[Mr. Dunlop.

no opportunity of a personal reply, is all too common, and I am pleased to have the opportunity to reply in this case.

“In the first place, I do not get £300 a year, and Mr. Dunlop could easily have ascertained that if he had taken the trouble to look up the Estimates in Chief.

“I was asked to take over the position, and was promised £250 per annum to do so. I took it over on the distinct understanding that I was not benefiting at the expense of Peirson, who held the dual position of Comptroller-General of Prisons and Superintendent, Brisbane Prison, at the time. He is receiving now as Superintendent, Brisbane Prison, what he got as Comptroller and Superintendent before. He is under no monetary disability by the change.

“The prison was in an absolute state of disorganisation when I took it over. There was an outbreak in one of the shops soon after; prisoners attacked the warder, and refused to work. I settled that trouble in a couple of days, and there has been no similar trouble since. There was no discipline when I took it over; there is some now, and there will be more before I have done with the job.

“I gathered together regulations and general orders of this and other States, took what I considered best in each, and added others which I thought were necessary and helpful in connection with our prisons administration, and then framed a new set of regulations for our prisons. This, of course, was done after hours, and chiefly on Sunday afternoons in my office. The new regulations were promulgated, and I am satisfied that they are as up-to-date as any in the Commonwealth. In reorganisation of staff, I did without two clerks and a messenger. The extra amount paid to me really cost the Government nothing. They refused afterwards to give me the amount promised; they allowed me £100 a year, and I made no complaint.

“There is a difference between my case and that of Mr. Dunlop's, inasmuch as I did not seek the position, but was asked to take it over because it was considered that I was the officer able and willing to straighten out the position. Mr. Dunlop, however, sought the positions of mayor and a member of Parliament. For the former, I believe, he receives payment; for the latter he will probably get £500 a year.

“I think it will readily be admitted that the work I am doing in the position is worth the extra £100 a year, and in the circumstances it seems to me that it ill becomes this gentleman, who also holds a dual position, to look for the mote in my eye and to forget the beam in his own. If I were an ill-natured person, I might also suggest that his dual position also discloses a rotten state of affairs which should be immediately remedied, and it even might be forgivable if I so far forgot my dignity as to suggest that, whilst I have proved my worth in my position, he has yet to do so in his. That, however, would be such a departure from the usual amenities which are observed in official correspondence that I refrain from doing so.

"Personally, I do not care whether I retain the position of Comptroller-General of Prisons or not, but while I do so I shall not bother about Mr. Dunlop's opinion, not even if he voices it on the floor of the House. I hope he will be informed to this effect, and that, when dealing with my case on the floor of the House, he will also deal with his own and all similar cases.

"W.G.

"24-6-1929."

As mayor and chief citizen of Rockhampton, the dignity of my position is not respected by this particular Under Secretary. This is my reply—and rightly so, too—as he was insulting the citizens of Rockhampton besides myself—

"Rockhampton,

"29th June, 1929.

"The Hon. the Home Secretary
 "(Mr. James Peterson, M.L.A.),
 "Brisbane.

"Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 24th instant, attaching thereto a copy of Mr. Gall's reply to you and which you have sent on to me for perusal. I received your communication in a very busy period of carnival week, and hurriedly read the covering letter to the attached copy of letter alluded to above, and did not at that particular moment think it was your own signature to such letter but someone else's, and it is a 'staggerer' to me to think that, as the newly appointed Home Secretary, you tolerated such a scurrilously worded letter going out from a subordinate officer to your worthy self. I wish to say from the very outset before placing before you in no unmistakable manner my views regarding this 'wonderful' Mr. Gall (?) that I in no shape or form said anything about this officer's ability or otherwise, but I have no hesitation in saying that I now judge him in accordance with the tone of his communication, and I am most anxious to know whether you endorse such statements of his as regards myself, and if you do, then I am more than astonished after all you have been saying regarding me whilst in Rockhampton during carnival week.

"Now let me deal briefly with this 'czaristic' toned letter of this great 'I am'—Mr. Gall. As a new member of Parliament I am out to give every public servant a 'square go'—so much so that on the hustings I stated I stand for 'full civil rights to all public and other Government servants' at election or any other time so long as they 'do not attempt in any shape or form to abuse their superior officers.' What has Mr. Gall got to say to this? As regards the second paragraph of Mr. Gall's letter pointing out that he does not get £300 a year extra and that 'Mr. Dunlop could easily have ascertained that if he had taken the trouble to look up the Estimates-in-Chief.' I only went by the very well-known citizen who furnished me with the information, and I am honest enough and man enough to accept what Mr. Gall says; but even then my informant was only £50 out that what was 'promised to him' was allowed him as mentioned in the opening sentence of the third paragraph of his reply to you,

when he says, 'I was asked to take over the position, and was promised £250 per annum to do so,' and if such a promise was made why wasn't it carried out, and why didn't such an officer 'have the courage' to see that he got it? Mr. Gall's fourth paragraph reads too much of the 'I am' for my liking, and leads one to believe that he thinks, in my opinion, as if he were one of those officers who imagines 'he cannot be done without.' The contents of the fifth paragraph are some more of the 'I am' stuff.

"Regarding the following paragraph of Mr. Gall's:—

'There is a difference between my case and that of Mr. Dunlop's, inasmuch as I did not seek the position, but was asked to take it over because it was considered that I was the officer able and willing to straighten out the position. Mr. Dunlop, however, sought the position of mayor and member of Parliament. For the former, I believe, he receives payment; for the latter he will probably get £500 a year.'

"Just to show this wonderful (?) Mr. Gall he does not know what he is talking about, and that the same 'Mr. Dunlop' is highly respected in Greater Rockhampton: When I first stood for municipal honours with ten other Labour candidates, and that, too, by being approached by several citizens, he was the only Labour candidate returned; I served three years in 'this lonely capacity'; in April, 1927, and again by special request of several citizens here, I this time led the Labour team, and, besides carrying four other Labour candidates in with me, I also topped the poll, and thereby became mayor by a vote of the whole of the eligible electors of Greater Rockhampton, and I might also mention (as stated above) when I first stood for municipal honours I came second out of thirty odd candidates. I wonder if this 'Great I am, Mr. Gall,' has ever had the same honour of being held in the same esteem by the electors here? And again to 'gall' your Mr. Gall, I have just recently, as you well know, performed something unequalled in the whole of Queensland—been elected as 'an Independent candidate' for one of the strongest Labour strongholds in Queensland, and I was specially asked again to stand for legislative honours and it must be 'galling' now to Mr. Gall to know that I was returned by a wonderful majority, and that, too, 'on my own' without the assistance of any committee whatsoever. Kindly tell your 'impertinent' Mr. Gall that for the mayorship I get an 'allowance' of £500, and I have had to spend a large portion of it in holding such a responsible position and keep self, wife, and five children on the balance. Mr. Gall has been in the public service for many years, and he makes the stupid statement that 'for the latter position he will probably get £500 a year' (meaning member of Parliament), whereas his common sense ought to have told him 'if he himself had taken the trouble to look up the Estimates in Chief' that a member of Parliament gets £750 a year, and I am man enough to say that I have so far received two such payments,

Mr. Dunlop.]

and that through no fault of mine, and again I offer no apology whatsoever for having accepted same, as I darn-well earned it, and Mr. Gall ought also to know that the £500 salary cannot operate till Parliament passes a new Bill to that effect, and which Bill I intend to support as per the statements I expounded at election time, going to prove conclusively that 'I am not a shark for money,' but that I am imbued with absolute honesty of purpose seeing that the late Government had no right to raise their own salaries £250 after refusing the basic wage to the worker. Again, if Mr. Gall reads the newspapers at all, he would easily have found out the principles I stood for, and which now leads me to reply to his insulting 'par seven.' Mr. Gall states: 'I think it will readily be admitted that the work I am doing in the position is worth the extra £100 a year, and in the circumstances it seems to me that it ill becomes this gentleman, who holds a dual position, to look for the mote in my eye, and to forget the beam in his own. If I were an ill-natured person, I might also suggest that his dual position discloses a rotten state of affairs which should be immediately remedied, and it even might be forgivable if I so far forgot my dignity as to suggest that, whilst I have proved my worth in my position, he has yet to do so in his. That, however, would be such a departure from the usual amenities which are observed in official correspondence that I refrain from doing so.

"Let me say right here, in a most determined manner, if Mr. Gall has been in the habit of putting such damnable sarcasm over members of his staff, I, whilst I remain a member of Parliament, will not tolerate an 'under-strapper' like him attempting to put it over me, and I am more than surprised that you, as our worthy Home Secretary, countenance such impertinent stuff to a well-respected person like myself as chief citizen of this town, and now member for Rockhampton. I say again, as you yourself well know, I stand for the principle of one-man-one-job, which I stated before I was elected that I would fulfil before Parliament met, and I intend to carry it out to the letter, and everyone knows here that it was to be during the course of July. Kindly tell Mr. Gall to now 'get the mote out of his eye.' Tell him also I have 'more than proved my worth in this my native city,' otherwise the people would not have put me where they have done. If ever I become a Minister, you can rest assured, tell him, I would not allow an 'under-strapper' sending out such an insulting communication to me, but that I 'would put him in his rightful place.' Kindly also tell him, as per his remarks in his last par, I will see that he will for the future 'take some notice of Mr. Dunlop' when I get up to speak on the floor of the House, and that I will not be afraid to deal with his tone of letter, deal with my own honourable case, and all other cases too."

which I have done!

"Will you please also ask Mr. Gall if it is a fact that when a new position of deputy superintendent had to be

[Mr. Dunlop.

appointed he had to get a person outside the State of Queensland to fill such position? Does he think there is no one with sufficient brains in Queensland to fill positions in his department?"

"In conclusion, I shall esteem it a favour if you will let me know from what you have known of me all these years if you yourself personally agree with Mr. Gall's scurrilous remarks towards me; if you do, then you are not the same Hon. James Peterson that was up here during carnival week, and when you spoke quite sincerely I thought what you thought about me. There has been too much of this 'cheek' going out by some of these 'under-strappers,' and I will be one who will attempt to stop it when I get down to Parliament.

"Yours faithfully,
(Signed) THOMAS A. DUNLOP,
"Member for Rockhampton."

I sent a reminder on 25th July, 1929, asking for a reply, and on 27th July I got the following reply:—

"Thomas Dunlop, Esq., M.L.A.,
"Jones street, off Jardine street,
"Rockhampton.

"Dear Mr. Dunlop,—I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 25th instant wherein you complain that I had not answered the letter you wrote me, dated 29th June.

"I view the letter you wrote me, dated 29th June, as being purely a personal matter between yourself and Mr. Gall, and therefore not calling for a reply from me.

"Any difference between yourself and Mr. Gall can be ventilated on the floor of the House at the time when Mr. Gall's salary is under consideration—that is, the debate on the Estimates.

"I shall be pleased to see you on your next visit to Brisbane.

"Kind regards,
"Yours faithfully,
(Signed) J. C. PETERSON."

Mr. KELSO: What are you driving at?

Mr. DUNLOP: I am quite capable of handling my own case, and I want no assistance from anybody.

I, as Mayor of Rockhampton, wrote to the Home Secretary conveying certain information supplied by a reverend gentleman who took a great interest in prison work in Rockhampton. I say right here that I blame the Home Secretary more than I blame Mr. Gall. The Home Secretary must be working in unison with the Under Secretary when he allows him to send out a document like that. I remember the Secretary for Mines stating in this Chamber by way of interjection that the Public Service Commissioner, Mr. Story, would not run him, but apparently Mr. Gall is allowed to run the Home Secretary. I take strong exception to that position. I do not know why the Home Secretary did not answer me. So far as I am concerned, the Home Secretary upholds the Under Secretary, and apparently he has some whisperers. Do not run away with the idea that a certain position exists. It makes not the slightest difference to me whether certain aldermen differed from me or not. After the meeting was over, that was the end of the matter. I hope

that the Home Secretary will deal with the matter on the floor of this Chamber, and that he will not "back and fill" so far as I am concerned. If there is a czar in the police force to-day, it is he. He might be a capable officer—which I understand he is—and I give credit where credit is due even to my most bitter opponent, whether inside this Chamber or out. Still he occupies the position I have stated. No matter what takes place here, bitter though it may be for the Home Secretary, so far as I am concerned, he can take me outside and, with Mr. Gall as chairman, we can have a cup of tea. However, that is by the way. I want an answer on the floor of this Chamber, otherwise I intend to defend myself on the point outside this Chamber, and stand or fall on it. When the Director of Education was in Rockhampton he pointed out to the boys and girls that, if they wished to get on in their profession, they must have manners, and that they must know how to speak, and so forth. I have judged this man by the tone of his correspondence. Do hon. members mean to tell me that any Minister would tolerate a letter like that being forwarded to him? Apparently the Home Secretary was frightened of Mr. Gall, and allowed it to go out. I take it that he upholds the Under Secretary and agrees with him. I hope that this will be a moral lesson. Mr. Gall should not get the idea that he cannot be done without. When sixteen years of age I was taught two things by my father, and I want this to soak into Mr. Gall and anyone else of a similar calibre. I was taught never to forget that I could be done without, and that one's best friend is his pocket, and when his last shilling leaves him his best friend has left him. No truer statements could ever be made.

I shall have something to say on some of the votes for the sub-departments, especially on the very important subject expounded by the hon. member for Bulimba. Many Governments of to-day, including that of Queensland, have shown a weak-kneedness in relation to infantile life and the dealing with imbeciles that requires attention. It is never too late to mend, and when this particular vote is moved I intend to speak in unmistakable terms on what I consider the existing rotten state of affairs.

Dr. KERWIN (*Merthyr*): When one finds such an important department like the Health Department—and coupled with the Health Department is the management of the hospitals throughout Queensland—still being administered as a side department of the Home Secretary's Department, one cannot help criticising the inadequate system which has existed in Queensland for the last twenty or twenty-five years for the dealing with health matters. One must admit that it is absolutely impossible for a busy man like the Home Secretary to devote the attention that he should to such an important question. I would like to pay a special compliment to the Commissioner of Public Health and his staff for the way in which they are discharging their duties. When the vote that is allowed to the Commissioner for the carrying out of the health activities is considered—namely, a paltry £25,000—in comparison with the vote that is allowed for what are for the most part useless scholarships in the Department of Public Instruction, what hope has any department of properly carrying out activities that should be carried out by an up-to-date Health

Department? I am not blaming the Home Secretary for this. He has simply followed on the lines pursued in the past; but I sincerely hope that the Government of the day will see that some improvement is made. Surely the health of the community ought to be of paramount importance! No sick worker can be considered an asset. He is really a drag not only on his family, but also on the whole community. Some effort should be made to advance the science of preventive medicine. I would like to mention one activity in support of preventive medicine which I forgot to mention when I was speaking on the educational vote. It is only a small incident, but it will bring before hon. members what prevention means. The examination of children in schools for such things as adenoids and tonsils has led to a marked reduction in diseases of the middle ear, and such-like trouble. It has been practically reduced to a minimum now, and that is entirely owing to the medical inspection of these children, which has disclosed the defects and encouraged parents to attend to them. As a result, we find hundreds of children who would otherwise have been suffering from diseased ears through life are now saved that trouble owing to the preventive measures that have been adopted.

Another question that must exercise the minds of everybody to-day is the unfortunate scourge which is increasing in the community, I refer to cancer, the effects of which have been brought close to our attention in the last few weeks. Deaths from cancer for twenty years have totalled 10,264 in Queensland alone, and 2,549 of those fatal cases occurred in portions of the body where cancer can be prevented by the treatment of the pre-cancerous condition. If the principle of preventive medicine were intelligently applied to this problem, there would be a marked reduction in the mortality from this disease. The public has to be educated to seek advice in the very early stages of the disease, and I would suggest and recommend to the Government the advisability of establishing at once a special cancer hospital staffed by experts, where the benefit of expert advice would be available not only to those people who had any doubts as to their condition, but also to medical practitioners in the country. The establishment of an institution of that nature would be of inestimable benefit to the community; and I commend to the Government the question of taking the matter seriously in hand and joining with the Cancer Trust in establishing such a hospital at once.

The hon. member for Bulimba referred to mental defectives, but that is a question that we alone cannot deal with. It is not only a Commonwealth question, but is really international in character, and to my mind can only be effectively dealt with by the League of Nations. It is a question which involves a great deal—the getting away from the old traditions, and, of course, it is a difficult thing to overcome prejudice. A world-wide movement alone can do anything that would be of any benefit. What I would like to bring under the notice of the Home Secretary is the question of incipient mental cases. In Queensland we have numbers of nervous cases which are unable to be treated at home and cannot be dealt with in private hospitals, the only alternative being to send them to an asylum. In those cases where the persons concerned are really not sane and

Dr. Kerwin.]

yet not insane, it kills whatever prospect there is of recovery to go through the ordeal of examination by two medical men, have an order procured from a magistrate, and then to be sent to an asylum. The Government might take up the question of establishing an intermediate institution where cases of this description could be admitted and treated without any undue publicity or embarrassing proceedings so far as relatives are concerned.

There is another question I desire to refer to, and in doing so I shall probably differ slightly from the hon. member for Toowoong. On the question of the control of health in the city of Brisbane, it is an unfortunate thing that an Act was passed taking the control of the health activities of a city like Brisbane entirely out of the hands of the Government, so far as sanitation and infectious diseases go.

[4.30 p.m.]

It is not so long ago since we had a visitation of plague. The whole prevention of plague is entirely in the hands of the Greater Brisbane Council, and, as everyone knows, one of the principal measures to be adopted to prevent such an outbreak, which causes such an enormous loss to commerce, is the adequate destruction of rats, and on this matter I would like to read a little paragraph from the report of the Commissioner of Public Health—

“Reduced rat gangs and larger catches appear to me to indicate that rats are more numerous, especially so, as rat-proofing is being neglected. The rat population is stated to be equal to the human and the rat, in addition to being a carrier of bubonic plague, is a destructive animal. It is estimated that one rat annually will destroy from 10s. to £1 worth of food, property, or merchandise.”

If what the Commissioner says is true—that measures are not being taken to adopt rat-proofing in the way it should be done—look what is going to happen. Ships come from the East frequently. No one knows the moment when infection may come to the port, and the Health Department has no power whatsoever to make the Brisbane City Council carry out this rat-proofing in the way it should. That is something that should be altered. The whole health activities of the city should be removed from the control of the Brisbane City Council and placed entirely in the hands of the Health Department.

Just to show another thing that is happening in Brisbane—I think it is a thing of very serious importance to everybody. In connection with the sewerage of the city of Brisbane there is a system of emptying pans into the main sewer at Milton. That sewage is carried right down to Luggage Point, where it goes into a precipitation tank. This tank, when it is full, has to be emptied by two men. They shovel the sewage into a 12-inch pipe, and further sewage is coming down to help to wash this along the pipe with the aid of a little fresh water, and the whole of this stuff is being scattered on the mud flats at Luggage Point. Now what is happening? The report states—

“No method of purification has yet been adopted, and crude sewage is being discharged into the river, as has been reported on previous occasions.

[Dr. Kerwin.

“It was observed that a very large amount of sawdust is being precipitated in the sedimentation tanks. One tank was being cleared of sawdust at the time of visit. This tank was about two-thirds full of a solid mass of sawdust. The sawdust is removed from the tank utilising a stream of sewage augmented a little by clean water from a hose. A man is employed forking the sawdust into this stream of sewage, which sewage and sawdust are conveyed by means of a 12-inch diameter pipe drawn on to the large lowlying, swampy flat adjacent to the works.

“This 12-inch pipe, measured at the outlet, was discharging full force at time of inspection. A man was employed forking the channel clear of sawdust, so as to give a clear run to the sewage over the flat.

“It is estimated that it will take one man about ten days to clear one tank of the sawdust, which means that this stream of crude sewage is being discharged on to the flat during that period.

“It is also estimated that by the time one tank is cleared another will be ready for the same operation, hence the discharge on the flat appears to be a continuous one. Many thousands of gallons of crude sewage are daily being discharged on to this swampy land.

“The sawdust impregnated with crude sewage after long contact is levelled off and left lying on the flat. The sewage is swarming with fly maggots; the sawdust filling and sewage ponds are therefore likely to become huge breeding grounds for flies and mosquitoes.”

Such a thing to exist in a civilised community! Surely that must strike everybody; still, the Health Department has no control whatsoever over it. That is a matter that should be seriously considered by the Home Secretary. Something has to be done. The Health Act has to be amended sooner or later, and the whole of the health activities of the city ought to be under the control of the Queensland health authorities.

A lot has been said about the milk supply of Brisbane. The milk supply of the city has certainly improved wonderfully from what it used to be. There is one company here which is supplying milk in bottles, which undoubtedly is the correct system. I say further that it should be made compulsory for all milk to be supplied in bottles. The health authorities should also have supervision and control of the milk from the cow to the consumer. At present the authority is not concentrated. One portion of the milk supply is under the control of the Department of Agriculture, the other under the control of the City Council. Who is to say that the man who milks these cows is in a healthy condition and is a suitable person to help to milk the cows? He might be a man affected with tubercular trouble or have some skin disease on his fingers and hands. Who is to be the authority to say that he has not got such a disease? You cannot trust it to the inspectors of the Department of Agriculture, because it is really not their province to ascertain whether a man is suitable for that work or not. The milk supply of the city should be controlled by one central authority—from the cows to the consumer.

I would like to draw the attention of the Home Secretary to another matter referred to in the report of the Commissioner of Public Health—that is the practice of vegetable-growers using arsenate of lead in growing cabbages. We recently saw that several loads of cabbages had to be destroyed in the Roma Street Markets on account of the presence of arsenate of lead. Drastic action should be taken to prevent such an occurrence as that. The people of the city should not be exposed to such danger as that, and steps should be taken to prevent that practice, because unfortunately there has been an alarming amount of lead-poisoning in Brisbane. The difficulty is to find out and trace the evil to its source.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: A good deal of it is due to white-lead paint being used on veranda rails and fences.

Dr. KERWIN: Veranda railings and fences obtain all over Queensland; and I think there is more lead-poisoning in Brisbane than in any other city or town in Queensland.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: There is a good bit of it in other towns, too.

Dr. KERWIN: But not in the same proportion as in Brisbane. I would recommend that drastic action should be taken and regulations framed to prevent any further danger from this source.

Mr. DANIEL (*Keppel*): The hon. member for Townsville referred to the Eventide Home for aged people at Charters Towers, and I endorse the hon. member's remarks on that subject. We want a home of the same kind established in Rockhampton; and I would suggest that the Women's Hospital there be set aside for that purpose, as it would be an ideal site for a home for aged people. As the hon. member for Townsville said, it is almost impossible for relatives to get down to Brisbane to see their parents who are living at these homes in Brisbane. I would urge the Home Secretary to set aside the Women's Hospital at Rockhampton as a home for old people in the Central district. That would bring about a system of decentralisation, which is very necessary in this respect. There are many old people staying at homes in Brisbane who come from Rockhampton and other parts of Central Queensland, and who would be only too pleased to return to their own district.

There is another matter I want to mention—the attack of the hon. member for Rockhampton on the Under Secretary to the Home Secretary, whom he referred to as a czar. I very much deplore the hon. member's attack.

Mr. DUNLOP: I will deal with it again later.

Mr. DANIEL: I can assure the hon. member that I know as much about the matter as the hon. member for Rockhampton. In spite of all the hon. member may say, the fact remains that on two occasions the hon. member for Rockhampton was beaten in the council by ten votes to one.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: What has this got to do with the vote?

Mr. DANIEL: I am just telling hon. members something of the hon. member for Rockhampton, who attacked the Under Secretary for being a czar. On one occasion the hon. member suspended Mr. McCulloch,

and the Rockhampton Council immediately afterwards reinstated him. The hon. member has caused a lot of trouble in Rockhampton in connection with these matters.

Mr. POLLOCK: Is this a private row, or what?

Mr. DANIEL: The hon. member has made a "welter" of it.

Mr. DUNLOP interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. DANIEL: The hon. member has also introduced the question of Mr. Kelly's appointment to the Rockhampton Hospital Board. Mr. Kelly had no particular sympathy with the present Government. He was nominated by the late member for Rockhampton, but I intend to quote an extract from a report of a hospital board meeting to show how Mr. Kelly acted in regard to Mr. Clayton's retirement from the board—

"Mr. Lee moved that a protest be sent to the Home Secretary's Office against the withdrawal of Mr. Clayton from the board in view of his long services. . . .

"The Chairman: I hope you are not going to continue in that strain.

"Mr. Lee: What strain?

"The Chairman: Making a joke.

"Mr. Lee: I am serious. If you like to make a joke of it, that is not my intention. If this mistake has been made . . .

"The Chairman: We don't want that brought in.

"Mr. Lee: I am moving a motion.

"Mr. Kelly: And I am going to second it."

Mr. DUNLOP: What is wrong with that?

Mr. DANIEL: Of course there is nothing wrong with it. I only read it to show what Mr. Kelly, who was nominated by the late member for Rockhampton, did with regard to Mr. Clayton's case. At any rate, I deplore the scene the hon. member for Rockhampton made this afternoon.

Mr. STOPFORD (*Mount Morgan*): Whilst I do not want to be brought into the Central Queensland row that is going on—(laughter)—I feel that I would be hardly fair to the Under Secretary of my former department, Mr. Gall, if I were to allow the statements of the hon. member for Rockhampton to appear in the columns of "Hansard" without contradiction. I do not know who was responsible for the letter to which the hon. member for Rockhampton has referred, and I leave that matter to the man who is responsible. I was in the Home Department for some years, and I realise that, if a member sent me a letter similar to that which the hon. member for Rockhampton sent—attacking an officer of my department—I would in courtesy, if nothing else, submit it to my Under Secretary so that he might defend himself.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. STOPFORD: Whether the Under Secretary was justified in preparing a memorandum for the use of the Minister to be sent to the hon. member for Rockhampton is another matter. However, I am not concerned about that. When I was Home Secretary, I recommended to Cabinet the appointment of Mr. Gall as Comptroller-General of Prisons, and I am prepared to take full

Mr. Stopford.]

responsibility for that recommendation and to justify the appointment.

Mr. DUNLOP: I did not say that he was not a competent man.

Mr. STOPFORD: I refuse to be drawn into this brawl between the hon. member and the Home Department. I was in control of the department at the time that appointment was made. The present Home Secretary has not a full knowledge of the facts, and I conceive it my duty to extend a measure of justice to the Under Secretary—an officer with long and honest service in the State, a man who is not able to defend himself on the floor of this Chamber. In the circumstances, I consider that I am justified in doing that.

Mr. DUNLOP: The position was forced upon me.

Mr. STOPFORD: The reverend gentleman who supplied the information to the hon. member for Rockhampton made the statement that an additional £300 per annum was to be paid to the Under Secretary for his services as Comptroller-General of Prisons. The hon. member for Rockhampton was at liberty to peruse the journals of this Assembly and the documents of the Home Department, so that he cannot be justifiably excused on the ground that he was wrongly informed by someone who wrote him a letter—a person who had no opportunity of making himself conversant with the facts.

Mr. DUNLOP: Your Government promised him £250 per annum.

Mr. STOPFORD: I will deal with the promise of £250 at a later stage. The appointment was made, and the dual positions were ended. Prior to that time, escapes from the prison were frequent and discipline was gone. The state of affairs at that time presented a fit subject for a Gilbert and Sullivan comic opera. I am not going to blame the man who occupied the dual position. No doubt the Government of the day, when the dual position was created, believed that economy would result from a saving of money, but economy that is secured at the expense of efficiency really amounts to extravagance. That is what happened in that case. The then Home Secretary, Mr. Huxham, no doubt believed that he could economise in the expenditure of the Home Department by combining the two positions of Superintendent of the Brisbane Prison and Comptroller-General. Mr. Huxham was a kindly gentleman who believed that prisoners could be reformed—a belief that I do not uphold after spending several years in the department as Home Secretary. I do not share the view that prisoners can be reformed in the way that it is attempted to reform them in Queensland to-day. Major Peirson eventually occupied the dual position of Superintendent and Comptroller-General, but there then arose the peculiar position of this man very gravely punishing a prisoner as Superintendent of the prison, and then as Comptroller-General reading the prisoner a lecture and overriding what the Superintendent had done. (Laughter.) It was impossible to reform prisoners by a system of that kind. The result was that it was easier to get out of gaol than it was to get into it. Escapes became very frequent. I looked around to see if I could secure a suitable man for the position of Comptroller-General. For twelve months prior to the appointment I tried to persuade the Under

Secretary to assume responsibility of the position of Comptroller-General. I am not claiming that there were not suitable men available, but the salary that I was permitted to offer was not sufficient to induce a suitable man to assume the responsibility. For two years I, as Home Secretary, was ridiculed by the press in relation to prison matters. We could not enforce discipline in the gaols; we had the knowledge that drink was taken into them, and that prisoners were drunk. We knew that files, hack-saws, and other things found their way into the gaol, and all despite the fact that the gaol was staffed to a standard equal to any gaol in Australia. It became apparent that the time would surely come when the person occupying the responsible position of Home Secretary would have to sit up and take notice. I realised that that condition of things had to cease, and I made certain recommendations to Cabinet. First of all, I asked Mr. Gall, who I believed was quite capable, to assume the duties of Comptroller-General. I believed him to be a man having the necessary firmness of character and sense of justice, a man who would not pander to any prisoner, who would demand service from the staff at the same time that he would give that meed of justice to the staff to which they were entitled if they rendered service, and deal out to them whatever was their requirement if they did not give that service.

Mr. DUNLOP: That is not the opinion of other people.

Mr. STOPFORD: I was in the position of sweating for two years under a condition of things that very few men would like to go through. I suggested that an adequate salary for these additional duties would be something like £250 per year. Cabinet approved of my recommendation, but reduced the salary to £100 per year. Cabinet looked upon the appointment in the light of an experiment, and said that, if Mr. Gall could pull the position around, he would then draw the higher salary I recommended.

Mr. DUNLOP: What year was that?

Mr. STOPFORD: I do not know the exact date; I did not come here prepared to speak on this matter, and the Home Secretary has access to documents which I have not. Speaking from memory, the position then was that Mr. Gall very reluctantly assumed the duties of Comptroller-General of Prisons for £100 a year. Really, what prompted him to do so was to relieve me of a certain amount of responsibility and anxiety rather than for the sake of the monetary gain attached to the position. I quite realised that Mr. Peirson was a man who could carry out the duties of superintendent of the Boggo Road Gaol, and that he would be sure to give very sympathetic treatment to the prisoners; but he required someone behind him to lend that stiffening influence to bring about that discipline so necessary in a gaol. Mr. Gall first said that he would take the position provided Mr. Peirson suffered no loss in salary. That was agreed upon. Mr. Gall's allowance has never been increased. The usual tightness of money has always been the excuse for not fulfilling this understanding, which really was not in the nature of a promise; but it was asserted that, if Mr. Gall did restore the discipline we had lost in the gaol, the allowance would be increased. I sincerely

[Mr. Stopford.]

hope that it will be increased. I had discussed the matter with the Treasurer, but the financial position was always the excuse for not increasing the allowance. In fairness to Mr. Gall, the hon. member for Rockhampton should first be possessed of a full knowledge of the facts before making an attack upon him. To-day we have a gaol which anyone can go through with the full knowledge that he will see discipline there. Let me give an incident that happened when I went through Boggo Road Gaol during the time escapes were so frequent. I became so worried that, together with Mr. Gall, I decided to go over to the gaol and see if we could unravel the cause. We could not do so. I had hardly entered the gaol when the roof was bombarded with stones, but no one was responsible for it. I had previously granted the prisoners permission to have a gramophone, and, as I was making my inspection, the tune "Show me the way to go home" was played—(laughter)—followed by "The Prisoner's Song." That is not all.

In one of the reports that came to the Home Office concerning a prisoner who had left without leaving his future address, it was disclosed that the warden concerned, in explaining the absence of this prisoner, said, "When I missed him, I said, 'Where's Denny?'" I expressed astonishment that he was in the habit of calling prisoners by their Christian names. That prisoner got as far as Sydney before he was recaptured; but even before that a lady telephoned from Fairfield inquiring if the prison authorities had mislaid a prisoner! (Laughter.) I think the appointment of Mr. Gall as comptroller was necessary, and I make no apology for saying that. If any apology is needed, it is that the remuneration was not sufficient. Whatever row may exist between the Home Secretary and the hon. member for Rockhampton—

The HOME SECRETARY: There is no row.

Mr. STOPFORD: They have ways of ventilating it. I speak for Mr. Gall, who has no other way of stating his case. As ex-Home Secretary I desire to pay a tribute to that officer of the Home Department, who served under me for seven years. I had from him loyalty, advice, ready assistance, and service, and the same will be at the command of the new Home Secretary. I only hope the hon. gentleman will exercise that common sense that we all seem to lack at the commencement. For instance, had the hon. gentleman been more experienced, I am sure he would not have promised an inquiry into the Dulcie Barclay affair—

Mr. DUNLOP: Why shouldn't it be held?

Mr. STOPFORD: As I have no access to the documents, I am not going to pass judgment on this matter—not even at the request of the hon. member for Rockhampton. There were many similar cases during my term of office in which no inquiry was held. At the same time, I never made a public statement to the effect that an inquiry would be held, and then, when I took the matter to Cabinet, had to back down on my original intention because certain strong interests were brought to bear on me. The law regarding inquiries is clear and definite. Representatives of certain newspapers waited on me and tried to force me to give a declaration that an inquiry would be held in certain cases. I always assumed the attitude that the police were the proper authorities to decide whether an inquiry should be held

or not, and that the public had the common right whereby any two of them might petition for an inquiry. If the Home Secretary is going to run round all the time looking for things that should be inquired into, then he will not have much time to do other work.

Dealing with the Estimates generally, the Home Department is a spending department, and it manages to get through a fair amount of money. I was a fairly good spender, both for the Government and for myself, and I have a certain amount of sympathy for the Home Secretary on this occasion, (because I happen to know the Treasurer. (Laughter.)

The TREASURER: You know he is a very good fellow.

Mr. STOPFORD: Yes; but I prefer to find out from experience. The Estimates for this department show an increase of only £13,000 on the amount appropriated last year. I can see the Treasurer, anxious to reduce that anticipated deficit—

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: There will be a lot of "U.E." before the end of the year.

Mr. STOPFORD: The Treasurer, anxious to make that anticipated deficit as little as possible, has carefully "blue-pencilled" what the Home Secretary required for the year.

[5 p.m.]

The TREASURER: What does the blue pencil mean?

Mr. STOPFORD: The Home Secretary has very high ideals. We all have. He started off building up fine schemes in his mind. He believes that we should have improved prisons. Then he prepares his Estimates, and asks for the necessary money; but the hard-hearted Treasurer, who has had a little conversation with the Commissioner of Taxes, and who has put the Deputy Stamp Commissioner on the Racing Commission, to see if he can find another means of raking in revenue, says, "Cut your Estimates down by £18,000." I say he cannot do it. I am only relating my experience. I can see the same thing going on to-day. I am not criticising the Treasurer; but I realise that he has blue-pencilled the Estimates of this department.

I would like the Home Secretary to answer me one question on this vote, if he will—I am sure he has the information there. I ask him what he has already spent on relief this year. He has allowed £30,000 for this purpose. I know my expenditure last year was fairly heavy, and my allocation was very small. There are many votes in this Estimate that should be increased. I notice particularly that the Government have made no provision for all those extra police that they used to rail at me about. The hon. member for Kurilpa used to picture all the dark corners around about Brisbane, and draw a painful picture of the lonely female going home, and how well protected her nerves would be if another policeman were appointed. The Home Secretary himself used to paint for me a painful picture of the danger of these unfortunate people who had to pass through Delaney's lane leading to the Melbourne Street railway station. I notice that he has made no provision on the Estimates for extra police. A careful analysis of the Estimates for three years will disclose that I at least was increasing the police force by a certain number each year. I think the Government are providing something in the vicinity of £4,000 extra for the

Mr. Stopford.]

police. What does that mean? Does it mean that we are going to have retirement at sixty-five years of age in the police force so that we shall not have such a wastage in the force? Does it mean that we are going to have forty-eight hours in the police force? There must be some reason why the Home Secretary has cut this Estimate down at the behest of the Treasurer.

The TREASURER: It may mean that the community is very much better behaved than they were previously.

Mr. STOPFORD: It may mean that your grievances were imaginary or political.

If you take the State Children Department, it will be seen that there is provision for an extra £4,000 odd in this vote. I want to know what is the intention regarding the State Children Department. Is there going to be an alteration in the matter of administration? I remember when you, Mr. Roberts, said that every State child in Toowoomba should have a foster father. You regarded me, Mr. Roberts, as one of the hardest-hearted people in the world because I did not put every one of them on the State Children Department. However, we shall discuss all these votes as they come before us. There is the vote for "Relief of Aborigines," for instance, for which £66,101 was voted last year. We cannot alter some of the votes because the items in them are protected by awards.

The hon. member for Toowong said that Brisbane was a dirty city.

Mr. MAXWELL: I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. STOPFORD: It certainly was a dirty city when the hon. member was mayor. I notice that the vote for the Health Department has been reduced by nearly £1,000 this year. I do not know whether the rat gangs have been dispensed with owing to there being now no danger from rats; yet the hon. member for Toowong got up and pleaded that this is a clean city.

The question of the hospitals is where the Treasurer and I ought to have a little heart-to-heart talk. I remember the Treasurer refusing on one occasion to take a cheque for £5,000.

Mr. POLLOCK: Don't rake that up again. (Laughter.)

Mr. STOPFORD: The Treasurer refused a sum in the vicinity of £5,000 for the Children's Hospital because it came from the "Golden Casket." I notice that the amount put down for hospitals is £196,908; but we know that they are costing a lot more. What does the Minister estimate will be the total expenditure for hospitals this year; and what will be the amount by which the hospital vote will have to be subsidised from the "Golden Casket"? I do not want the Minister to misunderstand me. I do not want it to go out that I am asking what amounts are allocated from the "Golden Casket" to different hospitals. I am asking what individual amounts will be allocated from "Golden Casket" money to relieve other revenue in the various hospitals. Hon. members are aware that we give an endowment of £2 for every £1 of bona fide donations and subscriptions during the year; and I would like to know what amount it will be necessary to take from "Golden Casket" funds to supplement the vote in order to give that endowment. As we are asking for other information on the first vote, I think

[Mr. Stopford.

we ought also to get this information. I shall have an opportunity of speaking with regard to the hospitals at a later stage.

Mr. ANNAND (*Toowoomba*): I regret that I have not had the opportunity of following the debate very closely, but I would like to say a word or two, more particularly as chairman of the Local Authorities' Association of Queensland. I would point out to the Home Secretary that the question of health inspection in Queensland is a burning subject with the local authorities concerned. When a local authority wants an inspector, the appointment has to be made by the Commissioner of Public Health. The position is that very often those men do not perform their duties to the satisfaction of the local authorities concerned—I say local authorities, because in very many instances they perform duties for more than one local authority. That is a very necessary work; and we know very well that it frequently happens that an inspector is called upon to condemn work on premises belonging to some member of a local authority. For this and other reasons the Commissioner holds that he should have the appointment and discharge of these men in his hands—that he should, in fact, have sole control over them. To a great extent I agree; but the local authorities feel that, when these health inspectors have not done their duty to the satisfaction of those local authorities, the latter should have the right to say that they should be relieved of their positions. I am told by the Home Secretary that in a Bill which is to be introduced very shortly dealing with local authorities attention will be given to this matter, and very many other matters of a like nature; but I should not like the opportunity to pass without speaking for the local authorities on the question, because I think that every year it has been discussed at our annual conference, and thence taken to the Home Secretary for his consideration.

Before concluding, I would like to add just a little eulogy of the officers of the Home Department. As Mayor of Toowoomba and chairman of the Local Authorities' Association of Queensland, I regret very much the personal attack which has been made on one of them. They are a body of men, I can assure hon. members, for whom the local authorities of Queensland have the highest respect. For many years before I was a member of Parliament I came in contact almost weekly with these officers, and I want to say right here on the floor of this Chamber how highly I appreciate their untiring work and the unfailing courtesy they have always shown to me in both the official capacities I have named.

Mr. KELSO (*Nundah*): I can assure the hon. member for Rockhampton that I shall not delay him any longer. He is very anxious to speak.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. KELSO: I want to second the suggestion made by the hon. member for Bulimba with respect to the extension of the baby clinic system, so that mothers can in certain districts take their children to branch clinics instead of having the nurses going round to the different houses. It would save a considerable amount of time. I am very pleased to be able to announce that the people of Kedron in my electorate have already taken steps to put such a system into operation.

At the Kedron Memorial Hall—a hall built as a memorial to the soldiers—there is a room dedicated to the use of returned soldiers free of charge, but at the other end of the building in the basement two rooms have been turned into one, and are being fitted out for the free use of the baby clinic. The committee is collecting money for the purpose of equipping the room, which I believe is the first of its kind in Queensland—the first in which this free service for the accommodation of a clinic has been offered. I am sure that the Home Secretary will be glad to know it, and I hope that this public intimation of the fact will be the means of stirring up other centres, not only in Brisbane, but also in other cities. It seems to me that it is a work which might very well be taken up by the progress associations, which are designed to look after the interests of their own centres, for it seems to me that it is certainly one of the finest movements in which they could take an interest. It would be a very great assistance to the mothers in enabling them to bring their children to a local centre properly fitted out with the necessary equipment, which it is very difficult to carry about from house to house. I commend the suggestion of the hon. member for Bulimba that we should put into active operation what has already been started in Kedron. I hope that this public pronouncement will lead other people to act in a similar capacity, which I think will be for the good of those for whom clinics are established.

Mr. DUNLOP (*Rockhampton*): I shall deal with the hon. member for Keppel when the Hospitals vote is being discussed. I wish to reply to the remarks made by the ex-Home Secretary, the hon. member for Mount Morgan. If he had been listening, he would have heard me say that I did not dispute the ability of Mr. Gall. I do not dispute it even now. He is a man of ability and organising power. What I did dispute, and rightly so, was the tone of his correspondence with me as mayor of Rockhampton. I do not care whether the Home Secretary or anyone else on the Government benches tolerated such a letter coming to me. The ex-Home Secretary regretted that I had made certain remarks, but no one need regret anything I say here. I have made up my mind that whatever I do here will be of a becoming nature. It is my firm determination to speak with emphasis. I look before I leap, and I offer no apology to anyone. What the ex-Home Secretary said was quite irrelevant. It was not my wish to attack Mr. Gall on the floor of the House under cover of parliamentary privilege. I wanted the Home Secretary to give the Under Secretary the right to reply to my letter outside, but the Home Secretary forced me to bring the matter up in this Chamber. He is to blame and not Mr. Gall. On another vote I voted in support of an amendment submitted by the Leader of the Opposition deploring the abuse of parliamentary privilege in this Chamber. Parliamentary privilege is abused in this Chamber, and the sooner that practice ceases the better. I do not believe in attacking a man behind his back. I believe in going right up to the cannon's mouth, face to face, and calling a spade a spade. (Laughter.) That is all that I wish to say on this occasion.

Mr. WINSTANLEY (*Queenton*): I firmly believe that the health of the community should be a matter of paramount importance,

and should be maintained at a high standard, no matter what else may sink into insignificance. I read with some interest the report of the Commissioner of Public Health dealing with diphtheria, typhoid, and other diseases prevalent in various parts of the State. It does not follow that we have reached a stage of perfection, nor does it follow that we cannot do much better in the future than we have done in the past. The Commissioner of Public Health, in his annual report, says *inter alia*—

“Typhoid inoculation is no substitute for sanitary precautions, and the more highly civilised the community and the better use made of the knowledge of sanitation the less typhoid fever results.”

I consider that to be very sound reasoning; in fact, I do not think anybody would question it for a moment. It is a well-known fact that bad sanitation is very often the direct cause of diseases, particularly of typhoid. I subscribe to the remarks of the Commissioner of Public Health, and I do so without any hesitation whatever. In another part of his report he deals with sanitation generally, and says—

“A steady advance in matters appertaining to sanitary executive continues throughout the State. This is evinced by the reports of the departmental officers and those of the local authorities' health inspectors, which are submitted to the department each month. These reports show that stricter supervision is being exercised, and that systematic inspection work is regularly carried out.”

He further states—

“The danger which is ever present of mosquito-borne diseases has been kept well in sight, and the enforcement of the regulations in respect to mosquito elimination has been constantly urged upon local authorities.

“The conduct of sanitary services throughout the State has received attention. With few exceptions these services are carried out by daylight, and are well conducted.”

There are some exceptions, and these exceptions should be eliminated. There was a time when the whole service was carried out during the night. It is better for the employees to conduct this rather disagreeable service in the daytime; but I question very much whether it is better for the community as a whole. I question very much whether the sanitary science of our city could not be of a higher order. Whatever other people may think about sanitary services, I do think that the open wagon is not a suitable vehicle for carrying out this service. They would be better if closed; and it does seem to be an obsolete method to permit uncovered wagons to be used for the work. Nothing could be more objectionable than to see an open wagon being used for the collection of the sanitary services. I question very much whether such a system can be regarded as an up-to-date sanitary system; but that system is to be seen in use regularly practically every day in the week in this so-called up-to-date city. That calls for improvement. When anyone goes out of the city and pays a visit to the seaside where the air is supposed to be rarified and the ozone so refreshing, it is quite a common occurrence to see the heavy artillery going along the strand once or twice during the

Mr. Winstanley.]

day in the shape of a sanitary wagon. That is a regular happening. When one goes away from the city he does so with a view of getting away from the odours of the city, and is not favourably impressed with the sanitary methods in vogue at the seaside. They are certainly not as up-to-date or as complete as they should be. There is room for considerable improvement in the sanitary services in this city. I hope those responsible will look into the matter, and see if some better system than the one now in operation cannot be brought into operation. We all know that the present methods are more up-to-date and more scientific than the methods of a few years ago. A few years ago Brisbane was the by-word of all the cities with respect to her bad sanitation and disgusting system for the disposal of night-soil. While I am very pleased at the improvement which has taken place, nevertheless I desire to see it brought more up-to-date and scientific.

I desire to say one or two words in connection with the Eventide Home in Charters Towers. It is not in my electorate, but in the electorate of the hon. member for Charters Towers. At the same time, it serves the purposes not only of one electorate but of the whole of North Queensland. The hon. member for Townsville suggested that any Northern inmates of Dunwich who desired to enter this home should be allowed to do so. The home was built largely for "Northerners" who in the past have regarded going down to Dunwich very much in the same way as going down to St. Helena. They regarded the two places as being not only near to each other geographically, but as being pretty close to each other in other respects. Quite a number of our old people would sooner die in the North than come to Dunwich; but, having nowhere else to go to, and no other choice, they had to come to Dunwich. I do not know how many persons would be affected; but, judging from the number who have made application for transfer from Dunwich to the Eventide Home at Charters Towers and others who also desire to be considered, it would not take long to have over one hundred persons on the spot. Unquestionably this institution will be a model of its kind, and I hope it will be able to live up to modern conditions. If the expectations are only realised, it will be a very fine home where those who go to live there can pass their declining days in peace, quietness, and comfort.

One grave mistake has been made in connection with this institution, and that is that electric light was not installed instead of gas. I drew attention to this matter as soon as I knew that gas was being fitted, and suggested in the proper quarter that a mistake was being made by not supplying electric light, which could have been made available from a small plant fitted at the institution, and would not have been any more expensive after the initial cost had been defrayed. Gas is not the most convenient form of lighting, particularly for elderly people, who, in returning to their quarters in the dark, find it decidedly inconvenient to bother with matches, and even to find the gas jet. All that trouble would be obviated were electric light installed, which would only require the mere switching on of the power.

In connection with this institution, a number of would-be pensioners wrote to me some months ago. I submitted their letters

[Mr. Winstanley.

to the Home Department, and was informed that, when forms were available, they would be sent to the writers of the letters. I do not know if that has been done; but, if not, I ask that prompt attention should be given to the matter. Those who have no home will find the Charters Towers institution much more comfortable and agreeable than Dunwich—not that I speak derogatorily of Dunwich, but the fact that North Queenslanders have not the opportunity of coming in more frequent contact with their friends and relatives whilst at Dunwich makes the Eventide Home a most desirable place from that point of view, as it is easily accessible to residents of the North. In conclusion, I trust that the expectations of those who have set the institution on its way will be realised, as it is certainly an acquisition to similar activities already existing in the State.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. C. Pearson, *Normanby*): I desire to compliment hon. members on both sides for the very valuable suggestions which have been submitted for consideration by the Home Department. I was amazed to hear some hon. members on the other side explaining the best way to meet difficulties in various branches of the department. I am sure the hon. gentlemen cannot be directing criticism against the department for the reason that the present Administration has not had ample opportunities of demonstrating the possibilities of extending the functions of the Home Department on account of the short period that it has held office, while, on the other hand, [5.30 p.m.] the stringency of the financial market makes it almost impossible for the most enthusiastic Minister to solve all the problems which have been overlooked during the past fourteen years.

Mr. STOPFORD: Where is all that capital that was going to come in when you were elected?

The HOME SECRETARY: I would inform the hon. member for Mount Morgan that I have it on the most reliable authority that even Mount Morgan will be resuscitated shortly, and hundreds more men will be employed there; and the Home Department will take fine care that the hon. member and his friends will not be allowed to put the fires out in that mine again.

Mr. STOPFORD: You are making a definite promise that 100 more men will be employed?

The HOME SECRETARY: I am assured by Mr. Boyd that certain experiments are being made there now, and they appear to offer prospects of success.

Mr. STOPFORD: One hundred more men will be employed?

The HOME SECRETARY: If the experiments are successful, Mr. Boyd expects that a large number of men will be employed in that area.

Mr. POLLOCK: We shall see what happens next year.

The HOME SECRETARY: Apart from party issues and party politics, let us hope that it may come to pass. When it comes to a show-down, what matters it which Government is in power so long as that Government is in a position to encourage enterprise, come out in the forefront, and give the right hand of fellowship so that the workers can receive employment?

Mr. STOPFORD again interjected.

The HOME SECRETARY: When the hon. member was speaking I carefully refrained from interjecting; and the least he can do is to extend the same courtesy to me.

Mr. STOPFORD: You said that I caused the fires to be withdrawn. You know that is a lie.

The HOME SECRETARY: I withdraw the statement. I want to be perfectly fair; but the hon. member made some suggestion about millions of money and a lot of men.

Mr. POLLOCK: He asked you when the capital was coming in, and you insulted him.

The HOME SECRETARY: I did not intend to insult the hon. member, and I ask him to accept my assurance on that point. I know the hon. member too well to want to insult him.

Mr. BRUCE: Boyd caused trouble.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member knows that lessons have been learned by all sides. We can all profit by experience, and let us hope that the learning of that lesson will help us to go forward to greater things.

The Leader of the Opposition asked a very pertinent and a very fair question with regard to the Dulcie Barclay inquiry. Amongst other things, the hon. member also referred to the question of Trades Hall deputations. I intend to deal with these matters briefly in order to show that the hon. member was not quite fair in his criticism in either direction.

Let us take the Dulcie Barclay case first. On the evening this girl had committed suicide there appeared in the afternoon papers a statement that the mother had demanded an inquiry. When the newspaper reporters came to me that evening, I, as Minister, was not in possession of any papers; but, thinking that the cries of a mother should be given effect to, I said, "Certainly there will be an inquiry so far as this department is concerned." During the next week, while the police were investigating, Mrs. Barclay, the mother of Dulcie Barclay, came to my office; and I want those hon. gentlemen who are fond of sneering and inferring certain things to remember that, despite party politics, there is still left in mankind some little human kindness. So far as I am concerned, I am not ashamed of any action I have taken in that matter, and I am pleased to say that my colleagues on the front bench are prepared manfully to stand behind me in this matter. First of all, when the newspaper reporters asked me if there was going to be an inquiry, in view of the mother's pathetic appeal I said "Yes"; but I was not aware, nor was anybody else aware at the time, whether the girl had been poisoned by somebody else or whether the poison was self-administered. During the following week the mother came to my office. She brought a little child with her—the child of Dulcie Barclay.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Don't put in "sob stuff."

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not want to put in any "sob stuff." I want to tell the truth. Hon. members opposite have referred to the case and made all sorts of insinuations outside the House about hon. members on this side of the Chamber. We have nothing to be ashamed of. The mother came

to me and said, "Mr. Peterson, can you prevent this inquiry? I am being crucified. My heart is breaking." You know exactly how a mother would feel in those circumstances. I said, "No, I cannot prevent the inquiry; it is beyond my power to do that, because at the present moment I am not sure, as Minister of this department, whether your daughter was poisoned by somebody else, or whether she did it herself." She went out of my room crying, taking the little child with her.

I now come to the police reports. What did the police reports say ten days afterwards? The Commissioner of Police shows clearly and conclusively that the cause of death of Dulcie Barclay was strychnine, self-administered. The doctor's certificate shows it, and the chemist's statement on the papers shows that he sold her the regulation dose of strychnine. Whether that is right or not is not for me to discuss.

Mr. STOPFORD: Will he be prosecuted?

The HOME SECRETARY: He cannot, because he sold the regulation dose. The Commissioner of Police has made a report—and, after all, what are officers like the Commissioner of Police for—what are inspectors of police for? Are not Ministers and members of Parliament to receive their advice in matters of this description?

Mr. STOPFORD: But you changed your opinion.

The HOME SECRETARY: Circumstances alter cases. The hon. member can pose as a paragon of virtue about not changing his opinion. What man in the world does not change his opinion on such matters as this?

Several OPPOSITION MEMBERS interjecting.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Committee has been asking for an explanation from the Minister in charge of the department. He is trying to make a most important statement, and I must ask hon. members on my left to give him a chance to make that statement.

Mr. STOPFORD: He refers to me as "you" all the time.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The HOME SECRETARY: I was trying to explain that the Commissioner of Police, after perusing all the reports of his officers, recommended to the department that no inquiry should be held, as it was a clear case of suicide. Inspector Meldon, who had charge of the investigations, also reported to the department that, in his opinion, it was not necessary to have an open inquiry, because it was clearly apparent that she had committed suicide of her own accord.

Mr. BRUCE: It was never proved that she had enough poison to do it.

The HOME SECRETARY: After that took place, Mrs. Barclay, the mother of the girl, came again to me and pleaded that there should be no inquiry. I sympathised with the woman in her affliction. A couple of months previously she had lost a married daughter, and now this daughter, Dulcie, had committed suicide, and the old lady herself so appealed to me—I am quite candid about it—that it went to my very heart-strings to see her in the agony she was in. After that I went through the papers, and saw there was overwhelming evidence of suicide. I did not think of what I had said to the newspaper reporters—I thought of that mother.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. C. Peterson.]

The HOME SECRETARY: I did not think of what hon. members might say about me. I considered that it was a clear case of suicide, and there was no ground for inquiry, and in that I was backed up by the Commissioner of Police and one of his chief inspectors. In order to make the position clear, so far as the Government was concerned—so that they would not be involved in it without knowledge—I took the matter to Cabinet, and Cabinet upheld my view that there was no necessity for an inquiry. We hold no brief for anybody. We have nothing to hide. So far as certain individuals are concerned, I do not know them—I never met either of them in my life—but the broad principles of humanitarianism in the case appealed to me; I felt that the evidence in favour of suicide was overwhelming, and that no inquiry was necessary, and therefore came to the conclusion that there was nothing else to do but change my opinion on the matter.

Mr. DUNLOP: What caused her to commit suicide?

The HOME SECRETARY: What caused the hon. member to get up in this Chamber and say he had seen the papers, and that in them the police recommended that an inquiry should be held? I challenge him to show one tittle of evidence to show that they recommended an inquiry.

Mr. DUNLOP: I offered to make a personal explanation, and I went to the clerk of the Parliament, and I was advised that it was inadvisable.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: You went to the police the day after you challenged me, and you found you were wrong.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The HOME SECRETARY: No inquiry was needed. It is certainly not my province to conduct investigations. The evidence was submitted to me, and any reasonable body of men would have given the same decision, in view of the repeated requests made by and on behalf of that mother.

Now let us go a little further with the matter. Certain clergymen published letters in the press, and I asked them to come and meet me and discuss the matter. I wanted to extend to them that courtesy. We discussed the case from various points of view. I put to them the aspect which I have already explained to hon. members, and those gentlemen told me that they sympathised with the position in which we found ourselves over the matter, and they went out of the room telling me that they would give me their decision in writing. The Attorney-General, in making his reply in the Committee the other night, evidently misunderstood what I had said. Those reverend gentlemen never on any occasion said that they were against an inquiry. The whole thing occurred in this way. The National Council of Women approached me and sent me a letter, which I referred to the Attorney-General. It was my mistake in explaining the matter to the Attorney-General—I was not clear enough in stating that it was from the National Council of Women, and that is where the mistake occurred so far as my colleague is concerned. I hope the Leader of the Opposition will accept my apology in that respect. The National Council of Women approached me, and it was they who came to that decision. These ladies were very interested, and they

looked at the matter from all angles—the danger to young girls in allowing the conditions to continue which led up to this occurrence, the other evils accruing from a position such as existed in this case, and so on. I discussed the whole matter with them, and put the mother's side to them, and, like mothers who sympathise with mothers, they agreed with my decision.

In order to show the attitude of the National Council of Women, let me read their letter of 14th October to the Home Department—

“After hearing the report from members of the executive of the National Council of Women of Queensland, who, at your request, attended your office on Saturday, 23rd September, to peruse and discuss the ‘evidence’ connected with the Dulcie Barclay case, the National Council of Women is of the opinion that it would not be wise to further insist upon the holding of an inquiry as requested by them in their letter of 13th September. The National Council of Women would, however, like action to be taken to prevent the holding of beauty competitions, as we entirely support your opinion that winning a beauty competition was a contributing factor in this case. It was therefore resolved at the council's meeting, held on the 11th instant, that the Home Secretary be asked to introduce legislation to prevent the holding of beauty competitions, as it is considered that the commercialising of beauty in such cases has a demoralising effect upon the competitors and the community generally.”

“We feel sure, judging from your sympathetic attitude regarding this matter, that you will do your best to persuade your Government to take early action to introduce this desirable legislation, thereby granting the request of the National Council of Women of Queensland, which council speaks for a large section of the women of Queensland.”

That is the position so far as those women were concerned. As soon as the facts were placed before them, they agreed that it was not necessary to hold an inquiry.

Let me go a step further. On the Saturday morning, the same day as the reverend gentleman met me at my office, two reporters from the “Truth” newspaper, with seven or eight other pressmen, came into my office, and one of the “Truth” reporters threw a paper on my table, and said, “Here is a demand for an inquiry under the 1886 Act.” The name of that man was Mr. J. F. Power. Out of the whole community in Queensland the only two persons who are anxious that an inquiry should be held into the death of Dulcie Barclay are two “Truth” reporters.

Mr. POLLOCK: The hon. member for Rockhampton, too.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member did not comply with the Act. He did not submit a demand signed by two persons eligible under the Act. The two “Truth” reporters were enterprising enough to do that; and they were quite within the law in so doing. As a result of that request, the law had to be put into operation. If the whole community is incensed over this matter, why was it left to two reporters of that paper to make the demand? I am not complaining about that paper doing it; that

[Hon. J. C. Peterson.

is part of their business. It is part of the business of a newspaper to get copy. I take no umbrage whatever at that.

Mr. DUNLOP: You said that the whole of the community was incensed. Be fair.

The HOME SECRETARY: I did not say that the whole community was incensed. What I do say is that the whole community is now interested in this question; and I believe that the best minds in the community are anxious to see that the causes which led up to this tragedy are not capitalised in the interests of any person. It is a big job to do that. It is a very easy matter to pass resolutions.

Mr. DUNLOP: In fairness to me, tell me about the Milton trouble.

The HOME SECRETARY: In fairness to the hon. gentleman—

Mr. DUNLOP: Tell us why the girl poisoned herself.

The HOME SECRETARY: I have tried to explain the position.

Mr. DUNLOP: Don't dodge it.

The HOME SECRETARY: On looking through the files of the department, I find that there have been quite a large number of cases of suicide and violent deaths into which no inquiries were held—not the slightest attempt to hold an inquiry. Why? Simply because the Commissioner of Police and his officers had certified that there were no suspicious circumstances.

Mr. DUNLOP: Two wrongs don't make a right.

The HOME SECRETARY: I agree with the hon. member. As to the future, I believe it would be safer and wiser to provide legislation permitting these matters to be dealt with by a tribunal once for all. I think it would be wise to institute the systems in force in other States, but not for the purpose of securing sordid matter and filth in order that the minds of the young people of the country may be poisoned by it—not that at all. If I have anything to do with introducing such a system here, I will endeavour to make provision that no individual shall capitalise that kind of thing.

Mr. DUNLOP: Do you think that is what I am after?

The HOME SECRETARY: I am not referring to the hon. member at all; I am speaking generally.

Mr. DUNLOP: Tell us about that Milton letter that made the girl poison herself, and about the fortnight she spent in a house at Milton!

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member knows full well that this case is sub judice, and that you, Mr. Roberts, would pull me up if I attempted to quote any of the evidence.

Mr. POLLOCK: Hear, hear! You shouldn't go into the evidence at all.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is so. If the hon. member for Rockhampton does not know the procedure and will not listen, he will have to be taught. If I attempted to quote anything in connection with the evidence in this case, the Chairman would rule me out of order.

The Leader of the Opposition complained that I refused to meet a deputation from

the Trades and Labour Council. I can assure the hon. gentleman that I had no intention whatsoever of being discourteous, and I again appeal to hon. members opposite who have waited on me in deputation to verify my statement that I have on many occasions gone out of my way at great personal inconvenience to myself to meet their personal convenience. I quite realise that every hon. member has a right to meet a Minister in deputation, and that it is only courtesy on the part of a Minister to accede to their requests. I had only been in office a week when the Unemployed Workers' Union approached me, and we had a very long conversation on unemployment matters generally. Later on I understand that the Trades and Labour Council met the Premier on the very question that they wanted to see me about. What necessity was there then to come to me? They did not come to see me first; they went to the Premier.

Mr. HYNES: They might have thought you would be more sympathetic.

The HOME SECRETARY: I endeavour to be as sympathetic as I possibly can. I realise to the full the trials and tribulations of the unemployed and all they have to go through; and so long as I hold my present position I shall do all that is in my power to endeavour to be fair and just to every section of the community deserving attention. I have looked up the matter, and find that there has been delay in regard to meeting these gentlemen; but I have issued instructions that they were to be met, and I will meet them on a date to be agreed upon. I am very sorry for this apparent lack of courtesy, which was not meant in any way.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: The correspondence shows that there was an unusual delay in the replies.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member knows as well as I do that after every election, and more particularly after a new Government ascends to power, there is a congestion of business in Government departments, and that delay occurs in dealing with business. Whatever delay there has been will be overcome. I shall arrange for the deputation to take place, hear what they have to say, and, if their requests are within reason, try to meet them.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: This letter is dated 23rd September, and they have received no reply yet.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. gentleman must realise, as I interjected when he was speaking on Thursday, that the ex-Premier refused to meet deputations from the unemployed because, as he stated, there are times when such action is justified in order to prevent "stunting." The hon. member knows perfectly well that the reason for this deputation was to prepare a "stunt" for the Federal elections.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: No, no!

The HOME SECRETARY: Stunt or no stunt, I decided not to meet them then.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: I did not know that was the objective; I can assure you of that.

The HOME SECRETARY: Be that as it may, I hope at a very early date that I shall be able to meet these gentlemen and discuss their problems with them.

Hon. J. C. Peterson.]

The Leader of the Opposition also referred to the abolition of the life term of imprisonment and the substitution of a determinate sentence.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: I referred to the question of fixing a determinate sentence.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is one of the legacies left behind by the hon. gentleman's party. Quite a number of things have been suggested this afternoon by hon. members opposite which they evidently shelved or shirked when they were the Government. Yet I am asked to do what they neglected to do.

Mr. BRUCE: That is no reason why you should not do it.

The HOME SECRETARY: Quite so, and I am not urging it as a reason.

Mr. POLLOCK: You are supposed to be put there to do the things we did not do.

The HOME SECRETARY: There is something in that.

So far as the representations of the Leader of the Opposition with regard to a man in his own district are concerned, I have submitted the matter to Cabinet. It is not the easiest thing to let prisoners out of gaol. Very properly judges have to be considered. In the cases brought forward I have already taken action, and hope to submit recommendations to Cabinet which I feel will meet the wishes of the hon. member.

The hon. member for Warrego made a very interesting speech on the question of health. He showed up deficiencies of the past and suggested remedies for the future. I shall certainly inquire into the case raised by him concerning the shire of Adavale and its water supply, and, if it is possible for the department to meet the hon. gentleman's wishes, that will be done. The hon. member, replying to an interjection, stated that the residents in that district had been suffering for six years, during which they have passed through troublous drought conditions. No doubt that experience has emphasised the necessity for an adequate water supply, and, if the question of finance, which must necessarily be involved, can be overcome, the matter will be remedied.

The metropolitan milk supply and the subject of adulterated milk generally came up for comment from the hon. member for Barcoo. Hon. members, of course, realise the importance of this problem, which affects not only Brisbane but other cities and towns. At the present time no definite scheme has been formulated by the Brisbane City Council in this connection; and it may be necessary for the Government at an early date to take steps to bring about some system of milk distribution throughout the metropolitan area in order to ensure a uniform supply of pure milk and minimise the possibility of adulteration.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: There are three different authorities, which is one of the difficulties.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes, there should be co-ordination of authorities on this important matter. I might mention that the Health Department has already been moving actively in dealing with delinquent milk vendors. I have authorised the expenditure of money for motor car service, so that inspections may be extended.

A large number of tests have been made in regard to the milk supply to ascertain

[Hon. J. C. Peterson.

if there is any danger of the bacilli of tuberculosis being present in our milk supply; and in every case, I am pleased to report, the result has been negative, show-

[7 p.m.] ing that, no matter what may be the condition of the milk supply in other parts of the world or in the other States, so far as we have gone up to the present we have a pure milk supply, not only in Brisbane, but in other towns in Queensland from that point of view, which is one of the most dangerous points of our infant life. Consequently, I think the Government are deserving of credit for taking steps in this direction. The Home Department intends to pursue that policy, and to see that, as far as possible, the children and adults of the State are supplied with the purest milk possible.

The hon. member for Barcoo gave a very good argument as to why we should have sealed milk cans. Certainly it looks good on the face of it; but a sealed milk can test has been tried out; and this is what has occurred in that connection. I am credibly informed by officers in the Health Department that cases have been brought under their notice where employees, in distributing the milk, as soon as the sealed can is half empty, take the can to a tap and allow water to run in with the can upside down. It will, therefore, be seen what a difficult matter it is to deal with milk adulteration. I unhesitatingly say that the penalties should be greater than have been inflicted in the past. Some magistrates take a very severe view of adulteration, while others take a lenient view. In the near future an Act should be devised setting out specific penalties, which should be very high in order to protect the health of the community. The department is acting on those lines, and we shall do our best within our means to secure a pure milk supply. However, it is gratifying to learn from the efforts of the Health Department that we have as pure a milk supply as we have. It is a grand thing to know that, so far as tests have gone, there is an absence of tuberculosis bacilli. That in itself is the cause for much congratulation, and, if I am spared to live till the next discussion of these Estimates, I hope we shall be able definitely to prove, as far as the Brisbane supply at any rate is concerned, that householders and others need not be worried on that score.

The hon. member for Barcoo put forward a very good contention, and he asked in conjunction with maternity hospitals that there should be a nurse qualified in pre-natal and post-natal obstetrics. That is a very good idea. With that end in view, maternity nurses are now called upon to qualify in that direction; and, as vacancies permit, those who go into maternity hospitals will be qualified in this very important work. It is remarkable that in times gone by, although a nurse may have been a competent midwife, she might know absolutely nothing as to how to rear a delicate baby; and anything we can do in that direction will be done.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: That system is already in operation.

The HOME SECRETARY: I know it is; but I was referring to the hon. member's impression that it was not in operation. We are going to follow the lines laid down by the previous Home Secretary. I think it is a very good thing, and I shall carry it out.

The hon. member for Townsville referred to the report on child welfare. I am sure that those of us who have read that report are pleased that the crusade for child welfare in Queensland has made for a better condition of child life in the different homes here. We hope as time goes on to amplify the system, and to have Queensland in the proud position of having the lowest child mortality in the Commonwealth.

The hon. member for Townsville asked that transfers should be arranged for old people at Dunwich to the Eventide Home in the North. The other day I was at Dunwich, and saw an old man lying in bed. Many hon. members know him; his name is Peter Aldridge, and he wishes to be sent up to the Eventide Home in Charters Towers. He was anxious to get home to the North near the fields where he worked in days gone by. I understand that the Eventide Home is capable of housing from 100 to 150 people, and at the present time there are only about thirty or forty who have applied to get into the home. That home was established by the late Home Secretary, to whom it is a monument, for the purpose of housing the aged people north of Townsville. All I can say is that, if the aged people of the North do not take advantage of that Eventide Home, then the door is open for others from Dunwich and other places to be transferred if they desire to get up to that centre. Hon. members will realise that, being a purely Northern home, in following on the lines of the ex-Home Secretary we should endeavour to place as many as possible there from the North. I understand they struck a line north from Townsville.

Mr. WELLINGTON: Mackay.

The HOME SECRETARY: If the aged people in the North do not wish to avail themselves of the opportunity, we shall have to accede to the wishes of the hon. member for Townsville and other hon. members who have spoken in a similar strain.

The hon. member also referred to the removal of certain people from hospital boards. He ought to know that those gentlemen who have been removed from the hospital boards should have resigned, and quite a number did resign on their own account. They recognised that they were appointed as representatives of the Government, so they resigned. By no stretch of imagination could the hon. member say that the gentlemen whom he mentioned represent the policy of this party so far as hospitals are concerned.

Mr. HYNES: But they were doing the work on the board. As a matter of fact, one was chairman of the Townsville Hospital Board.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am not complaining about that at all. All I say is that the Hospitals Act specifically provides for a certain number of Government representatives—not Opposition representatives—there is no provision in the Act for that at all. On no occasion have hon. members opposite nominated one supporter of this party on a hospital board.

Mr. STOPFORD: Was the late Maurice Baldwin a supporter of this Government?

The HOME SECRETARY: In reply to the ex-Home Secretary, no other hon. member on this side has any knowledge that Mr. Baldwin had any connection with this party. When the hon. gentleman was in office he

did not accept nomination from any member of this party.

Mr. HYNES: Some of them were Government employees. It was the practice of the Government to appoint the police magistrate, if possible. The past Government had Mr. Byrne representing them on the board in Townsville for many years.

The HOME SECRETARY: All I can say is that the Government wish to see the hospital policy succeed. We are going to formulate a new policy; and we claim the right to appoint as our representatives men who will uphold our policy. We make no apology for doing that.

Mr. STOPFORD: That is all right in the case of a new man.

The HOME SECRETARY: In every case all nominations made to a hospital board in the time of the late Government—and I have the list here—were made on the recommendation of hon. members opposite.

Mr. FOLEY: Where is this policy going to lead?

Mr. MAXWELL: Where did it lead you people?

The HOME SECRETARY: I am glad of that interjection. So far as we are concerned, it is going to lead to this—that we shall have men who support our policy on the boards, because we are responsible.

Mr. STOPFORD: Is the Hospitals Act your policy?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask the Minister not to take so much notice of interjections; and I ask hon. members on my left not to interject. The reply of the Minister is really being converted into a reply to interjections, and not to the speeches of hon. members.

The HOME SECRETARY: The next matter to which I wish to refer is the question of segregating mentally deficient children. The hon. member for Kurilpa, the hon. member for Bulimba, and several hon. members on this side of the Chamber have expressed themselves as in favour of a home for mental deficients. It is a matter of vital interest to this State. I am afraid, however, that very few members of the Committee realise the conditions in our asylums at the present moment. They fail to visualise the state of affairs at a place like Dunwich, where people go in their old age, and where those who are mentally deficient have been kept during the past fourteen years—

Mr. STOPFORD: Before that, too!

The HOME SECRETARY: Never mind that. I claim that in the prosperous times which occurred during the last fourteen years the question of mental deficients should have been dealt with.

Mr. STOPFORD: Why did you not voice it when you were over there before?

The HOME SECRETARY: Why did I not voice it? A voice crying in the wilderness! The hon. member is a humane man, whose administration in many cases has shown him to be sympathetic; yet he got up in this Chamber this afternoon and asked that mental deficients should be provided with homes! We have to realise that we have been handed down a legacy by our predecessors. We propose to tackle the subject at the right time; but I ask hon. members

Hon. J. C. Peterson.]

if it is a fair thing that down amongst these old people at Dunwich there should be housed blacks, Chinese, all classes of coloured people, and mental deficient in addition. I am wholly in accord with the views of deputations that have waited on myself and the Government generally and asked us to establish a home for mental deficient where they may be treated and segregated. I hope the hon. member will help me to bring about that result; but, just as the hon. member rightly said that he was always up against a Treasurer in his own Administration, so are members on this side up against a Treasurer—not because he is a hostile Treasurer, but because he is a Treasurer who cannot give them £50,000 when he has only £20,000. The position financially is acute, but I shall do my utmost.

I feel convinced that the Government will do their utmost to establish a home for mental deficient as soon as the financial position becomes easier. When hon. members propose the establishment of such a home, it is well to reflect for a moment, and to realise the causes that operate rendering such a home necessary. Reflect for a moment on the mental wrecks housed in our asylums, and the men and women reduced to a state of degradation—almost lower than animals—conditions that prevail in different parts of the State. When we consider the establishment of a home for mental deficient, we must realise the circumstances operating in the direction of compelling the establishment of such an institution; we must probe the problem to the bottom if we are to solve it.

Mr. STOFFORD: Where is all this capital that was to come into this State on the election of your Government?

The HOME SECRETARY: Where is all this capital! Four months in office! The Labour Party were in power for fourteen years, and established a record in the creation of unemployment in Queensland. If our Government are not able to show a better record after a period of three years, then, as the hon. member for Bowen has stated, we deserve to go out.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: You will, too.

The HOME SECRETARY: Then we shall have to accept the position. The problem of the mental deficient has exercised the great medical minds of the world, and, speaking as a layman, the only way in which we can solve the problem is to deal with the causes that lead up to it. What are the causes? I make the solemn statement that, unless we can grapple successfully with the venereal disease problem, we are not going to achieve the success anticipated by the establishment of a home for mental deficient.

Mr. DUNLOP: What about an amendment of the marriage laws?

The HOME SECRETARY: I am not referring to that just now. This matter should be considered in conjunction with the Health Department. At an early date we should make it compulsory that every boy and every girl on leaving school, or perhaps at a little later stage, should receive a thorough training in sex hygiene at the hands of medical officers. At the present time these matters are treated with contempt; they are kept under cover and approached in a manner which indicates that they should be hushed up. Hon. members should realise

the position presented by our asylums and by the mentally deficient. If we are to safeguard the mental faculties and the health of the children in the future, then we shall have to realise our responsibility, and not be content with the present smug hypocrisy in connection with matters of this kind. Legislation should be introduced. We have a great problem before us in the saving of people from lives of mental anguish such as we witness in all our asylums to-day. Action should be taken by the Government as early as possible; and a start will be made along those lines by the establishment of a home for mental deficient.

Mr. STOFFORD: You should try to redeem your promises to the mentally efficient.

The HOME SECRETARY: Our promises will be redeemed in accordance with the policy of the Government, and when we require the advice of the hon. gentleman he will be called in.

The next subject I desire to deal with is that of the appointment of women police. That is a subject that has agitated the minds of social workers who have taken a keen interest in the matter. The matter was referred to this afternoon by the hon. member for Bulimba. A deputation waited upon me in connection with the matter; but, unfortunately, the Government found it necessary to turn down the proposal on account of financial stringency; but that does not indicate that the subject will be entirely forgotten. No doubt, when the financial position improves, the Government will take steps to try out the system of women police in Queensland. There is no doubt that in certain circumstances women police are of greater advantage than male policemen. However, we can deal with the subject when the occasion arises.

In reply to the charges made by the hon. member for Rockhampton against the Under Secretary of the department, I endorse thoroughly the views expressed by the ex-Home Secretary, the hon. member for Mount Morgan. I have known Mr. Gail for the past fifteen years. I can honestly endorse the remarks made by the hon. member for Mount Morgan with regard to that gentleman.

Mr. DUNLOP: Do you endorse the tone of that letter?

The HOME SECRETARY: I will take the responsibility when it comes to me. I am not going to shirk this matter, nor am I going to permit the hon. member to treat the officers of my department with disrespect.

Mr. DUNLOP: I did not question his ability at all.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member for Rockhampton wrote a very impertinent letter addressed to me reflecting on the officer concerned and the rotten state of affairs existing in the department. In order to get at the truth of the matter, I had nothing else to do but submit the letter to the Under Secretary. The Under Secretary made a reply, and he asked me to send that reply to the hon. member for Rockhampton, who, because he got back a little more than he bargained for, is now squealing.

Mr. DUNLOP: I gave him a Roland for his Oliver.

The HOME SECRETARY: So far as I am concerned, I want the hon. member for

Rockhampton to understand that, although he may brag and boast that he can bluff people, he cannot bluff me. If he wants to quarrel with my officers and insult them, then I am going to stand by them.

Mr. DUNLOP: Do you endorse the tone of that letter?

The HOME SECRETARY: If the hon. member for Rockhampton is going to take up the stand in this Chamber—

Mr. DUNLOP: I am prepared to take it up outside with you.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member for Rockhampton is not worth it. The hon. member invited the reply he received from the Under Secretary, and, having asked for what he received, he must put up with it.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: He will want a doctor soon.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member for Merthyr referred to the use of arsenate of lead which is being used as a spray on cabbages that are being supplied to the public through our markets. The Health Department has been very vigilant in this matter. It has caused the confiscation of a very large number of cabbages during the last five months. Indeed, the officers of that department have been very active. I quite agree with the hon. member that there should be some prohibition of the use of arsenate of lead on vegetables supplied to the people, and, if there is no power to prohibit it, power must be sought. We cannot risk the lives of people because of some desire to get rid of a few caterpillars and slugs.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: There are some regulations dealing with the matter in the Department of Agriculture. You can amend those regulations if they do not assist you now to deal with the position.

The HOME SECRETARY: Does the hon. gentleman infer that the Health Department has one job to do, and at the same time the Department of Agriculture advises farmers how to get rid of slugs and snails by the use of arsenate of lead?

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: No. They have no power to use a mixture above a certain standard. It all depends at what stage of growth the mixture is used.

The HOME SECRETARY: I have seen atrocious abuse of the use of arsenate of lead, and, were it not for the vigilance of the Health Department, there would be sorry tales to tell.

The hon. member for Keppel advocated the establishment of a home in Rockhampton for the aged, and suggested that the buildings now used as a women's hospital, but which is being vacated, should be used for the purpose. I agree with the policy of decentralisation in regard to the care of the aged. The hon. member for Mount Morgan, when Home Secretary, established the Eventide Home at Charters Towers, which was a step in that direction. I hope that, as soon as the finances permit, the Cabinet will agree to the establishment of a home for the aged in Rockhampton.

Mr. STOPFORD: You should also consider the building of a home for the incurables in Rockhampton.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is a suggestion worthy of consideration. Such a

building would obviate transferring incurables from the Central district to the Diamantina Hospital in Brisbane.

Mr. STOPFORD: You have a wonderful benevolent society in Rockhampton.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is another aspect in connection with our aged that could be considered. There is no doubt that the Central district is entitled to such a home, and I hope that, as soon as finances permit—I feel confident—the Government will do the fair thing.

The hon. member for Mount Morgan wanted to know the expenditure on relief during this financial year. Between 30th June and 30th September between £27,000 and £30,000 was spent in relief. That sum will be considerably augmented from time to time in order to meet the exigencies of the case.

With regard to the information sought concerning hospitals and "Golden Casket" funds, I cannot provide the particulars off-hand, but will furnish the information before the Estimates of the department go through.

The hon. member for Toowoomba referred to the power of the Health Department over the health inspectors. We are prepared to give reasonable consideration to the claims of the local authorities in this matter, and hope that any difficulties that exist in this direction may be overcome. In consultation with the departmental officers we hope to come to a decision that will meet with the wishes of not only the Government, but of the local authorities concerned.

The health laws concerning mosquitoes and sanitary arrangements were referred to by the hon. member for Quentoon. So far as the Health Act permits, every avenue will be explored to see that these matters are attended to. I hope that the public generally will realise that they, too, have responsibilities, because in this matter of mosquito eradication there is too much dependence upon Government departments.

Mr. KIRWAN: Local authorities are the worst offenders. They may neglect to deal with a swamp under their control whilst at the same time they insist on householders screening their tanks.

The HOME SECRETARY: I agree with the hon. member that that may happen; but at the same time the people should see to it that the problem is dealt with by their particular council. After all, the question is not one for the Home Department alone, but should be grappled with seriously by councils concerned, in order that progress may be registered in the work of mosquito eradication, and to see also that the sanitary laws are rigidly adhered to.

Reverting to the matter of the Eventide Home in order to reply to the hon. member for Quentoon, we shall do our best to see that the aged at Dunwich who desire to get to Charters Towers are considered in their turn after those in the North are accommodated.

As the discussion proceeds no doubt hon. members will desire more information, which I shall be pleased to give on the subsequent votes.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH (*Mackay*): I was interested to hear the Minister's explanation regarding the inquiry into the Barclay case. It appears that the hon. gentleman first spoke without thinking, and that, after

Mr. Smith.]

thinking, he decided to take different action. If his explanation means anything, it means that. The point, however, that has emerged from the whole business is that the Government should seriously consider the advisability of amending the law so that those situations will not again develop.

I am glad to note that the Minister, after looking up the correspondence in the matter, has seen that there has been a certain oversight in regard to the correspondence from the Trades and Labour Council, and that he will receive a deputation from that body along the lines that are asked for.

My principal reason, however, for rising to speak is in regard to the extraordinary statement that the Minister made in regard to hospital administration in this State. The hon. gentleman stated definitely that he intends to introduce a new hospital policy into Queensland. We shall deal with that policy when it comes before the Chamber, but for the present I would remind the hon. gentleman that, if he thinks he can introduce a policy relating to the hospitals of Queensland and run them through his particular political organisations, he is making a departure that no State in Australia has ever made.

Mr. MAXWELL: He never said that.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: Hospitals are the concern of the whole people. They are institutions provided for sick, the injured, and the distressed; and no question of political opinions should enter into their administration.

When vacancies fall due on these boards I can understand the Government appointing a suitable nominee on the recommendation of the local member. There is nothing wrong with that at all, provided they [7.30 p.m.] are prepared and have the capacity to carry out their responsibilities on those boards; but if the Minister's words mean anything at all, they mean that he intends to introduce a hospital policy, and the nominees on these boards will be nominees taken from the political party that he represents. I want to take this opportunity of seriously warning him against adopting such a policy. Where is it going to end? That is the real question. If the Minister is prepared to take up this line of activity, how far does he propose to go with it? He has just enunciated a line of activity that is alien to the administration of the law of this country, or any part of the British Empire. He has enunciated candidly and callously the Tammany gospel of the United States of "the spoils to the victors." In effect, he says that all bodies of public or semi-public character shall be appointed from the nominees of his political party. In some cases it has been done before now, both in this and in the other States, but it is the first time that I have heard any Minister rise in his place in this House and say that he intends in future to adopt the policy of "the spoils to the victors" and a policy of hospital control by the political nominees of his party.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is what your Government did.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: If he thinks he can run the public institutions of this State by people who are political nominees hostile to the organised workers of this State, then he is going to meet with a great deal of trouble in his future administration. He has said that the past Government did these

[Mr. Smith.

things. I can call to my memory many committees appointed by the last Government. What happened in connection with the Children's Hospital in Brisbane? For years the Children's Hospital and the General Hospital in Brisbane were a disgrace to the capital city of the State. They were continually short of the necessary funds to carry on the work of these institutions. They could not get money; the buildings were ill-equipped; and everything left very much to be desired. At one period the committee resigned, and the Home Secretary of the day, Mr. McCormack, had to appoint a committee. Did the committee that was appointed to take charge of the hospital until it was boarded consist of political partisans? I do not suppose there were more than two supporters of the Labour Party on that committee. The members were chosen from men and women who had at heart work of this kind—public-spirited men and women who were prepared to do their bit in the interests of the unfortunate children who had to be treated in that institution. Only an hon. member with a heart of stone could think of running these institutions on a political basis. I have been over the Children's Hospital, but I have not been able to go through the whole building on one visit. One ward is enough for any man who is sympathetic. The hon. member for Toowoong was one member of that committee. I wish to raise an emphatic protest against the political control of the hospitals. Hospitals are intended for the sick and injured members of the community; and the committee should be composed of people who are willing to give their time in that noble service to the community. Where vacancies occur on a hospital board, or any other board, in regard to the Government representatives, I do not object at all to the Minister of the day asking the member for the district who are suitable persons to fill those vacancies; but the idea that, for no reasons at all other than political reasons, the Government should ruthlessly gazette these committees out and put in political nominees of their own is a form of callous conduct that I will oppose so long as I am a member of this Parliament.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. C. Peterson, *Normanby*): I am amused at the mock sincerity of the hon. member. I shall show this hon. member who is opposed to what he calls political influence on hospital committees what has been done in the past by his own Government. I shall read out a list of Government representatives on hospital committees, and I challenge the hon. member to say they are not partisans belonging to his party.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: Can you show where we gazetted men out for political reasons? That is what I say you are doing.

The HOME SECRETARY: This straight gentleman proposes to stand for what he calls freedom of political opinion in these institutions. Why, I am only following out the dictum laid down by himself!

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: You are not. We never gazetted any one out for political reasons.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member knows as well as I do that the Hospitals Act provides for representatives of the Government—not of his party. The Act specifically mentions representatives of

the Government. The hon. members knows that as well as I do. Did he cast his eyes round when he wanted representatives? Where did he get them from? Let us take Maryborough. The first board comprised Charles Henry Adam—

Mr. CLAYTON: A Labour man.

The HOME SECRETARY: Phillip Brophy, William Halliwell Demaine, James Edgar McCleer—all Labour—Frederick W. O. Short—not one single member supporting this side of the House.

Mr. CLAYTON: The Australian Labour Party recommended them all.

The HOME SECRETARY: Let us go further to show the insincerity of hon. members opposite. Take the Central Burnett Hospital Board—William Krueger, John Moore, William C. V. Turner, William Alfred Wharton. Were they supporters of this party?

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: Was anybody gazetted out to create a vacancy?

The HOME SECRETARY: No—

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: It is political persecution.

The HOME SECRETARY: No, for the simple reason that the hon. member had not the common decency to appoint other than those of his own party as Government representatives. The hon. member forgets that the reason why we gazetted them out is that they were all members of his party. If ever any leader of a party established the principle of Tammanyism, the hon. member did. However, there came a day of reckoning, and we are now on this side of the House.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: You are the only one on that side of the House who is prepared to do it.

The HOME SECRETARY: Take the Kilkoy Hospital Board—John Grehan, James Gillies, John Joseph Walsh, Michael McAtee—not a single member supporting the policy of this party.

Mr. HYNES: What proof have you got of that?

The HOME SECRETARY: I know who nominated them. When there was a vacancy on the Brisbane and South Coast Hospital Board, did the hon. member pick a business man? Did he look round to get somebody who did not agree with him in politics? No, he selected a member of his own side—Mr. Lloyd, the late member for Kelvin Grove.

Mr. DUNLOP: Who nominated the members of the Rockhampton Hospital Board?

The HOME SECRETARY: Mr. Farrell, the ex-member for Rockhampton, nominated Mr. Kelly.

Mr. DUNLOP: Who nominated the rest? I challenge you to prove any nomination.

The HOME SECRETARY: Take the Townsville Hospital Board—Francis P. J. Byrne—

Mr. HYNES: A Government servant.

The HOME SECRETARY: But that did not alter his Labour views. Then George Sims Edwards. Then there is the Gladstone Hospital Board—Arthur Thomas Power, William O'Reilly, William Ross, Edward Matthew Breslin. Can anybody opposite tell me that there was one Opposition supporter gazetted on that board?

Mr. STOPFORD: How do we know? (Laughter.)

The HOME SECRETARY: Let us take the Bundaberg Hospital Board—Albert William Baker, Benjamin Courtice, Stephen George Crooks, and John Laurison—not a single supporter of this side was put on there.

Mr. BARBER: Why didn't you appoint Cattermull? I nominated him.

The HOME SECRETARY: Because we have got people just as good as Cattermull. Then take the Cairns Hospital Board—Laurits Ingvard Jeppesen, editor of the Labour paper, and John Campbell. Take the Gympie Hospital Board—John Francis Donovan, Daniel Price, Walter Gordon Schmidt, and Cornelius Daniel O'Keefe. If hon. members opposite are sincere in their statement that they would not consider politics at all, why is it that on these boards the Government representatives were all supporters of hon. members opposite? (Opposition interruption.)

The hon. member had something to say again about the Barclay inquiry. He seemed to be annoyed that I said that there was going to be an inquiry, although the Commissioner of Police had made a recommendation against it. Let me quote to the hon. member a case in point. Does he remember the case of ex-Constable Kyle, who was dismissed from the police force? He was dismissed on the evidence of a prostitute—in a matter that concerned his livelihood. Many decent-minded people sent a petition to the Minister and the Government asking for an inquiry into that case, yet it was refused. The hon. member refused that man the right to show that he had been wronged.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: You do not know what you are talking about.

The HOME SECRETARY: It has since transpired that that same prostitute made a sworn statement that she lied; yet not one attempt was made by the ex-Home Secretary to have that inquiry reopened and give that man a chance to show that he was right. An inquiry is going to be held into that case, and also into other cases where police were "dumped."

Mr. STOPFORD: Like Moloney to Townsville?

The HOME SECRETARY: What about that? Has not the Commissioner the right to transfer?

Mr. STOPFORD: The action of a coward.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I understood that the hon. member for Mount Morgan applied to the Minister the word "coward."

Mr. STOPFORD: No—the action of a coward.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to withdraw.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: And apologise.

Mr. BRUCE interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to withdraw the word "coward."

Mr. STOPFORD (*Mount Morgan*): Are you going to deal with him (indicating Mr. Bruce)?

The CHAIRMAN: I will deal with him.

Mr. STOPFORD: Who has the floor?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has the floor.

Mr. Stopford.]

Mr. STOPFORD: I withdraw. Let him have "a go."

The CHAIRMAN: I can quite understand the occurrence in the temper of the Committee at the moment; but I think that the ex-Home Secretary, when he comes to reflect, will realise that in the position he occupies in this Committee he is not playing the game honourably with an opponent, and I ask him to withdraw the remark without any reference to an hon. member behind him.

Mr. STOPFORD: I withdraw, without any reference to an hon. member behind me. (Laughter.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. STOPFORD: I withdraw.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. C. Peterson, *Normanby*): Let me continue.

Mr. STOPFORD: I thought you were going to deal with him. (Laughter.)

The HOME SECRETARY: Let me ask the honourable the Leader of the Opposition—since he is so keen about inquiries—why that officer was deprived of the right to an inquiry?

Mr. STOPFORD: Ask the Commissioner of Police. You have the papers.

The HOME SECRETARY: We have; and that officer is going to have an opportunity to prove whether he was right or wrong.

Mr. STOPFORD: Who deprived him of the right?

The HOME SECRETARY: It was refused time and time again.

Mr. STOPFORD: By whom?

The HOME SECRETARY: By your Government. It was brought up here in this Chamber, and the Leader of the Government, Mr. McCormack, read a statement by that prostitute. That man was kicked out of his job for seven years on the evidence of that woman. Since that time another statement has been made by that woman saying that she lied.

Mr. STOPFORD: What year was that?

The HOME SECRETARY: I will give the year later. It was about seven years ago.

Mr. STOPFORD: It was not in my time.

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not know whether it was in the hon. member's time or not. All I can say is that the inquiry was refused. The Government—the Premier at the time—would have been well advised to grant the inquiry, although in the first place they refused it.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: It was a detail of the administration for the Commissioner's office.

The HOME SECRETARY: In this case the refusal came from the Premier. The records show that. I am sure that no hon. member in this Chamber would be willing to subscribe to the doctrine of persecution of this type aimed at officers.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: If an injustice has been done to Kyle or to anybody else, then I support any action being taken to rectify that injustice.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am glad to have the assurance of the hon. gentleman on that point. A long period has elapsed, and

[*Mr. Stopford.*]

this officer has suffered tremendous mental strain in the meantime. There are other cases, but it is questionable whether they are as strong as the case of Kyle. There may come a time when it is not apparent that an inquiry should be held; but there also comes a time when fresh circumstances demand that an inquiry should be held, as will be done in this case. When the whole matter is sifted to the bottom, I am sure that hon. members will unanimously agree that the Government did the fair thing in the circumstances.

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*): I desire to discuss the policy of constituting hospital boards and committees retreats for Nationalist supporters. I am not going to argue, and never have argued, that a member representing a certain district should be refused the right to nominate a political supporter if he thinks he is the best man. I do not take that stand at all, but I do take the stand that the Labour Government, when in office, never did gazette or consider the gazetting of Nationalist supporters from hospital committees or boards, and I should be surprised if the Home Secretary is able to find to the contrary even in one case.

Mr. KENNY: You did not appoint any of our supporters to the boards in the first place; consequently you could not gazette any off the boards.

Mr. POLLOCK: Mr. Roberts, you mentioned earlier that the Home Secretary was making an important statement. I am now making an important statement. I take it that my statements are as important as those of the Home Secretary. I have the same rights in this Committee as he has.

Mr. FRY: The Minister can speak as many times as he likes, but you can't.

Mr. POLLOCK: I claim the same right to be heard when I am speaking. If the Home Secretary peruses the papers in his department, he will not find any instance—certainly none to my knowledge—where Nationalist supporters have been gazetted off hospital boards by our Government.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: They were never put on the boards.

Mr. POLLOCK: That is a very poor and lame excuse.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: It is a fact.

Mr. POLLOCK: There were a large number of hospital committees in existence in Queensland before the Labour Government came into office, and they were fully represented by Nationalist supporters. In fact, there were none of our supporters on the committees before the Labour Party came into office. Therefore, after we assumed control of the Government, we could have had these men removed. Take, for instance, the most important hospital committee—the committee controlling the Brisbane General Hospital. The Labour Government appointed three representatives to that committee. They were Mr. Maurice Baldwin, whose politics nobody knew, if he had any. I do not think they were Labour; I am not prepared to say what they were. I do not think they were ever questioned.

Dr. KERWIN: He was a good man.

Mr. POLLOCK: He was a good man. Then there was Mr. Chuter, of the Home Secretary's office, of whose politics I have no knowledge and care less about. Then

there was Mr. Mackay, of whose politics I have no knowledge either; nor do I think the department had any knowledge of the politics of these men when making the appointments; nor do I think their politics would have been considered if the Government had any knowledge of them. Let me now proceed to the attitude that I adopted at Winton, where we had a very difficult position to handle. It was represented to me on all sides by Labour supporters that I should urge the Government to appoint Labour men to the Winton hospital committee. Yet nothing of the sort was ever done or attempted.

I do not believe that hospital committees should be made refuges for supporters of either the Nationalist or the Labour Party. I believe that the Government should get the best men for those committees. Their job is to look after the sick; and, where a dispute exists on a committee, it should be the desire of the Government to have such representatives on the board as to obtain from both parties the real truth of the difficulties.

The HOME SECRETARY: Don't you think that when the Government find a large proportion of the finance they should have representatives to see that their policy is carried out?

Mr. POLLOCK: You secure that by appointing National Party political hacks.

The HOME SECRETARY: There were more hacks of the hon. member's party appointed by his Government.

Mr. POLLOCK: I do not believe in the principle. The Labourites at Winton endeavored to persuade me to appoint a Labour supporter as Government representative on the hospital committee at Winton, but I made a recommendation to the Government that they appoint Mr. Schwarten, the local clerk of petty sessions. He was appointed, and has proved himself an excellent representative. I do not know, and I do not care, what Mr. Schwarten's politics are. The man has been able, and has always supplied to the Government a complete résumé of what is being done by the Committee. That, I take it, is the duty of a Government representative. I take it that no Labour Government in Australia—so far as I know, at any rate—has yet gone to the extent of victimising a man by gazet-ting him off a hospital committee in order to make room for one of their own supporters. I draw the line at that. The Government cannot defend such a policy. The Minister did not consider the first principles of administration when he said that he intended to do that in the future.

The HOME SECRETARY: I was speaking of the appointment of Government representatives in regard to administration.

Mr. DUNLOP: It is victimisation, especially when there is no payment attached to their services.

Mr. POLLOCK: I am not one who would seek for reprisals. The Government has no mandate for the permanent occupancy of the Treasury benches. This policy, therefore, can cut both ways, but I prefer that it should not be adopted.

The HOME SECRETARY: If this Government goes out of office, then every man who has been appointed by us as a Government representative on a hospital board should resign and make room for appointees of the succeeding Government.

Mr. POLLOCK: That is the old Tammany practice, to which I do not subscribe.

The HOME SECRETARY: Some of your nominees resigned as soon as the change of government took place.

Mr. POLLOCK: Where Government representatives have been appointed and have given good service, and when the public generally are satisfied with them, no interference with their position should take place. It ought to be the aim of the Government, where possible, to put independent men on the boards, as, in my opinion, when they are asked by the Government for the truth of the eternal disputes that crop up at every country hospital in Queensland, they will be able to give independent information. Do hon. members tell me seriously that, when a Government representative is appointed by the Minister solely on the ground that he is a supporter of the Minister's party, he is likely to give an unbiased opinion about these rows that take place at hospitals? Let me go farther, and say that, when we had rows on hospital committees, which included political partisans, it would have been an easy matter for the late Government to have adopted the same policy as the Home Secretary now proposes to adopt and gazetted all supporters of the Nationalist Party out of office and elected Labour representatives in their place. We did not do that.

Mr. EDWARDS: You did.

Mr. POLLOCK: The hon. member is saying something that is not true, and he knows it is not true.

Mr. EDWARDS: I can prove it.

Mr. POLLOCK: So far as I know, the Labour Government did not flood hospital committees with Labour representatives.

Mr. DANIELS: You made jobs for them.

Mr. POLLOCK: I know of no instance where it can be fairly said that, when Labour governed, it attempted to force their political ideas on to hospital committees.

Mr. CLAYTON: You always saw to it that you had a majority; and in Maryborough your nominees were selected at Australian Labour Party meetings.

Mr. POLLOCK: I do not know what happened at Maryborough; but, so far as my own constituency is concerned, there is not one Labour man on the hospital committee.

Mr. MAXWELL: Is it a board or a committee?

Mr. POLLOCK: It is a committee.

Mr. MAXWELL: We are talking about boards—not committees.

Mr. POLLOCK: I am dealing with committees; I have no experience of boards. Out my way the people are generous enough to support their own hospitals by subscription.

Mr. ANNAND: They are the people on the land.

Mr. POLLOCK: Not necessarily. Generally speaking, the public subscribe by race meetings, by general subscriptions, and other means, so that my personal experience only extends to hospital committees.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: They are elected by the subscribers.

Mr. Pollock.]

Mr. POLLOCK: They are elected by the subscribers on the proxy system. We have had quite a number of serious disputes in Western Queensland. In one instance in the Winton hospital there was only one doctor for many years. He was the hospital doctor, and every time an operation was necessary the person concerned—if he or she happened to be a poor person—had to send across to Longreach for Dr. Michod and bring him over by aeroplane at a cost of £84, or, if that could not be managed, the person had to take pot luck. I advocated encouraging a new doctor who came there to remain in Winton so that the public could have the opportunity of both medical men consulting in serious cases, and in order, too, that the hospital doctor would be able to get assistance when operations had to be performed. We had quite a dispute about that matter. The hospital committee, led by Mr. Reade, took the extraordinary stand that the second doctor was not to be allowed to stay in the town at all. Despite all that, and despite the most extreme position created by many men who were Nationalist supporters on the Winton hospital committee, I never at any time made any recommendation to the Government that we should flood that committee with Government representatives.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That is a committee. The Minister is speaking about boards. You are slightly mixed!

Mr. POLLOCK: I am not slightly mixed. I have a clear conception of what I am talking about. I am sorry to say the Secretary for Mines has not always the same conception.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I know the difference between a committee and a board—you don't. (Laughter.)

Mr. POLLOCK: I have at least a faint idea of the difference. We can take the hon. gentleman's statement in the same way as we took his remarks about the Sleigh agreement.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You took them very sorely.

Mr. POLLOCK: Since that time we have not taken the hon. gentleman very seriously; and we do not intend to depart from that attitude. I repeat that I have no experience of hospital boards; but I do know that men have been cast off committees—a principle to which I object—

Mr. KENNY: Not off boards.

Mr. POLLOCK: Simply because it was suspected that they were supporters of Labour. The Labour Party would not stoop to such a thing as that.

Mr. KENNY: They did worse.

Mr. POLLOCK: If a man is doing his job satisfactorily as a member of a hospital board or on any other board, is there any justification for removing him because of his political opinions? It is an extraordinary principle to lay down in this Parliament that it must be a question of "spoils to the victors"—that a man must be waving a Nationalist card outside a polling-booth before he is entitled to be put on a hospital committee.

Mr. MAXWELL: He had to wave the red flag in your time.

Mr. POLLOCK: Surely that is not the standard of intelligence we have reached in this Assembly!

[Mr. Pollock.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The hon. member for Bowen openly advocated that.

Mr. POLLOCK: I do not care what the hon. member for Bowen advocated—he can speak for himself. The principle of gazetted men off a board because they do not happen to agree with the Government politically is a rotten one. It is one [8 p.m.] that no man can defend; and I am surprised at the Home Secretary endeavouring to defend it. I do not think any defence can be sustained in favour of such a system.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It is only following the law made by you people.

Mr. POLLOCK: What law was made by the Labour Party providing that only men of our political convictions could be on a hospital board? Did we ever lay that down as a law? It is a surprise to me if it ever was laid down as a law.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You practised it.

Mr. POLLOCK: Whatever may have been done in connection with appointments to hospitals—whether it be a committee or a board—it is practically the same thing. They both administer the affairs of the hospital. Both committees and boards have a definite function to perform, and those functions differ in very minute particulars indeed. Whether it be a board controlling a hospital or a committee controlling a hospital does not make any difference to me. Whatever may be the technical distinction between a board and a committee, that is the body that is running the hospital; and it is news to me that a man should have to belong to the same party as the Secretary for Mines before he is eligible for appointment to a board such as that. It is a dangerous principle, and I hope that it will not be persisted in. If it is, this party will have a lot more to say about it.

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*): I want to say a few words in reply to the Leader and Acting Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Those two hon. members have worked themselves into a passion trying to make out a case for the Opposition. It is unfortunate that they should have to misconstrue the statements made by the Minister in trying to make out a case for the Opposition. Those hon. members seem to be absolutely devoid of argument. On many different occasions the late Home Secretary definitely stated that, when vacancies occurred, he would appoint men who agreed with the policy that he followed.

Mr. POLLOCK: When did he say that?

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. gentleman of whom I speak was straightforward. He did not make any bones about it, nor did he hide it. He stated on many occasions that at all times he would appoint men who agreed with his policy. The statement made by the Minister to-night had no reference to political appointments. What he definitely did say was that only men who believed in the hospital policy of the Government—which is a different thing altogether—would be appointed. If a person did not believe in the policy of the hospital, he could not administer the hospital as efficiently as a person who did believe in that policy. That is exactly what the Minister said to-night. Yet the two hon. members opposite who have just spoken tried to insinuate that the

Home Secretary stated that they would be Nationalist Party appointments. He never made any such statement. What he said was that he would appoint men who agreed with the hospital policy laid down by the present Government, which is right, fair, and the proper thing to do.

At 8.5 p.m.,

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toorony*), one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, relieved the Chairman in the chair.

Mr. EDWARDS: The acting Deputy Leader of the Opposition showed that he did not know the first thing about it. He waited for an interjection from this side to learn the difference between a hospital committee and a hospital board. Before that he did not know that a hospital committee was appointed by the subscribers, with whom the Government have nothing to do, and that the Government could not put any of them off the committee. He did not know that in the case of a hospital board the Government had the right under the Act to nominate members.

Mr. POLLOCK: If you and I had to pass a test in knowledge in this Committee, I think you would lose.

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not wonder at the hon. member believing that. I think that he believes that, if he had to pass a test with any man in the Chamber, he would win every time; but that does not make him any more clever. It only shows that he has to blow his own trumpet at all times. The Minister was justified in the statement he made in regard to this question. I think that a gentleman appointed to a hospital board or any other concern who believes in the policy laid down by the Government making the appointment is the right person to be appointed—it is not a political appointment at all.

Mr. POLLOCK: Why do you gazette Labour men off these boards?

Mr. EDWARDS: Because I suppose hon. members opposite had gazetted them on, and they did not know their jobs.

Mr. KIRWAN: That is another excuse.

Mr. EDWARDS: Hon. members opposite would put their own supporters on the boards, irrespective of whether they were the proper persons to control the business of the boards or not. It is unfortunate that the Leader of the Opposition has made a political question of this.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Did not you try to make a political question of appointments to the boards?

Mr. EDWARDS: As the Home Secretary said, we are doing the best we possibly can in the interests of the whole of the people of the State. This should not be a political question.

Mr. BRUCE (*Kennedy*): I am more concerned with the welfare of the hospitals than with the question of whether the representatives on the boards should be members of one party or the other. The hon. member for Nanango insinuated that, because members were nominated by the Labour Party, they were not capable of carrying on the job. There are three men in Townsville with whom I have been connected in hospital work, and those men are thoroughly capable and much appreciated by all grades

of opinion in the Townsville area, and they have carried out their work very well indeed. The main issue is this: When we were in power we did not gazette men off the hospital boards and replace them with people of our own political opinion; but, when there was a vacancy, we put members representing the then Government policy on those boards. I think that the previous Government failed very often in not putting Labour men on the boards when they should have done so. I quite frankly say that, if you want any policy carried out, whether Labour or anti-Labour, administration is one of the most important things; and you want Labour men there, if it is a Labour policy, in order to have it carried out.

They have set up an example which, when we are returned three years hence, will be an excellent weapon for the Labour Party. The income tax regulation of the Treasurer will furnish a very useful precedent to the Federal Treasurer, Mr. Theodore. We in the past have been handicapped owing to the fact that we have had people who had not a Labour outlook to carry out the administration of the Labour policy. How can you get people to carry out a policy opposed to their own in the manner in which it should be carried out? As to hospitals, of course, fortunately the Government do not appoint all the members of the boards. There is other representation, therefore we can rest assured that the welfare of the patients in our hospitals will be well looked after, irrespective of Government nominations or appointments, whatever they may be.

The Labour Government, it must be admitted, did an enormous amount of good so far as hospital administration and extensions were concerned. I take it that the present Government will follow that policy, and will not be lax in their administration or their care of those who need medical care and surgical attention; but there is one very important consideration of which we too often lose sight. The Minister mentioned it in reference to the insane of the State; but it applies also to the sick. Too much money is spent, and too much time is given to the curing instead of the prevention of disease. Of course, if we have sick people, we must attend to them; but very little is done for the prevention of sickness by the restriction of the sale of food which does not contain the correct amount of nutriment. Very little is done in a proper way in regard to the physical culture and other methods of building up healthy bodies in our youngsters in the early stages of development. Fortunately, much has been done in the Department of Public Instruction recently on these lines, and I recommend that it be extended, for by that means our expenditure on curing will be very much less in the future than it is to-day. These questions of correct food—unadulterated milk, for example—are very important.

The Minister said that the question of mental deficiencies had not been raised by members of the Opposition when they were on the other side of the Chamber. From the very first day I came into this Assembly I advocated the establishment of a proper institution for sub-normal persons or persons who were not fit for lunatic asylums or for gaols. There are many persons in Queensland—and we can only talk of Queensland—who are in gaols when they should not be there but in institutions for people who are sub-normal. There are many others in

Mr. Bruce.]

lunatic asylums who should not be there. I have advocated ever since I have been a member of this Parliament, and I shall continue to advocate, the establishment of an entirely separate institution for these people, because, if people who are slightly unbalanced are put amongst the violently insane, the probabilities are that they will progress in the same direction. Those who are slightly insane will tend to come within the criminal classification when they should not. With the Minister, I know that such persons have been sent to Dunwich, where they have been a nuisance to the old people and everybody else. This being so, I think the greatest effort should be made in the direction of the establishment of an institution specially for such persons.

During the last twelve months—I had not come into contact with the matter previously—I have had the opportunity of observing the effect of indeterminate sentences on prisoners. If my memory serves me rightly, the Labour Party were responsible for establishing that system. Whether that is so or not, I think it should be discontinued.

No more hideous torture could be inflicted upon a criminal than an indeterminate sentence. One can quite easily single out the indeterminate sentence man by his appearance of loss of hope. He does not know what is going to happen or what his end will be. When investigating the conditions in the gaols during the past twelve months, they have asked whether it would not be possible to be sentenced to a definite term of seven, eight, nine, or ten years' imprisonment? They prefer a definite sentence whether it be ten years, twelve years, or fifteen years. Any definite sentence is preferable to an indeterminate sentence. The indeterminate sentence is applied not only to criminals of desperate character, but perhaps to criminals who have a long record, say, of convictions for stealing. Their outlook is hopeless. I emphatically suggest that a definite sentence should be inflicted, because the worst possible thing that can be done is to remove their hope entirely, a result which follows upon an indeterminate sentence.

The Minister has referred to the difficult problem of grappling with insanity in our midst. There is no doubt, as he states, that the trouble is contributed to largely by the ravages of venereal disease. People are prone to discuss this matter in hushed tones, and no encouragement is given to discuss the matter frankly and openly. While the policy of hush is pursued in grappling with this disease, it is possible that the purest and best people in the country may become infected with this dreaded disease. No attempt is made to examine, check, and regulate, with a view to eliminating this disease. To some extent the disease is regulated so far as it applies to those who follow the occupation of prostitution, and perhaps to a lesser extent in the case of prisoners, but no strict examination or regulation is applied to the general public with a view to preventing the spread of the disease. The result is that the disease spreads to such an extent that it is impossible to estimate the extent of its ravages. Insanity is contributed to also by the excessive use of drugs, the excessive use of alcohol, and in many other directions. All these factors are aiding in the direction of filling our insane asylums, and any Government, irrespective of its political opinions, that endeavours to do something in the direction

[Mr. Bruce.

of protecting the people along these lines will be doing a service to the community as a whole, and will earn the respect and gratitude of those who understand these social problems.

Mr. ANNAND (*Toowoomba*): I have been deeply interested in this debate concerning hospitals, more particularly because I have been associated with hospitals for many many years. I was particularly interested to hear the hon. member for Gregory endeavour to explain that there was no difference between a hospital board and a hospital committee.

Mr. POLLOCK: I said that they both controlled these institutions.

Mr. ANNAND: I am very pleased to know that the hon. member lives in a district where the hospital is supported by voluntary contributions. I congratulate the people of that district.

Mr. POLLOCK: For God's sake, don't patronise me.

Mr. ANNAND: I do congratulate the hon. member. When he was speaking I made a note that perhaps the committee there was elected by voluntary contributors. Very many of the supporters may not voluntarily subscribe to that hospital, and therefore would not have a vote. They may subscribe individually. I am not in any way reflecting upon their generosity, because I know that shearers and men who work on stations are very liberal in their support of race meetings in aid of hospitals, and I know that they support these institutions very well indeed.

Mr. POLLOCK: They often give more in proportion to their capacity than the employers.

Mr. ANNAND: They do give more than other people, but very often they have no voice in the election of the committee because they are not direct subscribers.

Mr. POLLOCK: Oh yes, they have.

Mr. ANNAND: I maintain they have not; and I know what I am talking about, as I was chairman of a Toowoomba hospital committee for a number of years. The hospital committee was elected by direct subscribers. I want the hon. member for Gregory to know that, and at the same time to know that I am not deprecating the excellent work they do in contributing to hospitals.

Mr. POLLOCK: They have their representatives. What is the use of telling me they have not, when they have?

Mr. ANNAND: The subscribers elect the representatives. They have their union representatives, of course. As the hon. member for Gregory may know, a hospital board is made up by subscribers' representatives, local authority representatives, and Government representatives; but the point I want to make—and I could not allow the opportunity to pass without referring to the board in the town I have the honour to represent—is this: I have taken exception for many years to a Government servant being the Government representative. I do not believe that is right. The chairman of the hospital board in Toowoomba at the present time is a Government servant, who has been identified with the Labour movement for many years, and is their campaign director.

Mr. COSTELLO: And this Government never removed him.

Mr. ANNAND: He is a prominent official of the Labour movement.

Mr. STOPFORD: He is an excellent chairman.

Mr. ANNAND: He is a very good man and an excellent chairman; but I want to remind hon. members opposite of the fact that at a recent valedictory social in Toowoomba this gentleman asked the people not to lose heart—that the present Government were in office for three years only, and at the expiration of that period the other party would come back triumphant. I ask: Does that gentleman represent the views of this Government? That is the crux of the whole matter; and the Home Secretary spoke a good deal of commonsense when he maintained that men with particular political leanings do not represent the views of this Government.

Mr. STOPFORD: He represents the institution.

Mr. ANNAND: On every possible occasion I am going to ask that the seats of these men be vacated, and that representatives of this Government take their places on hospital boards.

Mr. STOPFORD: And you expect those people to buy your drapery!

Mr. HANLON (*Ithaca*): I have heard some peculiar statements in my life, but I do not consider that I have ever heard a Minister propound such a dangerous doctrine as that enunciated by the Home Secretary when he said that it was the intention of the Government to replace the members of hospital committees appointed by the late Government with representatives of his Government.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You are misquoting him.

Mr. HANLON: I know what the hon. gentleman said, and I will not allow any irresponsible interjector to put me off. The Home Secretary said that the Government were going to appoint to the hospital boards men who were believers in their policy; and he turned round and pointed to the party sitting behind him. If that does not mean that the Government believe in the appointment of their supporters to positions on such bodies as hospital boards, then I do not know what it does mean. The question is, Where is this policy to stop? Is it the intention of the hon. gentleman to dismiss every head of a Government department and every official who is not a supporter of his political party? If this doctrine is persisted in, it will mean that every time there is a change of Government in this State every head of a department, every public servant, every official, who is suspected of political leanings towards the preceding Government will be dismissed. The hon. member for Toowoomba put it even more plainly than the Minister when he pointed out that they had a chairman of the Toowoomba Hospital Board a man who, to quote his own words was a good chairman, but whom because of a statement made at a valedictory social—and we can quite understand that it was not composed of supporters of hon. members opposite, but was evidently a social tendered to some member of this party at the conclusion of an election campaign—he would endeavour to have thrown out of his job, notwithstanding the fact that he was a good chairman.

Mr. STOPFORD: Why should Labourites buy his drapery?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I would remind the hon. member for Mount Morgan that he must obey my call to order.

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member for Toowoomba said quite voluntarily that the chairman of the Toowoomba Hospital Board was an excellent chairman, but, because he had Labour political leanings, the hon. member was going to endeavour to have him gazetted out of his job, and to have someone with Nationalist leanings put in his place. Perhaps this would not be so dangerous if it could be confined to hospital boards; but there is no saying where that doctrine would stop. It is a very common remark made by people who are unthinking that it served the Labour Party quite right when they were in power because they had that Tory So-and-So at the head of some department or other. This is only going to encourage the feeling that Governments must appoint followers of their own political faith when making any appointment. You cannot have that sort of thing in regard to hospital boards and not have the same thing in other directions. I understood that the Government representative on any institution represented the Government as the executive body of this Parliament. A Government representative, to my mind, never meant a representative of the political party who were attached to the Government. There is no member of this Committee who represents people of one political faith only. We represent people of all political faiths. In my own electorate, whether they have voted for me or not, I represent the people who have political ideals and political opinions quite different from those of the two parties in this Committee. To suggest that a Government representative on any board must necessarily be a political representative of the party of which the Government consists is the most barefaced declaration I have heard in this Committee. I hope the hon. gentleman will not pursue that line of political appointment, because it is going to spread beyond hospital boards—it is going right into the public service.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. C. Peterson, *Yormanby*): I am amused listening to the continued protests of hon. members opposite against what we have done. I have already proved how, during the last six or seven years, in all nominations of Government representatives on hospital boards, the then Government selected only supporters of their own party as representatives on those boards, and that in many cases they were selected by Australian Labour Party meetings. I would refer hon. members to the Hospitals Act, from which they can see for themselves that the Government—not the Opposition—have responsibility. We are responsible for 60 per cent. of hospital deficits, and we have to see that, so far as finance is concerned, we have men representing us from whom we can expect a fair deal. The statement made by the hon. member for Toowoomba with reference to the chairman of the Toowoomba Hospital Board, who stated that this party would only be in office for three years, is most illuminating. What does that mean? If it means anything, it means that the Government are not going to find that Government representative doing anything that will embarrass their position. Section 9 of the Hospitals Act

Hon. J. C. Peterson.]

provides that the contributors shall elect three members, and that the local authority shall elect three members. The local authority concerned can elect whom it likes to represent it. Its representatives need not be members of the local authority; it can appoint people from outside. The contributors—and in many cases they are unions, as, for example, the Australian Workers' Union, the Australian Railways Union, etc.—have direct representation on the score of being in the contributors' category. Then the Governor in Council has the power to appoint three members. What is the duty

[8.30 p.m.] of these three members? What are they there for? They do not go there to represent themselves.

Some hon. members seem to think that it is the duty of the Government to put certain men on hospital boards, and that, once they get there, they represent themselves. These representatives appointed by the Government are supposed to represent the Government policy and to carry out instructions from the Home Department on any critical issue. Why are they Government representatives? To carry out the instructions of the department concerned. The Government have to find 60 per cent. of the deficit incurred in running these hospitals.

Seeing that the Government are responsible for that vast amount of money, we must have men representing the Government who are in accord with the policy of the party under the Hospitals Act. In this way they will see to it that the money is not wasted, and they will see to it that it will go as far as money can go.

Mr. HANLON: Any honest man would represent the Government fairly, irrespective of policy.

The HOME SECRETARY: As I stated at the outset, certain members who were appointed by hon. members opposite have voluntarily resigned. In their letters they stated that they were not in accord with the Government's policy. That was a manly action to take, and I sincerely trust that every nominee of the present Government who is appointed to a hospital board will, in common decency, get out if the present Government are defeated, so that the new Government can appoint their own members on the hospital boards. There is a Government policy in connection with hospitals. It is all moonshine to say that this Government has no policy in connection with hospitals. For years past men on the land have been ground down by hospital taxes. In my own district quite a number of councils have been rendered almost bankrupt, and, in order to prevent any waste of money in all those hospitals that have been badly administered in the past, it is essential that men of integrity and of the greatest capacity be placed on those boards to safeguard the funds of the State. I make no bones in subscribing to that doctrine. After all, they are there to conserve the funds of the State.

Mr. DUNLOP: Why should Mr. Kelly be removed from the Rockhampton Hospital Board?

The HOME SECRETARY: I am not going to apologise to the hon. member on account of Mr. Kelly. The hon. member for Rockhampton sits up on the back bench, but, so far as representatives of this Government are concerned, we take the responsibility.

Mr. DUNLOP: I am proud to be here.

[Hon. J. C. Peterson.]

The HOME SECRETARY: I am not going to worry any more about this matter. All we are concerned about is to see that the very best is secured as far as hospital boards are concerned, and that people should be appointed who are in favour of obtaining the greatest possible results with the money available.

Mr. DUNLOP: You tell that to the Rockhampton elector.

The HOME SECRETARY: I have been up to Rockhampton several times since this matter occurred, and only two people have spoken to me about this vast question—two friends of the hon. member, who had been "oiled up" in regard to the whole question. This national question of Mr. Kelly is never heard of in Rockhampton. All I can say is that the hon. member would be better engaged in doing some more serviceable work for his constituency than bothering about that matter.

Mr. DUNLOP: You wait until the hospitals vote comes on, and I will expose your action. You will see who is right and who is wrong.

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not care what the hon. member attempts to expose. I quite agree with hon. members opposite that, on broad general lines, there should not be political appointments. It is unfair in a general sense; but when it comes to a question where the direct policy of the Government is in conflict with the opinions of the board member concerned, the case is not parallel with that of the public service. There is much at stake in this matter, and the Labour Party has established a precedent. In every case except in Brisbane the Labour Party debarred any political supporter of the Government policy from being on a hospital board. If that is fair, then I cannot understand what fairness means.

The hon. member for Kennedy brought up the question of indeterminate sentences. I have already replied to the Leader of the Opposition on that matter, and will not take up the time of the Committee further than to say that I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member. As he pointed out, prisoners who are sentenced for life must naturally get broken-spirited, and something should be done to give a ray of hope to these men. The Cabinet have already determined that each case is to be treated on its merits, and a definite sentence fixed. I think it will be admitted that that is a fair proposition. Naturally you could not fix indeterminate sentences for all prisoners. Each case has to be treated on its merits, and I quite concur with the opinion of hon. members on the subject.

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*): I understand that, in spite of the protest of the Opposition, the hon. member for Toowoomba and the Home Secretary still persist in saying that on hospital boards the politics of the individual only are to count.

Mr. ANNAND: No.

Mr. POLLOCK: The welfare of the institution is to be a secondary consideration.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: No.

Mr. POLLOCK: That must be the meaning one must attach to such a policy as this. The Home Secretary says that these men were appointed to administer a scheme fathered by Labour, and that, therefore,

these men can be expected to give loyal support to that policy. One would assume from that that, when these men were gazetted off the board, and Nationalist supporters gazetted on, they would be there for the purpose of administering a scheme introduced by the Nationalist Government. But the present Government have not any hospital scheme—they have never had one. For years hon. members opposite complained about the Labour Party's "districting" of hospitals. The Government have argued against the districting of hospitals, and have fought a number of elections on that issue. They have promised they would amend the Act. They have told the people that this scheme is unsuitable, and that they would introduce a better scheme. But this session is drawing to a close—

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Not at all.

Mr. POLLOCK: I do not care personally how long it lasts, but I think it is drawing to its close. There was a rush to put an Appropriation Bill through all its stages in one day, and I have a good idea what that means. But there is no indication in the Governor's Speech of a measure to amend the Hospitals Act to give us this Nationalist scheme which hon. members opposite promised. They have not got a scheme, and they are going to appoint a commission to think out a scheme for them.

Mr. STOPFORD: From outside the State.

Mr. POLLOCK: As the hon. member for Mount Morgan interjects, the members of that committee will probably come from outside the State. How can they say that these men whom they are appointing are going to administer their Act? They will be administering the Labour Party's Act, and, while that Act is in existence, the present members of the boards should continue in office. If the Home Secretary desires to have a different method of dealing with hospitals—a new system of maintenance—then let him remodel the whole policy and put in his nominees. This system of boycott under the existing system is something to which no hon. member can lend his support. If we are to have the principle of boycott instituted here, as suggested by the hon. member for Toowoomba, I suggest to him that the same principle might well be applied by Labour supporters in Toowoomba to his business with very disastrous results to him. Mr. McInnes is the man who is talked about as being the Government representative there. He is a most capable man, and has given excellent service to that hospital. I believe that the Premier is putting his foot on a scheme to "shanghai" him out of the service.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. C. Peterson, *Normanby*): I rise to a point of order. That statement is absolutely untrue.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The Home Secretary has denied the statement that the hon. member has made. He has said that it is untrue, and I ask the hon. member for Gregory to accept the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. POLLOCK: I accept his denial. If you do not believe a man, you must, nevertheless, accept his denial. For instance, if I saw the Home Secretary climbing out of that window without any seat in his pants, and I said so, and he denied it, I would have to accept his denial because it was parliamentary, but you could not make me believe that he had a seat in his pants.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask the hon. member to accept directly the statement of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. POLLOCK: I have already done so, Mr. Maxwell. Mr. McInnes is respected by every section of the community in Toowoomba. Everybody knows his politics—he has never made any secret of them—but once hon. members opposite start to boycott those who do not believe in their politics we might be tempted to take a hand, and that would not be for the good of the community. We do not want that, and we do not want the principle to be introduced into our hospitals. I sincerely hope the Treasurer will take a hand in the debate, and tell us what he knows.

Mr. HYNES (*Townsville*): Seeing that to some extent I was the cause of this discussion, perhaps I should have something to say regarding the reply of the Minister. The facts in respect of the Townsville matter are these: Mr. Frank Byrne, who was a Government servant, was, on my recommendation, appointed to the hospital board. It was an excellent appointment, as was proved by the fact that, after he had sat on the board for some time, the board, on which there was a majority of gentlemen who did not subscribe to Labour politics, thought sufficient of him to elect him chairman. Mr. Garbutt, the man whom I defeated for Townsville, made it his boast at election time that Mr. Byrne would be taken off the board. It is rather singular that Mr. Byrne was specially selected for gazettal off that board. Two other men were also gazetted off the board, one of whom was recommended by the hon. member for Mundingburra, and the other by the hon. member for Kennedy. Those men also gave excellent service to the board—there is no question about that—and I think that the Townsville people appreciated it. The people served by the Townsville hospitals—the electors in a portion of Kennedy, the whole of Mundingburra, and the whole of Townsville—at the last election cast a big vote in favour of this party, and the three Labour candidates were successful, showing that the people there were satisfied with the Labour policy of hospital administration. Yet Mr. Garbutt's boast was put into effect immediately, and I think that Mr. Byrne and his two colleagues were three of the first to be gazetted off a board in Queensland. We do not stand for that. If there is going to be a heresy hunt after every election, what will the position develop into? It will not be only the members of hospital boards, but also departmental heads, who will be affected; and we shall have the same thing perpetrated here as in America. We shall have Tammany government before very long if the example set by the Home Secretary is carried into effect. It is a matter that should cause great concern to every right-thinking citizen of this country.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It operated during the period of fourteen years that Labour was in office.

Mr. HYNES: We had democratic Government for fourteen years. Hon. members opposite cannot point to one single instance where men who were placed on hospital committees by the Denham Government or past Tory Governments were gazetted out of those positions by the Labour Government when they assumed control of office. The Secretary for Mines and other hon. members opposite have stated that the Labour Go-

Mr. Hynes.]

vernment had no opportunity of so doing because there were no hospital boards then in existence; but there were hospital committees in existence. I was a member of a hospital committee during the reign of Tory Governments prior to 1915, and the law at that time provided that the committee should be comprised of subscribers' representatives with one to three Government representatives, so that, when Labour came into office in 1915, there were upon almost every hospital committee in the State people who subscribed to Tory political thought representing the Labour Government on those hospital committees. There is not a single instance on record where the Labour Government gazetted those representatives off the committees.

Mr. FOLEY (*Leichhardt*): I view with alarm the statements made to-night by the Home Secretary and the hon. member for Toowoomba that the Government intend to elect to hospital boards representatives who will carry out the policy of the Government. In listening to the debate the thought struck me that even the Home Secretary does not seem to realise that he is establishing a dangerous precedent. First of all, we have in existence at the present time the Hospitals Act introduced by the Labour Government, under which Government representatives on boards were recommended by members of that Government. Yet no consideration whatever was given to the politics of those individuals. They were appointed purely on the recommendation of the members representing the various districts, and were recommended as the men most suitable to carry out the administration of the Act. As member for my district, I have been requested from time to time by the Home Department to recommend certain persons as Government nominees on hospital committees in my district. I did not take the stand that, because I was given that privilege, I should recommend a Labour representative although I knew he would be incapable of carrying out the work. I simply handed in the names of persons who I considered would be capable administrators if they were gazetted by the Government. I want to emphasise the point that the Home Secretary has already taken action to remove from hospital boards Government nominees who carried out their work faithfully and well in administering the present Hospitals Act, although the present Government have no hospital policy whatever. They have acted prematurely against the nominees appointed by the past Government, and have acted in the face of the fact that they have no hospital policy whatever. They have given expression to certain views in their policy speech and on the hustings from time to time; but all that they have done of a tangible nature is to promise the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into hospital matters generally, the report of which commission will serve as a guide in the formulation of a hospital policy. It would have been at least a matter of courtesy to the late Government and to the members of the hospital boards if the Home Secretary had permitted matters to stand until the present Hospitals Act was amended in accordance with whatever might be the policy of the Government.

The question arises, and will arise when the Hospitals Act is amended in accordance with the policy of the Government, whether any Government representative or any member

of a committee who does not administer the hospital in accordance with the Act laid down for his guidance will be automatically removed, no matter whether he be Labour or anti-Labour. That is the viewpoint which should be taken by the new Administration. If the Government are taking up the attitude that they are appointing representatives to these committees just because they happen to be Nationalist supporters, where is the system going to stop? What about other boards, such as the Wheat Board, where every opportunity offers for the Government to appoint representatives to administer their policy? If it is right to appoint to hospital boards as Government representatives men whose views are in accord with the views of the party in power, then the principle must be right with respect to other bodies. One can only infer from the action of the Government in connection with hospital boards that it is only a matter of time before the principle will apply generally. No such vindictive action was taken by the late Government. In Rockhampton recently a school teacher who was prominently identified with the Labour movement suddenly received notice of transfer to a remote portion of the State where he would be no hindrance to the Government. If that is to be the policy of the Government, it will not be long before American Tammany methods will be introduced in this State.

The HOME SECRETARY: You "sacked" political opponents.

Mr. FOLEY: It is not a question of whether we "sacked" anyone. We have had a fair taste in the Rockhampton district already of the policy of the Government, where this school teacher, who acted as campaign director for the Labour Party there, was transferred on the eve of the Federal election. We can only infer that it is only a question of time before such a policy will apply to every Government department, and that any Government official known to be a member of the Australian Labour Party or to be prominent in the Labour movement will receive similar vindictive treatment to that shown by the Government in regard to hospital matters. I sadly deplore the statement made by the Home Secretary, and I hope that the other members of the Government will not endorse the attitude taken up by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. KIRWAN (*Brisbane*): Some hon. members have expressed surprise at the policy enunciated by the Home Secretary and strongly supported by the hon. member for Toowoomba, and which the hon. member for Nanango endeavoured to explain away; but, knowing the party occupying the Treasury benches as I do, I am not at all surprised.

The HOME SECRETARY: I have not put you off the "Golden Casket" yet. (Laughter.)

Mr. KIRWAN: That is so; but the chairman of the Toowoomba Hospital Board and myself are about the only two exceptions. As the hon. gentleman has mentioned the matter, it is hardly necessary for me to remind hon. members that I am chairman of the "Golden Casket" committee. It is also true that, when the Government assumed office, and before the Home Secretary had hardly time to warm his chair, I waited on him, because I thought the Government might have a different policy in regard to the "Casket," and I, therefore, offered to tender my resignation. The hon.

[*Mr. Hynes.*

gentleman said he would much prefer if I continued to act. I then gave him the assurance that, if the Government at any time desired me to vacate office, and would do me the courtesy of mentioning the matter to me, I would resign. I quite realise that, if the hon. gentleman attempted to discuss the question of policy with me in relation to the conduct of the "Casket," he would find me a trifle awkward. I want to say that in fairness to the hon. gentleman. So far I am still chairman of the "Golden Casket" committee, and so far nothing has gone wrong.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You will be over here yet! (Laughter.)

Mr. KIRWAN: It is said that the age of miracles is not yet past; but I do not think there is any possibility of that particular miracle happening.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: It would be a calamity!

Mr. KIRWAN: I have been associated with this movement for a lifetime, and I trust to continue that association till the breath leaves my body. (Government laughter.) I am not ashamed of my association with the movement; and, while I claim credit for honest convictions, I am prepared to admit that there are hon. members on that side of the Committee who are just as honestly attached to the views they hold as I am to mine. There is as much possibility of those hon. gentlemen joining this party as there is of my joining theirs. I see the Treasurer smiling.

The TREASURER: We have been together at Canberra. (Laughter.)

Mr. KIRWAN: That is the only place at which we are likely to be together. The position in connection with the policy enunciated by the Home Secretary is perfectly clear. The hon. gentleman definitely said that it is the policy of his Government to remove Labour nominees and representatives of this political party from hospital boards. An attempt has been made to sidetrack the issue by pointing out that the previous Government had nominated only Labour supporters to a large number of the boards in Queensland. That is possibly true; but hon. members opposite cannot quote any instance where any supporter of a previous Government was gazetted out of office.

The HOME SECRETARY: There were no hospital boards in those days.

Mr. KIRWAN: But there were harbour boards, fire brigade boards, pest boards, etc., all of which had Government representatives. Take, for example, the Metropolitan Fire Brigade Board. Mr. Mackay, an officer of the Home Department, and myself were the Government representatives on that board for quite a number of years. It was my good fortune to be elected to the Cabinet, and, naturally, following on that, I had to resign. The hon. member for Enoggera is now the Government representative on the board. It is one of those positions that are entirely honorary, and where excellent service has been rendered to the citizens of Brisbane by all sections on that board.

The HOME SECRETARY: Do you know of any Labour men who have been put off the Brisbane Hospital Board?

Mr. KIRWAN: I do not know that there have been any vacancies. What about the ex-member for Kelvin Grove?

The HOME SECRETARY: He resigned.

The TREASURER: I think you know of an ex-Labour man who was put off as a fire brigade board representative.

Mr. KIRWAN: Yes; and I take advantage of this opportunity to say that, if the hon. gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches to-day were as broadminded and big-hearted as the members of the Fire Brigade Board, they might have something for which they could claim credit.

During the whole period that Major Carter, Mr. Purkiss, Mr. Wickham, and Mr. Denmead, representing the insurance companies, were on that board, the work was carried out in the most harmonious and capable manner, and no mention [9 p.m.] of politics was made. The hon. member mentioned Mr. Wright's appointment. When Major Carter, who was chairman, toured the continents of Europe and America, that board, which had not a solitary Labour man on it, paid me the compliment of making me chairman. If we had gentlemen sitting on the front Treasury bench as broadminded as those men, we would not be discussing this question to-night. The attitude of that board was entirely different from the attitude which the Treasurer followed in the 1912 strike. The hon. member for Ithaca and myself, were it not out of order, could tell this Committee what attitude was adopted by the hon. gentleman's Cabinet at that time.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. KIRWAN: I would not be addressing myself to this vote if it had not been for the action of the hon. gentleman's Cabinet in 1912; neither would the hon. member for Ithaca be here. We would probably be in the railway service somewhere in Queensland.

Dealing with the question raised by the Home Secretary, I think the attitude taken up by the Government should be clearly understood. It is not a question of appointing new members to hospital boards where vacancies occur; it is a question of removing men from the hospital boards and appointing others in their places. I do not know of any request made for these removals either by municipal councils or any body of responsible citizens. I do not know that there has been any criticism in the public press in the towns where removals have taken place calling attention to the extravagant methods of those boards or the lack of careful and proper administration either from the financial point of view or from the point of view of making the necessary provision for the sick. These men have been giving satisfaction even though they may hold political views opposed to hon. members opposite. I could quite understand the position of the Home Secretary if he came down with a new Hospitals Act in which drastic changes were made in regard to hospital management, and the hon. gentleman wanted to see his new system given a fair trial. He would then say, "In every instance there must be a new board elected under the new conditions." If the hon. gentleman asked for that, I do not know that there could be any great objection; but in the present instance these men have been removed although there has been no public demand for their removal. It is rather strange that the chairman of the Toowoomba hospital board has been allowed to hold his job. There was a rumour abroad that he was to be shifted, but some prominent Nationalists up there objected, and he was

Mr. Kirwan.]

not removed. So long as he was able to do the job, they were going to see that he was kept there, because, if he were put out, they would possibly have to pay more rates to make up the loss. Is this principle going to apply to harbour boards?

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: There are no Government representatives on harbour boards.

MR. KIRWAN: Are there no Government representatives on harbour boards?

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: No.

MR. KIRWAN: The Treasurer will not say "No." He sits there silent. With that charitable disposition of his, he is not prepared to put his colleague in an untenable position. I want to know from the Treasurer if he is going to carry out this policy in connection with harbour boards. I want to know from the Home Secretary if he is going to apply it to the fire brigade boards of the State. Are all the Labour nominees on the different fire brigade boards going to be removed next week and Nationalists appointed in their stead? I want to know about the technical colleges and grammar schools. Why is it that this essential point of Government policy is only going to be applied to the hospitals? If the policy is wise and sound and can be publicly defended, let the Government carry it out in its entirety. Let them sweep all the Labour nominees off the various Government boards and institutions, and put their own nominees on them. That would be showing some boldness in carrying out their policy. Why do they leave it to the Home Secretary to carry out the policy in his department, while the Treasurer is not touching it, even with the proverbial 40-foot pole, and other Ministers are adopting the same attitude?

There is just one other matter I want to refer to—the question of the mosquito campaign. When the Greater Brisbane area was proclaimed and the new council came into operation, it was generally believed that some concerted and well-organised attempt would be made to get rid of the mosquitoes in this city. I believe that something like £20,000 or £25,000 has been spent in attempting to exterminate mosquitoes. A prominent member of the City Council, Alderman Oxlade, made a statement last year in the council that the mosquitoes were worse in Brisbane and suburbs to-day than ever in its previous history. We remember what happened last year—I do not know whether they were bad in the district where you live, Mr. Maxwell, but I know that around Clayfield you could not read a newspaper or a book at night unless you had some chemical on the table to keep them away.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: They would lift you out of bed at Ascot.

MR. KIRWAN: It would be difficult to lift the Minister or myself out, but they might get away with the Home Secretary. The attitude I took up in regard to the rat-gang campaign when I was Assistant Minister in the Home Department was that it is no use doing a thing piecemeal. So in connection with the mosquito campaign—some well-organised attempt will have to be made not only by the local authorities concerned but by every householder. If you go down the Sandgate road in a car, you will notice on both sides of the road before you come to the Toombul overbridge a cutting called Schultz's canal.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: "Schultz's Folly."

[Mr. Kirwan.]

MR. KIRWAN: That particular place is nothing but a series of swamps and water-holes. The people in Nundah received notices from the City Council involving them in the payment of 15s. or £1 towards the cost of the work, yet, after that has been done, the City Council has a mosquito-breeding ground in that particular swamp for not only the whole of Nundah but for the whole of Brisbane. What is the good of the council insisting on householders doing their part in the business if they are going to have swamps breeding these mosquitoes by the million?

THE TREASURER: The mosquitoes have not yet succeeded in thinning you.

MR. KIRWAN: The reason they do not attack me is because I have been seventeen years in political life, and, like my friend the Treasurer, who has been here a shade longer than that, we are not soft enough for the mosquitoes to tackle. Possibly they would be more inclined to tackle the Attorney-General or the Secretary for Mines, who are pretty soft so far, and offer more inducement.

The hon. member for Kennedy referred to a matter which had been discussed on several occasions on this vote—that of venereal disease. Although it is a matter that is discussed frequently—it is debated at various medical conferences and all Governments have considered it—there does not seem to be any real attempt to grapple with the evil. The previous Government passed legislation which perhaps to a certain extent has been responsible for stemming the tide. There was need for it. I remember reading an address delivered four or five years ago by Dr. Barrett, of Melbourne, who I believe is one of the leading medical practitioners in Australia, in which he said that one in every ten persons was affected by this awful plague. It makes one shudder to think that that is the state of the nation. There is to be found in our library a book by an English doctor named Reid, and anybody who wants to get an insight into the ravages of venereal disease during the war should read it. No doubt the hon. member for Merthyr is familiar with it. This authority shows that at one time in England, such was the tremendous wastage caused by the spread of that disease in the war period, enough men were in the hospitals to have brought decisive victory for the Allies in a very brief period if they could have been put into the field. I think that we are more fortunate in this State than in other portions of the Commonwealth; yet the position here demands the consideration of each and every one of us. As to what measures must ultimately be adopted I am not in a position to say. I prefer to leave that to medical men, who are more competent to judge, and still more competent to advise as to remedial measures; but whatever measures are adopted, they will have to be of the most drastic character, and the liberty of the subject will have to be thrown overboard for the time being.

At 9.13 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

MR. KIRWAN: I think that we can compliment the Commissioner of Public Health upon his activity in connection with this disease and the work that has been done by the department generally to mitigate its awful results.

I repeat that I am surprised at the policy enunciated by the Home Secretary, and the extraordinary position that other Ministers are in not attempting to carry out such a scheme. It may be possible of some explanation as to why the Home Secretary is to be asked to carry this burden of making political appointments under a policy which is not going to be applied to harbour boards and other bodies.

I repeat that I hope that, if any action is taken by local authorities in a mosquito campaign, it will be effective in the direction I have mentioned. I understand that in Toowoomba the council has got rid of the pest. I do not know whether the hon. member for Toowoomba is conversant with its methods, but it has earned undying fame. If he is familiar with the scheme, no doubt the Committee would be indebted to him if he gave them an outline of it in order that we may judge whether it could not be applied to Brisbane.

Mr. CONROY (*Maranoa*): I was very interested to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Toowoomba to-night. His remarks took me back many years—to the time when a supporter of the Labour movement could not occupy a Government position. He complained that Mr. McInnes was chairman of the Toowoomba Hospital Board, and, if he had his way, Mr. McInnes would not now occupy that position.

Mr. ANNAND: He is a Government servant.

Mr. CONROY: I am a very old member of the Labour movement, and I have had many experiences. I can recall the time when a man who was recognised as a supporter of the Labour movement was regarded as of no account; but, fortunately, that feeling has now passed away; but, if the hon. member for Toowoomba is correct, the same feeling is going to be reintroduced, and if the policy contemplated by the hon. member is carried out in its application to Labour supporters, then they are not going to get a very fair deal.

The TREASURER: No one said that.

Mr. CONROY: That is the inference. I can recollect many years ago Labour supporters being regarded as of no account.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: How long ago?

Mr. CONROY: Longer than the hon. gentleman can remember.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The late Billy Browne was one of the most popular men in Queensland.

Mr. CONROY: I can go back thirty-seven years. The remarks of the hon. member for Toowoomba took me back to those old times when a man was of no account because he was a supporter of the Labour movement. It is evident that the intention on the part of hon. members opposite is in the direction of restoring the feeling that existed in those days. That will be a very bad thing indeed. However, we have had a taste of it to-night, and no blame can be attached to us if, when we are returned to power—which will be in three years' time—we give hon. members opposite a taste of what they are endeavouring to give us to-night. They are taking away all control of hospital matters from

representatives of the Labour movement. We on this side never did that.

The HOME SECRETARY: You did.

Mr. CONROY: We did not put Nationalists off.

The HOME SECRETARY: Because you had no occasion to do so.

Mr. CONROY: The Home Secretary knows that I nominated three men who were not Labour supporters.

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not know that.

Mr. CONROY: I am telling the hon. gentleman. He knows that one was a police magistrate. He knows that one was a Government representative at the time, and that the other man was not elected by the subscribers.

I do not agree that a Government representative should be a political supporter of the party in power for the time being. The Government have taken every opportunity possible to replace on hospital committees Government representative having Labour leanings with supporters of their own party. We can only object to such a policy very strongly, and I am perfectly certain that, when the opportunity arises, this party, when again returned to power, will pursue the example that has been set by the Government.

Item (Chief Office) agreed to.

RELIEF OF ABORIGINALS.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. C. Peterson, *Normanby*): I beg to move—

“That £64,860 be granted for ‘Relief of Aborigines.’”

Hon. members will notice that there is a decrease of £1,241 in this vote as compared with last year's appropriation. That does not mean that economies have been effected at the expense of the aborigines. The reduction has been mainly brought about by the removal of the aboriginal settlement from Taroom to Wooralinda having been completed, and by the fact that the vote on last year's Estimates for repairs to the auxiliary ketch “Melbidir” does not appear on these Estimates, the work having been completed. The vote for the relief of aborigines has actually been increased if allowance is made for these two items.

Item agreed to.

CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS AND GRANTS.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. C. Peterson, *Normanby*): I beg to move—

“That £110,481 be granted for ‘Charitable Institutions and Grants.’”

This vote shows an increase of £4,471 over last year. The increases are made up of an increase of £237 for teachers at the “School of Instruction and Workshop for the Blind and Deaf”; £35 increase in the salary of the medical superintendent at the “Dunwich Home for Aged People”; £20 increase for the assistant steward in that institution; and the usual automatic increases. I am pleased to say that there is no reduction in the vote for charitable institutions. As a matter of fact, it is increased.

Hon. J. C. Peterson.]

At 9.25 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN: Under the provisions of the Sessional Order agreed to by the House on 22nd August last, I shall now leave the chair and make my report to the House.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported progress.

Resumption of Committee made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

The House adjourned at 9.30 p.m.
