

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**THURSDAY, 25 SEPTEMBER 1879**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

*Thursday, 25 September, 1879.*

Claim of Dr. Purcell.—Divisional Boards Bill.—Council's amendments.—The Royal Assent.—Appropriation Bill No. 2.—Dr. Purcell's Claim.—Orphanages Bill.—committee.—Licensing Boards Bill.—*Hansard*.—Appropriation Bill No. 2.—Adjournment.

The SPEAKER took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

## CLAIM OF DR. PURCELL.

On the Order of the Day relating to this claim being called on,

Mr. RUTLEDGE said that, in order to give Government facilities for carrying on their business, he wished to postpone the motion until a later hour of the day.

Postponed accordingly.

## DIVISIONAL BOARDS BILL—COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

The House having resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the message of the Legislative Council insisting

on their amendments in clauses 58, 59, and 74 of the Divisional Boards Bill,

The PREMIER (Mr. McLlwraith) said: When the House disagreed with the amendments in these clauses sent down by the other Chamber, they gave as their reason that they had the constitutional right to have sole control of the taxation of the colony. That was considered by the Assembly a sufficient reason to send back to the other Chamber. It has raised a question which has been long in dispute between the two Chambers, and which has never been brought to the point at which a final decision can be arrived at. It remains now as unsettled as it was before. The position, however, to which it is brought by the message we have now received from the other Chamber leaves it in this way—that the Government are now forced to one of three alternatives: either to send back another message giving further opportunity for the consideration of these amendments by the other Chamber, or to withdraw the Bill altogether, or to insist on our rights, exactly in the forms we have sent up before. I think, myself, a course might have been adopted by the other Chamber which would have preserved all their rights, leaving the question where it was, and not force upon us the other alternative, if we pass the Bill, of admitting at the same time the principle that the other Chamber had a right to interfere in any Bill concerning the taxation of the colony. I cannot possibly ask this House—for it is against all its privileges, and which it must uphold in its own behalf—to admit that the other Chamber have the right to interfere with Bills regulating the taxation of the colony. To accept these amendments would be to make that admission. To have given reasons apart from the reasons we gave why the Council should not make these amendments would be admitting the principle that they had the right to interfere. I did expect and hope that the Council would have adopted conciliatory measures, and would have been content with letting things remain as they are. There were many reasons for doing so. At the present time the session is drawing near a close, and it is quite impossible that a great constitutional question of this kind can be fought out. If it is not something must give way, and the only thing that can give way is the Bill, which I consider to be of great importance to the colony. We have been at great trouble, and after mature consideration, to secure the passing of a Bill which, I again say, will conduce to the welfare of the colony. We have made it a necessity, by our collateral legislation, that such a Bill should pass. We have passed the Estimates through, the Appropriation Bill is through most of its stages, and no provision has been made for carrying on the public works of the colony

except those that are dependent upon this Bill passing. It would be a misfortune, therefore, for the colony, at the present time, if the public works were stopped until Parliament had time to meet again, and initiate fresh legislation. That is an effect I wish by all means to prevent. I have no intention to, nor do I think the House at this time could, do anything aggressive towards the other Chamber. We have no notion of being aggressive at all. All we have to determine is to insist upon what we have always considered to be our own rights. We have, at the same time, a right to expect that the Council will not insist upon having more than their own rights. We have always insisted that we have the exclusive right of taxation, and they have insisted upon their right to alter any of the clauses of Bills sent to that Chamber. That is the position at the present time, and the Legislative Council have no right to try and extort a stronger position. If we accept their message and pass the Bill with the amendments sent down, or if we send a message which will let them pass the Bill but at the same time concede their right to amend these clauses, we should be taking a step in legislation to which I should be averse to be a party. I had hoped the message that we received would have asserted their rights, while agreeing to the amendments. That would have left the position exactly as it was before. They would have asserted their position as we had asserted ours; the course of legislation would go on, and a useful Bill would come into operation. I understand that there are no vital objections to the Bill, and but for this constitutional point the amendments would easily have passed. If we had had a message that agreed to our amendments, but dissented altogether from the reasons given, it would have left the other Chamber in the position they were in before. I do not wish to adopt the alternative of throwing this Bill aside. I believe it would be more detrimental to the interests of the colony, especially from the stage which legislation has reached now; and I have gone as far as I can, in the message I propose to send in reply, to promote conciliation without in any way departing from the privileges we consider we are entitled to claim for this Chamber. The message I propose to send in reply is as follows:—

MR. PRESIDENT,—The Legislative Assembly having taken into consideration the message from the Legislative Council, insisting upon the amendments made in clauses 58, 59, and 74 of the Divisional Boards Bill, on the ground that the reasons assigned for the Legislative Assembly's disagreement are untenable, beg now to reaffirm the undoubted right of this Assembly, as the representative branch of the Legislature, to control the taxation of the colony. Without admitting the right of the Legislative Council

to require further reasons from the Legislative Assembly than that given above, it is the duty of the Legislative Assembly to insist on disagreeing with the amendments in clauses 58, 59, and 74, *because*—

In clause 58—

1. The value of minerals beneath the surface is an unknown and unascertainable quantity.
2. The liability of undeveloped mineral properties to capricious taxation would prejudicially affect one of the colony's most valuable industries.

In clause 59—

1. The amendment makes the incidence of local taxation inequitable.
2. The clause, as amended, is ambiguous, the only statutory definition of "country lands" being "all (Crown) lands not being town or suburban lands."

In clause 74—

The amendment makes an undesirable variation in the conditions on which loans are granted to local bodies.

In this message I do not consider the House departs from its privileges. We insist we have the sole right of taxation, and deny the right of altering any clause in taxing Bills in the other House. We have infringed none of our privileges in going so far as to send the message I have just read, and I beg to move that it be sent.

THE HON. S. W. GRIFFITH: If this message is to be sent in its proposed form it means plainly enough that this House, while it reaffirms its right, does not insist on the reason it previously alleged, but relies upon the other reasons mentioned in the message. It asserts the bare fact that we insist upon our rights, but it gives quite another reason for insisting upon the disagreement to the amendments. I can understand that the other branch of the Legislature will be well satisfied indeed if we make this idle assertion of our rights and at the same time give the reasons we here offer for our disagreement. If these reasons had been given at first it would have been different. Now that there is likely to be some entanglement, the Government practically recede from the reasons they gave before. I should be ready to agree to the motion before the Committee, but I do trust we shall make some alteration in the proposed message, in order that it may not be supposed we have abandoned our exclusive right to deal with taxation. Talk about making a dangerous precedent, this would be a dangerous one indeed! It is our duty to insist on our disagreement, but not to recede from those reasons which we first gave. Perhaps, however, I have misunderstood the hon. gentleman. His observations did not appear to point to such a course as is proposed to be adopted in sending this message; but, considering the form of the message as drafted, I cannot come to any other conclusion than that which I have stated—that the Government

are willing, for the sake of peace, to give up the rights of this House.

The PREMIER: I know perfectly well the hon. gentleman would like much better that things should come to a dead-lock. I do not wish anything of the sort. I wish the position between the two Chambers to remain *in statu quo*. We shall have to fight the great constitutional question some day, but because we cannot do it now I do not wish to see the colony go to ruin in the meantime; and, therefore, I have framed this message without making the slightest concession on the part of the Assembly. How did the hon. member for North Brisbane, while Attorney-General, get over this exact difficulty in connection with the Navigation Act? That Act was returned from the other Chamber, where they made certain alterations in it which this House considered to be an infringement of the very principle which we are upholding at the present time. The then Government, while saying that the Council had not the slightest right to alter the Bill, withdrew it, and brought in another embodying every one of the objectionable amendments of the Council, in which form the Bill was passed. But the Council achieved their object, and made an alteration in a money Bill. If the present motion is accepted the gain will be entirely for this Chamber;—because, while I have not sacrificed any of its rights, I shall have gained the passing of my Bill in the form in which I want it. There are no concessions made in the words I have used. Without admitting the right of the Legislative Council to require further reasons from the Assembly, I considered it my duty to give them this additional information; and it is important for the country to know that we have those additional reasons to give.

Mr. GRIFFITH: With respect to the Navigation Act, the Premier tries to infer that in our action on that occasion we sacrificed the rights of the House. We did nothing of the kind. We simply followed a precedent which has been adopted over and over again in England—it is the usual form adopted whenever there is a difference of this kind between the Commons and the Lords. On that occasion the House entirely concurred in the amendments of the Council, and the only difference was a constitutional one, and we adopted the time-honoured precedent of withdrawing the Bill and introducing it in a form which we knew would be acceptable to both Houses. We gave up nothing whatever. A precedent of that kind, I admit, is hardly applicable on the present occasion, although it would certainly be an improvement if the Bill were gone through again and clause 59 passed in the form desired by the Legislative Council. If this motion is to go, I am anxious that we

should state plainly that our insistence is founded on the old reasons, and not on the new ones.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is plainly stated in the motion that we do insist on our undoubted rights. What could be plainer than these words:—

“The Legislative Assembly \* \* \* \* \* beg now to reaffirm the undoubted right of this Assembly, as the representative branch of the Legislature, to control the taxation of the colony.”

I can very easily see what the hon. member is aiming at with his objections. It is either to bring about a dead-lock, or have the Bill laid aside—I don't think he cares much which. But the duty of the Government is, while maintaining the rights of this House inviolate, by any compromise short of giving up that principle, to pass a Bill which they believe to be of the greatest importance to the country. The circumstances are plain. The Estimates are passed, making no provision whatever for the roads of the colony, except in connection with the Divisional Boards Bill, which has passed both Houses with a few alterations with which hon. members are well acquainted. We have now come to a dead-lock on a constitutional question; and believing as we do that it is of the greatest importance that this Bill should pass, it is the duty of the Government to give the Upper House additional reasons showing that they are wrong in their judgment. If the Bill does not pass, the responsibility for the neglected state of the roads of the colony and the other public works must rest on the other branch of the Legislature. It is the duty of the House, as well as of the Ministry, to employ every means to prevent a dead-lock on this very important question. The present motion will not interfere with the constitutional question; in that respect we shall be just as we were, and the House will have insisted upon its rights. If in giving additional reasons which may move the other House to re-consider their conclusion we can succeed in passing a Bill which we believe to be of enormous importance to the colony, we are bound to take that course, without at the same time sacrificing, what we all value highly, any of the privileges of the House.

Mr. DOUGLAS: I do not quite agree with the Premier that if the Divisional Boards Bill is not passed the colony will go to ruin. From the Government point of view it is certainly very desirable that that Bill should pass, but I do not attach that importance to it which the hon. gentleman does, and I do not think that without it the country will go to ruin. I am quite willing, however, that it should be tried as an experimental measure, and I have no doubt that in our future legislation in this direction we shall have to work upon its

lines though putting it into a very different shape. I can conceive that the Government must stretch a point in order to secure the passing of the Bill, for if not passed it will materially interfere with their policy. The form the motion assumes now simply offers the Legislative Council a sort of *locus penitentiae* if they choose to adopt it, and affords us a means of getting out of the present predicament. I hardly think the Upper House have taken up their position on this Bill with the intention of fighting it out on this issue. The small majority—10 to 9—indicates that there was a difference of opinion on the matter, and possibly on reconsideration they may be willing to recede from their position. The hon. gentleman, it seems to me, is taking the best steps, from his point of view, to enable them to reconsider their decision, without any loss of respect on their part. It is extremely undesirable to humiliate the Upper House, and what is called a dead-lock should by all possible means be prevented. I have not expressed my opinion on the constitutional question, but I suspect it may be found that the statutable powers of the Legislative Council are very different from the constitutional prescriptive powers of the House of Lords. The comparison between the two Chambers is not strictly analogous. I do not think it desirable at present to raise this constitutional question. We are all desirous—I speak for myself—that the Upper House should be a real power, that it should exercise real and independent legislative action; but we should preserve intact our privileges while at the same time paying every respect to the privileges of the co-ordinate legislative body. Expressions that have lately fallen from some hon. members have not been calculated to foster that respect which I think we ought to show to a co-ordinate branch of the Legislature—

Mr. BAYNES: Shame!

Mr. DOUGLAS: I do not know whether the hon. member imputes shame to me?

Mr. BAYNES: I do.

Mr. DOUGLAS: I am very sorry. I have always endeavoured to express my opinions decidedly, and I shall not be deterred from doing so by any amount of opposition from the other side. I generally endeavour to convey my opinions in terms which are at least parliamentary, and, if I occasionally exceed the bounds of propriety, I am generally found to express my penitence on being called to order by the proper authority—not without.

Mr. BAYNES said that as a representative he had a perfect right to call the hon. gentleman to order, and he would repeat that it was a matter of shame that this House should humiliate itself to the other Chamber. In this colony there was not the material for a House of Lords, as the hon.

gentleman termed the Upper House. He did not know what the hon. gentleman's aspirations were, but if they were to go into the Upper House he would have the pleasure of sitting amongst men who had not been allowed to take their seats here. That was a fact. The majority of the members of the Upper House were men who had failed to get returned under the representative system. That was why he cried "shame," and not for any personal reason. He had heard that in another place most derogatory language had been used towards the Speaker, and that the Premier had been advised to gag the Press. Such language was disgraceful. He hoped the hon. gentleman did not aspire to a seat amongst those who could not become representatives of the people, but would continue long to adorn this branch of the Legislature. He (Mr. Baynes) would be sorry to sit alongside him, but would always be glad to sit opposite him. He hoped the hon. gentleman would not disgrace himself, as some others had done, by taking his seat in another Chamber. He would not hear anything derogatory said of this House, and that was why he cried "shame." He would repeat that in a colony of only 200,000 inhabitants there was not the material for a House of Lords, and to call the Upper House a House of Lords was nothing less than tomfoolery. It was a mere vestry, as the hon. gentleman knew very well; and now, when the best Bill ever brought forward by any Government was introduced into the other House, they threw every obstacle they could in the way to prevent its passing. Had the Government not stuck to that measure he would not have stuck to them, and he trusted they would not be put off by any bunkum from hon. members who called the Upper House a House of Lords, which was all rot and nonsense.

Mr. DOUGLAS: I never made use of the expression, "House of Lords," in connection with the Legislative Council. I was endeavouring to show that there was a great distinction between the House of Lords and the Legislative Council. I imagined the ejaculation of the hon. member arose from my taking exception—as I was justly entitled to do—to some derogatory remarks made in this House with reference to the Upper House—remarks which, I hope, will not be repeated, and which, if they are, shall certainly be taken notice of, because they are not calculated to promote that harmony and good feeling between the two Houses which I have always endeavoured to do my best to secure. As to my possible aspirations, I can only tell the hon. member that I have twice had the honour of a seat in the Upper House, and that I have never found that stand in my way in regard to the trust which popular constituencies

have subsequently reposed in me. I regret extremely that an hon. member of the experience of the hon. member for Burnett should endeavour to cast obloquy on a Chamber which has hitherto worked remarkably well and in accord with this Chamber—in marked distinction to other Upper Houses, as he is well aware of. I am anxious not to disturb the happy harmony that has prevailed; and if the Upper House does give expression to its opinion sometimes with a little vigour it will benefit us rather than the reverse. We require the expression of a different phase of opinion from that which we obtain from representatives of the people—from men of large experience, and who have in many instances filled positions of trust and honour. They are chosen by the chosen of the representatives of the people, and are entitled to our confidence and trust as co-legislators.

The PREMIER: Whenever the hon. gentleman attempts extreme courtesy he always has an object outside his remarks; and he has now taken advantage of a little irritation between the two Chambers to make it appear that the offensive expressions emanated entirely from the Government side. I have many a time heard remarks made with regard to the other Chamber which I considered in bad taste, and I have always thought it best to laugh at them; but if the Speaker, who is the custodian of the self-respect of the House, does not interfere, I do not see what right the hon. member (Mr. Douglas) has to get into a state of indignation about it. Expressions of the kind referred to have always been accompanied with an amount of good humour which really condoned the offence; and I have heard nothing said which could justify any member of the other Chamber in showing the irritation that some have displayed on the subject. There is no feeling of animosity on the part of this House towards the other—certainly not on the Government side—and the hon. member has taken an unfair advantage of the remark of the hon. member for Burnett by trying to make out that there is such a feeling, and that it has been brought about by the language of hon. members on this side. Expressions have certainly been used which I regretted to hear; but the Upper House knows very well not to mind them.

Mr. DOUGLAS: My remarks arose from the assault of the hon. member for Burnett, and I think I was justified in saying what I did.

Mr. REA said all the words derogatory of the Legislative Council had come from the other side of the House. The conduct of the Upper House with regard to the Divisional Boards Bill was fully justified, for they must have seen that the Bill was an effort of hon. members on the other side to

over-tax the people of the colony in order to keep taxation off their own shoulders. If the Upper House were technically wrong on this occasion they were politically right, and the country would support them. It was not very fair of the Premier to attempt to mislead the public by giving out that the condemnation came from the Opposition side of the House when it came altogether from his side.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he wished to say a word about the reasons assigned for the disagreement to the Council's amendments on clause 59. The first reason given, that the amendment made the incidence of local taxation inequitable, was a very bold assertion—the fact being that the amendment made local taxation equitable, which it was not before, by taxing pastoral properties at their real value. With regard to the taxation of country lands, also, which had been frequently fully discussed, the amendment made taxation more equitable. The second reason stated that the clause as amended was ambiguous; the only statutory definition of "country lands" being all (Crown) lands not being town and suburban lands. Seeing that the terms "town lands" and "suburban lands" were defined in the statute, he failed to see how a provision affecting all lands, not town or suburban, could be ambiguous. If they could not find any better additional reasons they might have left them out;—the one was a bold assertion, and the other seemed simply foolish.

The PREMIER said the ambiguity arose from the fact that the term "country lands" meant by the statutes in force Crown lands only.

Question—That the Committee insist upon their disagreement to the amendments of the Legislative Council in clauses 58, 59, and 74—put and passed.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the Chairman reported the resolution to the House; and the following message was ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Council:—

Mr. PRESIDENT,—The Legislative Assembly having taken into consideration the message from the Legislative Council, insisting upon the amendments made in clauses 58, 59, and 74 of the Divisional Boards Bill, on the ground that the reasons assigned for the Legislative Assembly's disagreement are untenable, beg now to reaffirm the undoubted right of this Assembly, as the representative branch of the Legislature, to control the taxation of the colony. Without admitting the right of the Legislative Council to require any reasons from the Legislative Assembly than that given above, it is the duty of the Legislative Assembly to insist further on disagreeing with the amendments in clauses 58, 59, and 74, because—

In clause 58—

1. The value of minerals beneath the surface is an unknown and unascertainable quantity.

2. The liability of undeveloped mineral properties to capricious taxation would prejudicially affect one of the colony's most valuable industries.

In clause 59—

1. The amendment makes the incidence of local taxation inequitable.
2. The clause, as amended, is ambiguous, the only statutory definition of "country lands" being "all (Crown) lands not being town or suburban lands."

In clause 74—

The amendment makes an undesirable variation in the conditions on which loans are granted to local bodies.

#### THE ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he begged to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of calling attention to a matter for which the Government were, of course, responsible. About an hour ago three Bills were returned from the Legislative Council without amendment. In the ordinary course they would have remained in the custody of the Clerk until there was an opportunity of conveying them to the proper officer, to be submitted by him to His Excellency, yet the Royal assent had already been notified. The Attorney-General, as legal adviser of the Government, was required to advise His Excellency before any Bill was assented to or become law; but how the Attorney-General could have performed his duties with such expedition as was evinced on this occasion passed his comprehension.

The PREMIER said he was doubtful whether the hon. gentleman intended to congratulate the Government on the expedition with which the business had been carried on or not. The Council had sent down the Bills, and they had received the Royal assent, but how the transaction was managed in so short a time was not necessary for him to inquire into. It was not his duty to present Bills to His Excellency. There was an undoubted proof that they had been sent to His Excellency, because they had received the Royal assent.

Question put and negatived.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL No. 2.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the Bill was read a third time.

The PREMIER moved that the Bill do now pass.

Mr. GRIFFITH said before that question was put he wished to say that some important returns, for which orders had been made, were not yet produced. He referred especially to the returns of correspondence between the Auditor-General and the Government, and a return of fees paid to members of the House, about the latter of which he had inquired yesterday. It was also not unusual on the last day of the

session to ask the Government when they proposed to call Parliament together again. If they could not fix the date to a week or so, they might give some approximation. The meeting took place unusually late this year because there was a new Government in office, but the same reason would not apply next year. He would express a hope that the meeting would not be later than April—the present Government when in opposition insisted that that should be the latest date.

The PREMIER said he had ascertained this morning that the returns having reference to fees to members would be very difficult to make up, as the Under Secretary would have to write to all the different departments to get information. The correspondence between the Auditor-General and himself was not finished yet, and he had this morning received a letter from the Auditor-General about it. Although he (Mr. McIlwraith) did not object in the slightest degree to anything in the correspondence, he did not think it was of such vital importance as to demand publication just now. With regard to the meeting of Parliament, he thought it was unusual for a Government to fix any date. The hon. gentleman might have heard the question asked often, but he had never heard it answered. He could not say when Parliament would meet, but the date would probably be not much earlier than usual.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked if he understood rightly that the House would not meet before the 15th May next? He had heard the question asked before now and properly answered. Considering the state in which the Government had left the proposed branch lines of the colony, the country would probably be glad to see Parliament assembled very soon after the commencement of the year. There was an impression abroad—perhaps not altogether unfounded—that the trunk lines of the colony were to be gone on with, and that when the Premier got them he had not the slightest notion of making the branch ones. He did not join in that cry, because he did not believe it was a fact. So far as the Mount Esk line was concerned, he would rather see it put back for a year, or even two or three years, than carried out according to the present survey. Still the surveys might have been prosecuted during the sitting of the House, so that by a hard struggle the Fassifern, if not the Mount Esk line, might have been started at once. He must be candid, and say he did not expect the Mount Esk line to be gone on with during this session, but preparations might have been made for starting it at the beginning of next session. His constituents were in a nice temper about it and he should be the sufferer, but he would take the opportunity of saying that he had

done everything in his power to have both the lines he had referred to carried out. Had he his way the Government would go in for more branch lines than they had. He had said what he could in favour of lines to the Upper Logan and to South Brisbane. In the coal resources of the colony there were millions of money within their reach, and by making a branch line they would open up a fine coal trade. Whilst they were squandering money in every direction wealth was staring them in the face, if they would only go the right way about it. He hoped the Minister for Works would give a better explanation of the neglect of those branch lines than he had given last night. He believed the statement made outside to be untrue, and that it was the intention of the Government to do something in the matter of the branch lines. He now simply rose to ask the Minister for Works to give some more satisfactory explanation than he did last night.

Mr. BEATTIE said he was in hope that the return he had moved for would have been laid on the table ere this. He was asked by the Attorney-General whether he would be satisfied with a part return during this session, and replied that he would, and that he did not care to make the return an expensive one. He understood that it would be furnished in part, and that the rest would be supplied at some future time. He saw no difficulty in making the return from January 1, 1879, to June 30, as originally asked for.

Mr. DICKSON said he had been rather surprised to hear the Premier say that the correspondence between him and the Auditor-General was not so forward as to induce him to consider it proper to be laid before the House. The matter solely referred to was that of exchange, and he would now ask whether the correspondence connected with that question was not sufficiently complete to be laid upon the table? Before he moved for the papers he understood from the Treasurer that he was quite prepared to produce them, and that he had been only waiting for him to make the necessary motion. Of course, if the correspondence was not complete he would not press that it should be laid upon the table, though he thought it unsatisfactory that the session should close without its production. As to the subject referred to by the hon. member for Stanley, he should be glad to hear from the Minister for Works some further and more satisfactory explanation as to the action of the Government regarding branch lines than had yet been given. The hon. member seemed to think that the public were labouring under a mistaken impression as to the real intentions of the Government, and credited the Government with a sincere desire to extend branch lines

equally with the trunk ones. He did not participate in the confidence of the hon. member, and only judged the Ministry by their actions. He regretted that the session was to close without some decided action being taken by the Government in the matter, and was convinced that the public would have derived much more satisfaction at witnessing an attempt made to proceed with the construction of branch lines than to hear elaborate professions from Ministers regarding their future intentions.

Mr. HENDREN said when the Loan Estimates were brought forward members were led to believe by the Ministry that the branch and trunk lines were to go on in equal proportions. In the Southern districts they imagined they were to get branch lines—his constituency and that of the member for Stanley were equally interested in the matter. The other day a survey of the Fassifern line, and one of the most objectionable ones that had been made, was laid upon the table as a “decoy duck” to induce them to vote for the trunk lines, for as soon as the first sections of the trunk-line extensions were passed, the Premier, in answer to a question from him as to whether it was intended to ask for the approval of the plans for the Fassifern line this session, said it was not, because they could not afford to make it unless the people gave up the land for nothing. Subsequently it was stated, as a further reason for not taking action, that the line should run along the main road, and yet the Government had withdrawn the Bill which would have enabled them to do that. His belief was that it was never intended to make that branch line this session. He did not know whether the real reason was because he happened to represent a district through which it ran and sat with the Opposition. It had been said that hon. members on the Government side had got the branch lines in the West Moreton district, but where did the credit claimed for them now come in? They were left out in the cold just as much as he had been. As to the excuse that the people should give the land for nothing, it must be borne in mind that they had had to pay for it, and that they had fenced and cultivated it. He would be bound that they were prepared to give what land was required at first cost, but it was unreasonable to expect that poor struggling agriculturists should give way by allowing their land to be taken for nothing. He felt very sore upon the question of the Fassifern Railway. It had been his particular hobby during the weeks that the House had sat; he had tried his level best to find facilities for the people of the Southern district to get to market, and to find employment for the unemployed. They had gone through hard times; men



could not get their produce to market; and yet, at the tail end of the session, when it was too late to take other steps, the Tramways Bill was allowed to go, and no promise would be made that the line would be undertaken. It was never intended by the Government to make a single inch of branch lines in the Southern district. Let the Government turn to the country now and hear what the country would say, or let any of their supporters appeal to their constituents. When he was speaking of the Fassifern line, he wished it to be understood that he was speaking also of all the branch lines in the Loan Estimate. In all fair play they ought to have branch railways provided for equally with trunk ones, but the Government had passed the first sections of the latter and thrown a wet blanket on the former. They had also said there was a difficulty in the branch lines being undertaken before the loan was got; if so, the settled districts would be content to wait for the branch lines provided the trunk lines also had to stand over, and that when action was taken each should be made mile for mile.

Mr. KELLETT was very sorry that he was not present when the matter more particularly under discussion came before the House on Tuesday evening. It was very seldom that he was not in his place when anything affecting his constituents was going on. When he read in *Hansard* the statement made by the Minister for Works he hardly believed it—in fact, had he not known that *Hansard* was very correct in its reports he would have discredited it; and his reason was, because he had believed that a promise made by a gentleman occupying the responsible position of a Minister of the Crown, and accepted by the person to whom it was made, was as good as a bond duly signed. A distinct promise was made to him by the Minister for Works that the approval of Parliament would be asked for the Fassifern line this session, and that the work would be started at once. That was the promise made to him by the Minister for Works.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No.

Mr. KELLETT said the Minister for Works might say "No;" but, though the hon. gentleman had been a member of the House for many years, he (Mr. Kellett) dared say that his word would be taken by those who knew him to be worth just as much as the hon. gentleman's. During his twenty-five years in the colonies very few men had ever disbelieved a statement that he had made; and, with regard to the denial just given, he could bring other men to prove that his statement was correct. It was well known to the House and country that when the Ministerial programme was put before the House there was, as regarded branch lines, nothing but a line for the Darling Downs promised.

Many supporters of the Government came into the House for the purpose of ousting the late Ministry, in order to see whether other men could not steer the ship of State better; and they were dissatisfied when they saw no branch lines in the programme of the present Ministry. Instead of kicking against the pricks, they tried by their influence to show the Ministry their mistake. He and others told them that the people in the settled districts cried out for railways, and that it would be a great injustice not to give them facilities for bringing their produce to market—to do everything for the Far West and nothing for the hard-working people in the settled districts. They told them that they would find their mistake if they pushed on nothing but trunk lines. It was evident that the advice given them was considered by the Government, for when the Loan Estimates came before the House branch lines formed an important part of the programme. The Government would not have lasted this session if they had not done so;—as he had stated lately, he would not have voted for one of the trunk lines only that he was satisfied that the branch lines would also be carried on. One of the chief reasons besides the one just given by him why the Fassifern line should be started was that there was a great dearth of work in the settled districts; hard times had been experienced, and in consequence many men were out of work, and the present was a time when the line could be made at a much cheaper rate than at any other time hereafter—for he trusted that prosperity would return in the future, and that they were not likely to have such bad times as at present. He had a solemn promise that the Fassifern line, which would run through a large agricultural district, would be started at once; and when he came down yesterday he went to the Minister for Works and asked whether it was a fact he had stated, on Tuesday, that it was decided not to go on with the line this session. He replied that it was, and that it would put the country to too much expense, as it would have to go through much purchased land. Did the hon. gentleman not know by the four surveys that were made, and when the plans were laid upon the table, that it would go through purchased land? If the hon. gentleman said he did not know he was not doing his duty as a responsible Minister. The hon. gentleman, however, knew the locality, for he had been there before. He would acknowledge that he had been an active Minister since he had been in office—few Ministers had travelled round the settled districts more than he had done already. The other excuse was, that the Tramways Bill was blocked by the leader of the Opposition;—but when was the measure brought

in? There had been plenty of time to introduce it earlier, and the Ministry had been strong enough to pass it at any time, but they left the Bill to the last minute when there was no chance, no expectation—he might even say, no wish—to pass it. Any Minister that would break a promise such as had been given to him was a man not to be depended upon. The Minister for Works said the other evening that the plan for the Fassifern line had been laid upon the table and he had intended to move its adoption. The time that he got rid of these good intentions was apparently two or three days before when he paid a visit to the district with the Engineer-in-Chief. It was not intentions but actions that were wanted. It was well said the road to hell was paved with good intentions. It was proper action that they expected to have from Ministers of the Crown. The country and his constituents might well say that they had been “sold.” He had never sold his constituents by any vote, but he had been sold, and well sold, and he had discovered it when it was too late to do more than tell the House and the country the way that it had been done. If he had been only as wise at the beginning as he was now, he and those who thought with him might have acted in a different manner, and the present occupants of the Treasury benches might have found themselves sitting opposite. Being a young member he did not try to take a prominent part in the debates, but he worked as hard as any member in taking the trouble to find out what the requirements of his district and of the other settled districts were. He might be pardoned for stating that there were many matters upon which he had made suggestions to Ministers. He had been one of the means of having a great many clauses of Bills altered. He did not move the alterations himself, but he advised and left it to Ministers to do so. He had worked his best for his constituents and the country generally, but was sorry to think that he had been egregiously sold with some of his friends who sat on the same benches with him. He was glad the House had not risen to-day for good. There was nothing to prevent them sitting for another month or so; let them do so, and do some business for the good of the country. There was nothing to prevent the Tramways Bill being passed, if it was necessary before the branch railways could be started. And touching this Tramways Bill, he would ask were there any surveys made along the roads? If it was intended to pass the Bill this session, as it might have been, would they not have made railway surveys along the roads and had them ready to be passed by the House? But they did nothing of the kind, and had the Tramways Bill passed they would have been just in the same position as regards

the branch railways as they were now. He was satisfied that this was not only a disgraceful transaction on the part of the Minister for Works in the way he had treated good supporters, but nothing that had been done in the House would be the means of getting him more into detestation in the eyes of the country than this present matter. He was told as another reason why it could not be gone on with, that there was no money to go on with it, if it was passed. He was not in a position to know what money was in the Treasury—it was not his business—but he was satisfied with the promise that was made to him. He believed that there was nearly a million of money in the Treasury for public works that could be expended for that work, but where was it to be expended—on Northern works? Every *Gazette* that came out showed some new Northern work about to be carried out—in fact, the Northern element in the House at the present time was too strong, and that was the reason why they got so much and the South so little. Money could be found for the Northern Railway, for buildings at Townsville, Bowen and other Northern places, but they could get nothing done down here. That was a fact, and he was sorry that he had had to make use of such strong language as that he had used on this occasion.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I desire to say something in answer to the hon. member for Stanley; but it seems to me that, no matter what is said after what has fallen from the hon. member for Enoggera, it will not be believed. He says that it is impossible for the people to believe what the Ministry say, because they have not carried out what they promised in the early portion of the session.

Mr. DICKSON: What I stated was, that the country had a right to doubt the sincerity of the Government, judging from their actions.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. gentleman said that any man who believed in the Government, or in the intentions expressed by the Government, must have a large amount of credibility, which is just as much as to say that the Government have no intention of doing what they promised to do—no other meaning can be put upon the words. Now, in regard to the branch railways spoken of by the hon. member for Stanley—to Fassifern and Mount Esk—and the Sandgate line, which has not been mentioned, I believe it is well known to every member of the House that the only branch lines that could possibly have been gone on with, had the Government the money at their disposal at the present moment, are the lines to Fassifern as far as Harrisville, and the Sandgate line as far as German Station. But the

hon. members seem to forget that even if the surveys were in the most forward state, and the line was ready to be constructed at the present moment—that the parliamentary plans and sections had been approved of—the money is not in the Treasury for making these lines. The hon. member for Stanley has spoken of a million of money being in the Treasury; I do not know how much is in the Treasury, but if there were two millions of money there every penny of that money has been voted for a specific purpose and could not be applied to make a railway to Fassifern, or Sandgate, or anywhere else. The hon. member has also spoken about the Northern railway; but he does not know, being a young member of the House—but although he is a young member he can use language as strong as the oldest member—that the money that is being spent on the Northern railway was voted two years ago, and was allowed to remain two years unspent—until the present Government came into office. He wants to know why that money was not used to make the Fassifern line—simply because no Ministry dare do so; it would be illegal even if the plans and sections were approved of at the present moment. As far as these branch lines are concerned, I say, as I said the other evening, that I will not be a party to making lines through an extent of country every inch of which must be purchased by the Government. I have a strong recollection of the very large amount that had to be paid by the State for the purchase of land on the line between Brisbane and Ipswich—£63,000 for a line twenty-three miles long—and I am not going to repeat that; but if the Fassifern line, or the Sandgate line, or any other of the branch lines can possibly be made along the main line of road I shall do so with the approval of the House. It is quite true that I laid the plans and section of the Fassifern line on the table of this House thinking that I would be able to pass them; it is also equally true that I proposed the Tramways Bill believing that I would be able to pass that; but from the arguments used by the hon. member for North Brisbane I felt convinced that that Bill would have to be considerably modified, so as to protect the rights of people holding property having frontage to the main roads. But it was only last Saturday that I was able to convince myself that I could carry the line of railway along the Fassifern road for the greater part of the distance from Ipswich. I was in that portion of the country before, but only once, and I did not at that time examine the road for the purpose of seeing whether the line of railway could be carried along it or not; but on Saturday last I found that the line could be carried along the road without much detriment, or, in fact, any detriment to the people living

along the line, and I immediately gave orders to the engineer to survey the line, and to-day he has received written orders to do so. But I would point out that while some people would be satisfied with the Government carrying out a certain branch line by a particular route, others would be equally dissatisfied because that route was adopted, and some of them would be just as much displeased if the Fassifern line was carried out according to the plans and sections laid upon the table as if it had not been passed at all. The people in the district of Fassifern wish other lines of route to be adopted besides that I laid upon the table, but it is not because of giving satisfaction or dissatisfaction that we have not passed it. It is simply because I wish to do my duty to the country, and to expend as little money as possible in the making of that line. By the Loan Bill we are confined to making these lines for a certain sum of money—for £2,500 and £3,000 per mile; £3,000 is the highest amount we will be prepared to spend upon them, and I shall try as far as it is possible within me not to expend one single penny more than is set down in the Loan Bill. But if we were compelled to purchase the land through which these lines will go nearly every penny of the money would be absorbed, and that I am not prepared to do. As regards the main lines, I said distinctly in the House, and the Premier also said the other evening, that no new work will be commenced on the main lines; but the men now at work must not be allowed to be unemployed if the sections already under construction should be finished before the loan is floated. It is very probable that the men employed on the Roma section will be finished about March next, and then the Government will be compelled, probably, to go on with that line for a certain distance so as to keep the men employed; but beyond that we have no intention of carrying any of the main lines until the loan is floated. I say that we should not be justified in commencing any new work until we have the means of doing it. The hon. member for Stanley (Mr. Kellett) has stated that I promised him that the Fassifern line would be gone on with immediately: that I deny. I could not make a promise that that, or any other line, would be proceeded with until the money was obtained for the construction of it; and, however much the hon. member may appeal to his colonial experience of twenty-five years, I think that my word is equally as good as his. Even as a member of the House I could not be ignorant of the fact, much less as a Minister, that I would be compelled to have the money before I could make the line. Money that is voted for one specific purpose must not, and cannot be, applied to any other purpose. Ministers of the Crown dare not do such a thing as that—even the

worst Minister that ever existed would not do it; and if money has been voted for the Northern railway it must be spent on that railway. We have proof of that in the fact that two years' money was voted for the Northern railway, and yet not one penny of it was spent upon that railway, and that money is still available for that work. In the same way I could make no distinct promise that the Fassifern line would be gone on with immediately, knowing that the money must be first obtained; but what I said was, that the Fassifern line would be amongst the first lines to be gone on with, and that it would be gone on with as soon as possible; and I say so now. I may also state that when the Government proceed to purchase the material for the making of the railways which have been authorised by the House, every mile of branch-line material will be obtained at the same time as the material for the main lines. I think that ought to be sufficient to induce hon. members to believe in the intentions of the Government with regard to the construction of these branch lines. The hon. member for Stanley (Mr. O'Sullivan) said something about the Mount Esk line; but he has good sense enough to know that, although there has been one survey made of that line, it is not the survey that will be most advantageous to the people of the district. I may be compelled, in doing my duty to the House and to the country, to have perhaps three or four surveys, and I shall adopt the best, and if I can make the line for any distance along the main road I shall do so, if the House sanctions it, for the purpose of saving money that would otherwise have to be expended in the purchase of land. I do not think I need go any further, except to say that the Government intend to go on with every branch line of railway that has been mentioned in the Loan Bill, but that they cannot be gone on with at once. That is impossible, but no line mentioned in that Bill will be held back simply for the purpose of being held back; and I am quite certain that before the end of two years all of the lines will have been started, and that many of them will have been finished. I think it very unfair that the hon. member (Mr. Kellett), one of the youngest members of the House, who has only had the experience of one session, should stand up and place himself in the position of Mentor to the Ministry. He actually stood up and said that he advised the Ministry—men who have grown grey in the service of the country as Ministers and as members of this House—as to what they should do and what they should not. It is ridiculous. It is absurd to think that the hon. member for Stanley should be the confidential adviser and Mentor of the present Ministry. The Ministry are willing to take advice from any person; they have always been

willing to do so, even from members of the Opposition, when it agreed with their own opinions—when they found it was to the advantage of the colony to do so. But this much I will say, that, as far as having any one individual member of the House to advise them—to be their Mentor, as the hon. member (Mr. Kellett) appears to assume himself this evening, I do not think even the youngest member of the Ministry would accept advice from him unless he felt it was for the benefit of the country, and that his own opinion went in that direction as well.

Mr. REA said it would almost appear from the speeches of the hon. member that new members should not be allowed to speak in the House at all, and as to their giving an opinion it was out of the question. They were now told that the Government would only take advice where it suited their own views; and what did they hear the other night when the leader of the Opposition tendered advice to the Ministry—that that gentleman had got his preaching boots on—so that it made no difference how long a member had been in the House so long as he held an independent opinion, it was scouted by the present Ministry. That was the doctrine that was now laid down, and he was quite sure that it would require an hon. member with at least five times the experience of the Minister for Lands to qualify him to offer an opinion as to what the Ministry would consent to if it did not suit their own pockets. He thought the hon. member for Stanley deserved very great honour for having detected the subterfuge of the Ministry, and having had the manliness to speak out and tell them that their statements were not founded on fact; because that hon. member was quite as capable of understanding what was said to him as the Minister for Works was to remember what he said. The hon. member for Stanley was led to believe that the railway referred to would be proceeded with immediately, and it now required a further explanation from the Minister to show that he never meant anything of the sort. He was surprised that the hon. member for Stanley should ever have been deluded into believing any statement made by the Ministry. He was now beginning to find out that they never intended to keep their promises. Take their programme when they first met the House, and not one promise had been kept except that which put money in their own pockets.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: I ask the ruling of the Speaker if it is parliamentary for an hon. member to accuse the Ministry of having put money in their own pockets by their measures? It is time this kind of thing from the member for Rockhampton was put a stop to.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member has used language personally offensive to members of the House, and he must withdraw it.

Mr. REA said he had pleasure in withdrawing it, and was glad to find that those words were unparliamentary, as he had heard the very same words used by the Minister for Lands in reference to members on that side of the House, and no notice was taken of them.

The SPEAKER said the hon. member should not impute that a privilege was allowed to one side of the House which was denied to the other. If the Minister for Lands used the alleged words, his attention was not called to them.

Mr. REA said the Government at the opening of Parliament promised retrenchment, and a telegram had been sent to London speaking of the marked retrenchment that was to take place; but where did they find it? He had taken the trouble to go carefully into the matter, and found that the whole retrenchment of the session amounted to £115 10s.—not more than the cost of the telegrams to London. The Government advocated personal economy and promised public retrenchment; but in place of giving an example of economy they were most extravagant in their public display of private expenditure, and experience had shown that both of these things as mentioned in the Governor's Speech amounted to a mere sham. They found the same with regard to the other projects promised by the Government. They had failed in their promise of bringing in a Bill regarding the runs in the coast districts, and their great object was to get money into a limited liability bank. He found, as stated yesterday, that the opinions of the Crown law officers had to be taken with regard to the contract with the Government bank, and when it required the opinion of the Attorney-General, at the very outset, to explain one of the clauses of that contract, did it give them any confidence as to any bargain that might be made by the Premier when he went to London? Were they sure that clearer contracts would be made there? He said they would have the same blunders, the same mystification, and the same reference to the Crown lawyers as they now found in connection with this bank contract. He held that the whole history of the session was that of breaches of faith on the part of the Government, except that of putting extra taxation upon the country, and he was sorry that hon. members opposite had not sooner discovered those breaches of faith, and that no reliance could be placed in the promises of the Government. He hoped the country would see that the whole action of the Government this session had resulted in nothing short of doubling the taxes of the people and easing the Crown tenants of their taxes.

Question put and passed; and the Bill was ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Council with the usual message.

#### DR. PURCELL'S CLAIM.

Mr. RUTLEDGE, on rising to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of an Address to the Governor, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be placed on the Supplementary Estimates a sum not exceeding £115 10s., in satisfaction of the claim of Dr. Herbert Churchill Purcell, for services rendered to the Government in the capacity of medical officer of the quarantine station, Fitzroy Island, said he should not occupy the time of hon. members by making many remarks. It appeared to him that the question resolved itself into this—as to whose testimony was to be accepted. And when he said that he did not wish to say anything that was likely to be interpreted as impeaching the credibility of a gentleman like Mr. St. George. But it was quite possible that a gentleman who had his mind charged with a number of things might not recollect so distinctly what transpired as another gentleman would who was deeply interested in the transaction. In order that they might arrive at a fair appraisalment of the statements made by Dr. Purcell, it must be borne in mind that that gentleman's statements were confirmed by Mr. Smart, the manager of a bank at Cairns, by Captain Brooks, and by another gentleman who *was* present. He wished to draw the attention of hon. members to the letter sent down by Mr. St. George to the Colonial Secretary. When he was called upon to give an explanation of Dr. Purcell's letter, Mr. St. George said—

"I have the honour, in conformity with instructions received by wire from you, to furnish you with certified copies, under separate cover, of my press copies of all correspondence carried on by me with Dr. Purcell, relative to the quarantine station at Fitzroy Island. I further furnish correspondence which I had with other gentlemen, which may, perhaps, throw light upon this question; and I further furnish certified copies of my press copies of all correspondence held by me with the captain and agent of the s.s. 'Galley of Lorne,' as more remotely bearing on the same subject. I have learned from Mr. Reid that inquiries have been made from him by the sub-collector, Mr. Fahey, acting under instructions, as to any correspondence, private or otherwise, which he held with me, and particularly as to a private note which I wrote to Mr. Reid while on the Island, and a portion of which he read to Dr. Purcell, and upon which I believe Dr. Purcell grounds his claim for compensation, on the plea that I appointed him medical officer of the Island."

But now came a most significant paragraph—

"Mr. Reid has, most unfortunately, lost or mislaid this note, or left it on the Island—at all events it cannot be found; to the best of my knowledge and recollection, what I wrote to Mr. Reid was to the following effect, and Mr. Reid's recollection agrees with mine:—'I hear

a Dr. Purcell has been appointed medical officer at Fitzroy Island; if so, you will, of course, have to give up charge to him."

He (Mr. Rutledge) might state that it was quite clear that this reference to Dr. Purcell was contained in the letter of general instructions sent to Mr. Reid when he was appointed to take charge of Fitzroy Island, as he had before him another letter written by Mr. St. George to Mr. Reid before going to the quarantine station. He said in that letter—

"On arriving at Fitzroy Island you will take measures to establish yourself and party of constables on shore in the tents which will be furnished to you. I have no doubt but that a medical man from Cairns will be appointed to take the medical charge of the ship and crew."

This was a clause contained in the letter written to Mr. Reid before he went to take charge of Fitzroy Island, and it was received by him some considerable time before Mr. Reid had any communication with Dr. Purcell. It was proved, also, that Mr. Reid was in charge of the quarantine station, and was coming down on board of the launch belonging to the s.s. "Galley of Lorne" when the s.s. "Egmont" cast anchor in Trinity Bay. Dr. Purcell appeared on board, and Mr. Reid communicated to him the fact that he (Dr. Purcell) was appointed, and that he (Mr. Reid) was to take his instructions from him. The affidavit of Mr. Smart was accessible to any hon. members who might wish to see it, referring to what took place. That gentleman stated that he was on board the s.s. "Egmont" in Trinity Bay with Dr. Purcell, and he saw a steam-launch coming towards them, and he observed the yellow flag flying. Mr. Reid, who was on board the launch, received some letters, and immediately after reading them asked if Dr. Purcell was on board. He was answered in the affirmative. On Mr. Reid seeing Dr. Purcell, he told him he had to go to Fitzroy Island and take charge of the quarantine station as medical officer. Dr. Purcell then asked by whose instructions he was acting? Mr. Reid replied, "Mr. St. George's"; and the doctor left that evening by the s.s. "Dugong" for Fitzroy Island. That was the sworn testimony of Mr. Smart, and he (Mr. Rutledge) thought he was justified in saying that against that all the little stories that had been raked up about Dr. Purcell went for nothing. If there was nothing else than that testimony it was quite sufficient to show that Dr. Purcell's story was not a concocted one, but one deserving of belief. There was another letter written by Mr. St. George, in which he said—

"I much regret to learn that a misunderstanding has taken place between Dr. Purcell and yourself."

That referred to a letter written by Dr. Purcell complaining that Mr. Reid was

not doing his duty to the Chinamen and constables in the matter of food. Mr. St. George went on to say—

"Upon referring to your instructions, you will find that you are directed to put yourself under the orders of any duly appointed medical officer."

That was before Mr. Reid received the letter informing him that Dr. Purcell was the officer duly appointed. In a letter to Dr. Purcell on the same day, Mr. St. George said—

"In reply, I have the honour to state that I have no knowledge of your appointment by the Government to that or any office, and I certainly have no authority either to discharge Mr. Reid or to accept your resignation."

Hon. members would see that Mr. St. George was aware that there was trouble brewing and difficulty arising, and that was the way he got out of it—viz., by merely stating that he knew of no appointment by the Government—only a portion of the truth. Mr. St. George's letter further went on to say—

"I cannot conceive how Mr. Reid could have given you the message from me you say he did, to take medical charge of the island."

It was very strange that after the letter which had been read to Dr. Purcell in the presence of many persons Mr. St. George should write a letter repudiating all knowledge of Dr. Purcell's appointment after Dr. Purcell had got clear away from the island and could not reply to it. He (Mr. Rutledge) had received a letter from Dr. Purcell that day, in which he stated that he had never received that letter from Mr. St. George. He (Mr. Rutledge) submitted that a letter written under those circumstances, after Dr. Purcell had withdrawn from the island, amounted actually to nothing. Taking the fact into consideration that Mr. St. George signed the vouchers declaring certain work had been done, and also the declaration by the hon. member for Cook (Mr. Walsh)—who would have given his hearty support to the motion had he been present—and taking into consideration that Dr. Purcell did the work and gave satisfaction to all concerned, he considered that, although brought forward at that late period of the session, there would not be a disposition on the part of hon. members to deprive a gentleman of remuneration for services for which he had never yet been paid. He believed that Mr. Hart, of Bright Brothers and Co., had stated that if the accounts connected with the quarantining of the "Bowen" and "Normanby" had been rendered accurately, there would have been no objection on their part to have paid their share of the money.

MR. LUMLEY-HILL said he took exception to the manner in which the question had been brought before the House, as he did not consider it was a proper matter to bring

before them, more especially since certain matters in connection with it had come under his knowledge. Through the courtesy of the hon. member for Enoggera (Mr. Rutledge) he had seen some affidavits in the case, and one made by Mr. Smart had been read to the House that evening, but from the way in which it had been read out on a previous occasion he did not think hon. members had had a sufficient opportunity of forming an opinion on it. He himself believed that the best way to have dealt with the question would have been to refer it to a select committee, as, notwithstanding the hon. member for Stanley (Mr. O'Sullivan) said that it was useless to refer matters to select committees if their recommendations were not attended to, when a committee was appointed the evidence taken before it was printed, and the House had an opportunity of saying whether the report of such a committee was justified by the evidence or not. For that reason he considered it would have been better if this matter had been referred to a select committee. In the previous discussion in that House one very striking matter presented itself to him which needed explanation, and he should have been glad if Dr. Purcell could have been examined on his oath in reference to it. In the printed correspondence there appeared this telegram from the Acting Under Colonial Secretary to Dr. Purcell, Cooktown:—

"Who employed you as medical officer at Fitzroy Island?"

The reply to that was—

"Received your telegram Cairns. Shall arrive Brisbane per Florence Irving."

He (Mr. Hill) would like to know why, when a direct categorical question like that was put to Dr. Purcell, that gentleman could not give a direct answer. He could have said it was Mr. St. George who appointed him—if that gentleman had appointed him—and that he would explain all on his arrival in Brisbane. Instead of that Dr. Purcell avoided saying who made the appointment; and he seemed to vacillate between the Acting Under Colonial Secretary and Mr. St. George. But now it appeared from the speech of the hon. member for Enoggera (Mr. Rutledge) that Mr. St. George was the man. With regard to Mr. St. George having signed Dr. Purcell's vouchers, it appeared, according to Mr. St. George's statement, that he was induced to do so by Dr. Purcell, on what seemed to be very much like improper pretences, and he was reprimanded by the Acting Under Colonial Secretary for having done so in these terms—

"Your explanation is considered satisfactory, but at the same time it is considered desirable that you should exercise a little more caution in future."

No doubt it would have been well had Mr. St. George exercised a little more caution. If the money was to be voted by the House it should be in the form suggested by the hon. member for North Brisbane (Mr. Griffith)—namely, as a present to Dr. Purcell, and not as something that was due to him. He (Mr. Hill) did not believe that Dr. Purcell could recover 5s. in any court of law, and it was admitted by the strongest advocates of his case that he had no legal claim, but only an equitable one. But the House, as legislators, must look at the question as one of equity between the taxpayers and themselves. They had been told that Bright Brothers would have paid their share of Dr. Purcell's claim had the accounts of the steamer "Galley of Lorne" been rendered accurately; but it was no reason that because that statement was made the country should be asked to pay Dr. Purcell. It was beyond all common decency that they should be asked to do such a thing. He believed the hon. member for Enoggera would do well if he looked a little more to what was due to the people of the colony, and gave more attention to the protection of their interests, instead of constituting himself the champion of anyone who had a case to bring forward against the Government, at a time like this especially, when the session was so near its close and hon. members were anxious to get through their business in any sort of way. He would move, as an amendment, that the question be referred to a select committee.

Mr. BEATTIE was surprised to see this subject come up again, as it had been gone into fully two years ago, and the House then decided that Dr. Purcell had no claim. The hon. member (Mr. Rutledge) laid great stress on the appointment of Dr. Purcell, but if he were appointed by Mr. St. George it was very strange he did not receive a letter notifying the appointment at the same time and by the same conveyance that Mr. Reid did. Mr. St. George was not so unbusinesslike as simply to write a letter to the officer in charge of the quarantine station, intimating that a medical officer had been appointed when by the same conveyance he could have notified the appointment of Dr. Purcell. Dr. Purcell had never said he had received a letter from Mr. St. George—the impression at first was that Mr. Rawlins had; when that would not answer it was Mr. St. George; and when he denied it, it was said the letter to Reid mentioned the matter. If they were to adopt the hon. member for Enoggera's motion, they would be charging Mr. St. George with an act he declared he had no hand in. Until the appointment was proved to his satisfaction, he should oppose the payment of the money.

Mr. SCOTT said that none of the published papers threw much light on the appoint-

ment. Before the House came to any conclusion further information ought to be afforded them, and he therefore concurred in the suggestion of the hon. member for Burke that the claim should be referred to a select committee for investigation. They would then ascertain the facts of the case, and the House would be in a position to judge whether the money was due or not.

Mr. HENDREN said that considering that over two years had elapsed since the claim was made it was strange Government had not got at the facts of the case before now. He could not get over the fact that Dr. Purcell rendered the services he claimed to be paid for; neither could he reconcile Mr. St. George signing the vouchers for payment with his statement he had not appointed Dr. Purcell, who had gone with his life in his hands among the Chinese and rendered valuable services to the colony, had prevented the spread of disease, and had saved the lives of many. Whether Dr. Purcell was appointed by the Government or not, he had a claim upon them for his professional services; and the House should not ignore such services even if they were volunteered. He should support the motion, on the ground that the country derived benefit from Dr. Purcell's professional services, and that the labourer was worthy of his hire.

Mr. AMHURST said the claimant in this case had no legal right; but, judging from the evidence, he had a very strong equitable right. There was no doubt that Dr. Purcell believed he had been appointed by the Government, and everything went smoothly until the time for payment came. Dr. Purcell's expenses were apportioned between the owners of the quarantined vessel; objections were taken by the owners; and on account of the late Government, the vessels were allowed to leave without payment being enforced. It was entirely the fault of the late Government, and in all justice Dr. Purcell was entitled to the money. Considering that Mr. St. George signed the vouchers and requested payment from the owners of the vessels, there was no doubt he considered Dr. Purcell entitled to the money.

Mr. NORTON said that before voting in favour of the claim he should like to see some of the evidence in support of it. Some hon. members talked about having seen affidavits in connection with the claim, but they had never been brought before his notice, and he had no means of judging whether the claim was a sound one or not. He would not oppose Dr. Purcell's claim if he was sure he was entitled to the money, and until he was so satisfied he should most decidedly vote against it. He had heard that evidence could be collected in Brisbane; if so, it ought to be laid before the House.

Mr. BAYNES said he should vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Gregory, simply in order to be satisfied that Dr. Purcell had a claim on the country for the money. There was no doubt Dr. Purcell had done the colony good service, but whether his claim against the colony for recompense was good he was not lawyer enough to say. He should like to see the matter inquired into by a select committee; but the select committee, if appointed, would, he trusted, be treated by the Government with more courtesy than they usually accorded to those bodies. It was evident that this professional man had gone among a lot of lepers, or fever patients, and he should be treated with proper respect. Whether he made the visit as a private speculation or not, and what was due to him, would be for a select committee to decide.

Mr. HAMILTON said they all knew that Dr. Purcell had done certain necessary work, and that the gentleman who was said to have appointed him had been authorised to appoint a medical officer for a ship previously in quarantine. Against the assertion that Mr. St. George distinctly denied having made the appointment was the sworn evidence to the contrary. The hon. member for North Brisbane endeavoured to meet the statement in Mr. St. George's letter that he had heard that Dr. Purcell had been appointed medical officer by saying he had heard it, because Dr. Purcell himself had circulated the rumour. But the manager of the Queensland National Bank and the Collector of Customs both stated that they heard Mr. Reid tell Dr. Purcell that he (Dr. Purcell) was appointed to take charge of the quarantine station. It was very singular that that letter should have been lost after Mr. Reid had a row with Dr. Purcell. He had recently seen in the E. and A. Company's office a letter from Mr. Walsh, the Company's agent at Cooktown, stating that Mr. St. George had applied to him for payment of a certain sum, and that he had refused payment because the amount was exorbitant. Dr. Purcell had done the work, and the evidence was sufficient to show that he was entitled to the sum asked for.

Mr. GRIFFITH said the course the debate had taken this evening went to show that some hon. members had private information not available to other members of the House. They had seen documents and been told this, that, and the other, whilst hon. members generally had only parliamentary records to go upon.

Mr. MESTON said the claim was one that should have been settled by the Colonial Secretary, and it would be a very unsound course for the House to recognise a claim which the Colonial Secretary believed was unfounded. Whatever might be the pri-



vate opinions of hon. members, they had a duty to the country which should in all cases be preferred before friendship or sentimentalities. The matter should be referred to a select committee, and if they brought up a report in favour of the claim he should be quite willing to vote for it. At present there was no tangible evidence before the House to justify them in assenting to the motion. He should support the amendment of the hon. member for Gregory to refer the matter to a select committee.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said the reference of the matter to a select committee would mean putting the claim off for another session, when the amount would be three years overdue. His experience in dealing with the Government was that they were the greatest robbers in the colony. Nobody got anything from them, no claim was recognised, and if you went to law and got a verdict they would not pay you. Not long since the Government had robbed him of £6 in the same way, and the money was now lying in the Treasury, as he could not afford to go to law about such a small matter. Dr. Purcell had done the work, and it was not likely that he would undertake such a dangerous work without authority. If the matter were referred to a select committee the expense would be such that very little would be left out of the £115, and the Government would have the satisfaction of cheating a private citizen out of his earnings for three years.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he was very glad the hon. member had confined himself to abusing the Ministry, because they could stand it; but had he said as much about the Upper House there would have been a row. He agreed with the hon. member that reference to a select committee would shelve the motion for the session—and he hoped for ever. He would rather the motion were met with a direct negative, because the more the case was gone into the more convinced was he that no appointment was made. The evidence showed that Dr. Purcell appointed himself, and went on "spec," and he maintained that the Government were not bound to pay for such services. If the amendment was not carried he should meet the motion with a direct negative.

Mr. RUTLEDGE said there had been no disposition on the part of either Dr. Purcell or himself to avoid the regular process of a select committee. There were two reasons why he had objected to the matter being referred to a select committee: first, because it was late in the session and there was no chance of a decision being arrived at before Parliament adjourned; and, second, because he apprehended that if the committee brought up a report next year they might be told by the powers that be that they had made up their minds from the commencement that there was no claim.

He was very glad to hear some hon. members say that they were anxious to have more information, and for that reason he should be willing to accept the suggestion that the matter be referred to a select committee. He might state that the letters referred to were among the records of the House, and the evidence in support of Dr. Purcell's claim had been read out to the House by him. That was therefore not private information, as the hon. member for North Brisbane had suggested. He was exceedingly sorry that there was any anxiety displayed to avoid giving Dr. Purcell the credit, at all events, for some amount of honesty in making the claim. Nothing was further from his intention than to get the money in any other way than by the regular routine. Two years ago, when his claim was first brought forward, he suggested, in a communication to the Government, that if they were not satisfied with his statement they ought to order a sworn inquiry into the whole matter, and that, having adopted and reaped the advantage of his services, they should certainly pay for them. In a court of law the certificate to Dr. Purcell's voucher, signed by Mr. St. George, would go against the latter's denial of the appointment. If Mr. St. George did not appoint Dr. Purcell, then he would say, without wishing to injure him, that he was guilty of a gross misconception of his duty in signing vouchers that he had no authority to sign. Believing that the House would give due consideration to the matter next session, he would withdraw his motion in favour of the amendment of the member for Gregory.

Amendment put and passed.

#### ORPHANAGES BILL—COMMITTEE.

On the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, the House went into Committee to consider the Legislative Council's message relative to the amendments in this Bill.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the amendment the Council insisted upon in clause 8 he did not think of great consequence, and he would move that the Committee do not insist upon their disagreement to the amendment.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that when the Bill was last before the Committee he moved that the words "Not being the holder of a publican's license, or the keeper of a common lodging or boarding house," in clauses 22 and 23, should be left out as conveying a slur upon a very worthy class of people in many instances. The Council insisted upon retaining the words, and, although he objected to doing so, he could not afford to lose a good Bill, and would move that the Committee do not insist upon their disagreement to the Council's amendment in those clauses.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he regretted that the Council insisted upon their amendment. He could conceive many instances where the Minister should be allowed to let orphans lodge in boarding-houses. Where the orphanage was over-crowded, the only practical relief might be to send some of the children to boarding-houses. He did not see any reason for that part of the amendment, and as to the other the discretion of the Minister might safely be trusted. If the hon. gentleman, however, thought the Bill would otherwise be imperilled, he would agree with him that the Committee had better not insist upon their disagreement.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY agreed with every word that the hon. gentleman had said. He objected to the Council's amendment, but could not afford to lose a good useful Bill for the sake of it. The only person that it would affect was the holder of a publican's license, because it would be impossible to describe "a common lodging-house;" there was no such term in any Act that they had.

Question put and passed.

On the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, the Chairman left the chair, reported the resolutions arrived at, and the Bill was returned to the Legislative Council with the usual message.

#### LICENSING BOARDS BILL.

On the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, the House went into Committee to consider the Legislative Council's amendments in this Bill.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the Council insisted on their amendment in subsection 2 of clause 2, because it was desirable that ratepayers should be represented on every board, and no practical inconvenience would arise from the creation of additional municipalities. When the Bill was last before the House this amendment was disagreed to because it was considered that some inconvenience might arise from a number of municipalities being in the same police district; but it was not a matter of very great importance, and he moved that the House do not insist on their disagreement to the Council's amendment.

Mr. GRIFFITH pointed out that the amendment was inconsistent with clause 3, and of a very objectionable character.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the Legislative Council also insisted on their amendment in clause 6, which required that every license should be granted by a majority of the members of the board. The amendment was not an improvement, but quite the reverse. In the outside districts, where there was great difficulty in getting magistrates together for any purpose, it would lead to great inconvenience, and the practical result would be that in

sparsely-populated places they would not be able to have a licensing board at all, and everything would be left, as now, in the hands of the police magistrate. However, the Bill was a very useful one and might be worked in many districts, notwithstanding the Council's amendment—which he thoroughly disapproved of, and which would probably necessitate the amendment of the Bill next session—and he therefore moved that the Assembly did not insist on their disagreement to the Council's amendment in this clause.

Mr. GRIFFITH entirely concurred with the Colonial Secretary. Another practical result of the amendment would be, that if it happened that a majority of the board did not approve of the granting of licenses, all they would have to do was to stop away and no licenses could be granted. It was introducing the permissive prohibitory system to a certain extent. It would also render the Bill useless in many parts of the colony. He did not know whether it was not worth while insisting on their disagreement with it.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he would rather accept it than imperil the Bill.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that the Council had jumped back to clause 2 in a way they could not have done in the Assembly. However, he would move that the Committee do not insist on their disagreement with the Council's amendment.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed, and the CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee did not insist upon their disagreements to the amendments made in the Bill by the Legislative Council.

The report was adopted, and a message embodying the report was ordered to be sent to the Legislative Council in the usual form.

#### *HANSARD.*

On the Order of the Day for the consideration of the Legislative Council's message of date the 23rd inst., relative to the "issue of *Hansard*," being read—

The PREMIER said the report of the Select Committee of the Legislative Council on the "issue of *Hansard*" had come too late into the hands of hon. members to enable them to do it anything like justice. He had not read all the evidence that was taken by the committee, but what he had read did not, in his opinion, justify the report the committee had brought up. The recommendation of the committee was, that a daily *Hansard* for the Legislative Council should be amalgamated with the Assembly's *Hansard*. There might be something to say in favour of that proposition, certainly; but the further recommendation that the Short-hand Writer of the Council should be appointed to take charge of the select

committee work of both Houses would put a different face on the matter altogether, and put the report far beyond anything he could himself recommend. It meant, to his judgment, the creation of two departments instead of one. At present the Assembly had a *Hansard* that worked very well, and if the Upper House wanted one for themselves let them propose some arrangement for establishing one, but do not let them interfere with the arrangements of the Assembly. He did not understand that one gentleman could take charge of all the select committees unless he had a staff under him, and that would be equivalent to a second staff, the expense of which, he was quite sure, they could not afford. He did not see any reason why the Council should not have a daily *Hansard* the same as the Assembly had, and he did not know why they should not have had one before; but with a view to bring out the best arrangements that could be made for the purpose of carrying out that object, and at the same time showing that the Assembly did not agree with the proposed arrangements made for working the committees of the House separately from *Hansard*, he would move—

That this House has considered the message of the Legislative Council relative to the report of the Select Committee on *Hansard*, and recommends that the President of the Legislative Council, the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, and some member of the Government be authorised to confer together with the object of recommending some feasible scheme for issuing a daily *Hansard*.

Of course, all that those gentlemen could do would be to recommend the most practicable way of carrying out the issue of a daily *Hansard* for the Legislative Council in connection with that of the Assembly, if they decided that such a thing was desirable; but the House itself would, after all, have to decide whether it was to be carried out or not, as it would have to be submitted to it in the form of an estimate. It might be considered by some that his motion would be superseding the fourth paragraph of the report, which was that, supposing the Assembly did not agree with the recommendation of the other Chamber with regard to the amalgamation of the *Hansards* for both Houses, and a separate department for reporting committee work, the President be authorised to make all such other arrangements as will be necessary to ensure the circulation on the following morning of each day's Council's proceedings and business done. It was quite plain that the President of the Council had no authority to make an arrangement of that sort without the proper expenditure being authorised by the Assembly, and it was to supersede that recommendation that he proposed this message. The matter had much better be referred to the President, the Speaker, and a

Minister of the Crown, with a view to their recommending some practicable scheme to Parliament. If the Government, in the meantime, liked to take the responsibility of accepting the recommendation of those three gentlemen, and authorise the necessary expenditure before Parliament met, that would be their business—whether they would do so or not he could not say. The Ministers had the power to adopt the recommendation of those gentlemen, but whether they did so or not would depend upon whether the scheme proposed recommended itself to them. He now moved the resolution.

Mr. GRIFFITH said there was no reason why the proceedings of the Council should not be circulated and made public in a better way than they were at present. Like the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, he had not had time to read through the evidence taken by the committee very carefully, but he had noticed a great number of suggestions, some of which seemed entitled to respect; but the suggestion that the Shorthand Writer of the Council should take charge of select committee work of both Houses appeared to him to be creating two heads to one staff, and it would work clumsily in this way—that Mr. Senior might require a reporter in one place and the other gentleman want him in another. That would clearly be impracticable. He did not think the resolution moved by the Premier would be in concurrence with the recommendations of the select committee, because they recommended that the sanction of the Assembly be invited to the amalgamation of the respective *Hansards*; the chief of the reporting staff should be charged with the combined duty; and that the President be authorised to confer with the Speaker, and the Premier, or some other member of the Government, with the object of making the most suitable arrangements for carrying out the wishes of the House. The recommendation they were asked to concur in was some practical action, which would result in the reporting of the debates in the Legislative Council next session from the beginning. The message now proposed only authorised a conference of the heads of both Houses, and a member of the Government, with a view to recommending some scheme to Parliament. That was not the intention of the report. The Premier, however, did not propose to sanction anything but an inquiry. He (Mr. Griffith) was sorry the hon. gentleman did not see his way to go further and make some practical suggestion which would have the effect of carrying out the wishes of the Council as far as possible. He, himself, was not prepared to go into the matter now, but he feared what was proposed would not be satisfactory to the other House. The message moved by the Premier would, in effect, bring into operation

the recommendation of paragraph 4 of the report, which said—

"In the event of the Honourable the Legislative Assembly not concurring in the foregoing proposition, your Committee then recommend to your Honourable House that the President be authorised to make all such other arrangements as will be necessary to ensure the circulation on the following morning of each day's Council's proceedings and business done."

No doubt, by the message now before the House they did not concur in the recommendation of the Legislative Council; and he foresaw danger when he said that the President was authorised by the Council to make other arrangements should the Assembly not concur in the Committee's proposition. If the expenditure was incurred they would have to look pleasant and pay the Bill, or adopt another alternative which would lead to consequences to which all they had heard of during the last day or two would be child's play. He did not oppose the motion, but he regretted that the subject had not come up earlier in the session, when they might have had time to consider it fully, and it might have been referred to a select committee, so that the House could have arrived at a satisfactory means of meeting the wishes of the Council. One practical difficulty must arise, sometimes, if both Houses were fully reported in the daily *Hansard*. Let them, for example, take the case of the present week, when both Houses were sitting late. He did not know what staff might be required to report the proceedings of both Houses as fully as they had been accustomed to have them, but it would be practically impossible to do it in the manner proposed: but they were not in a position now to do justice to the matter at all. If they acted as proposed they would lay themselves open to the charge of discourtesy, which he was sure none of them wished to show to the Council. Under the circumstances, he thought it would have been better to have expressed their regret at not having fuller opportunity of considering the matter; but he was not prepared to move an amendment, and if none was moved by the Government, he did not see any other course than to agree to the resolution of the Premier.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that the motion was really the only way in which they could meet the message of the Legislative Council at this stage of the session; but it might be desirable to add to it that the House regretted that in consequence of the late period of the session when the message came down they could not give it the consideration they wished to give. The Premier was quite willing to add words to that effect to the motion. No debate could take place on the question now in a thin House that would be of any effect. As far as he understood the feeling of the Assembly, and he had spoken to several

hon. members on the subject, there would be a very strong indisposition indeed to any amalgamation of the respective *Hansards*. The Assembly had got a *Hansard* staff together for themselves which was doing very well, but if they had to take charge of the Legislative Council proceedings he was afraid they would be sadly thrown out of gear. He did not see why there should be any amalgamation at all. As one individual member, he was quite willing that the Upper House should have an opportunity of publishing their own *Hansard*, and of circulating it if they could; but he had very strong doubts about the circulation. He would prefer it rested on its own bottom, for it should not be tacked on to the Assembly *Hansard*. Let them try how much circulation they could get for it. He was quite certain that were the two amalgamated the Council would begin to insist that they should be first on the paper. That would block the Assembly at once, because, before the proceedings of the Assembly could be disposed of by the Government Printer, he would have to know how much matter there was to come from the Upper House. It would tie their hands and would end in the public not getting the Assembly *Hansard* at all. It was of the first importance it should go out with the morning papers, otherwise it would be useless. With their recent experience, it would seem as if the two Houses were much more likely to be on amiable terms the further they were kept apart, and any idea of amalgamating the two *Hansards* would not answer, and should not be sanctioned by the House. He was, at the same time, quite willing to assist the other House in having a *Hansard*, even if it did cost a little money. It was worth while to try it as an experiment, but he strongly recommended that it should be entirely under their own management and not interfere with the Assembly *Hansard* at all.

Mr. SCOTT said that as a member of the Printing Committee, he hoped there would be no alterations made in the mode of carrying out the Assembly *Hansard*. Only to-day he had had an opportunity of talking with the Principal Shorthand Writer on the subject of the working of his department, and he had expressed himself to the effect that everything was going on remarkably well; that there had been no hitch; and that the reporting during the session, although it had been exceptionally heavy, especially as regarded select committees, the work had been far ahead of anything previously experienced. He (Mr. Scott) felt quite sure that if the *Hansard* of the Council came to be mixed up with that of the Assembly, it would not work half so satisfactorily as it had done hitherto.

Mr. BAYNES, as representing the poor unfortunate taxpayers of the colony, pro-

tested against any taxation for the purpose of recording reports of the proceedings of the other Chamber. He trusted the Legislative Council would not fall into the misfortune of delaying the business of the country so far as the Assembly had done. The members of the Upper House were not representative men. They had tried to be, and had found themselves in the unfortunate position of the rejected candidates. It would not, therefore, be just to the taxpayers that they should be rated for this daily *Hansard*. The House had entrusted the Colonial Secretary with a large sum of money knowing him to be a good administrator; but he (Mr. Baynes) doubted very much whether, in view of the fact that the Government had appointed several nominees in the other Chamber, the House would be justified in voting money for the reporting of their speeches. They knew they had good talking men there, and talking meant money when it had to be reported by a large staff. If the country were put to so much expense for a Chamber which was not representative, the Colonial Secretary ought to be the first man to put his foot on anything of the sort; and the Government were not justified, either, in stating that it should be the Speaker, the President of the Legislative Council, and a member of the Government who should adjudicate upon the subject. Some leading member of the Opposition, such as the member for Brisbane or the member for Maryborough, should have been nominated to take part in such a conference.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the message proposed to be sent to the Legislative Council was amended as follows:—

The Legislative Assembly having considered the message of the Legislative Council relating to the report of the *Hansard* Committee, expresses its regret that the late period of the session at which the motion was received here prevented the Legislative Assembly from giving it more mature consideration. The Legislative Assembly recommends that the President of the Legislative Council, the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, and some member of the Government, be authorised to confer together with the object of recommending some feasible scheme for the issue of a daily *Hansard* for the Council.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said he had far rather the suggestion of the hon. member for Brisbane had been adopted, and that the Assembly had contented itself with simply expressing its regret at being unable to consider the message, as it had come down too late. He had been unable to read through one quarter of the evidence. No doubt the Colonial Secretary was right when he said that hon. members would not agree to print both reports in the same *Hansard*. He, for one, would not. He thought the 1st clause of the message in reply would be quite sufficient.

Mr. ARCHER said that, even if a scheme was framed it must be laid before the House, and the money could not be spent without its consent. There need be no fear that the money would be spent before it was voted.

Mr. DOUGLAS said the House was bound, as far as it could, to meet the convenience of the Legislative Council. It was a fair demand for them to make—that their proceedings should have the same publicity as those of the Assembly. He saw no reason why both reports could not be brought out on the same sheet as the Assembly *Hansard*, and amalgamated with it. Both economy and convenience pointed in that direction. They had an admirable head of the reporting staff in Mr. Senior, who was quite competent to undertake the superintendence of the whole issue. According to the evidence, the Government Printer stated that the additional expense in his department would not amount to more than £138; and a comparatively insignificant sum for occasional reporters, under Mr. Senior's control, would be amply sufficient to bring out the necessary report. For the greater part of the session the sittings of the Legislative Council were generally short—for three parts of the session they did not sit after six o'clock; and they might very well be accorded the precedence in the published sheet which was accorded to them on other occasions. The Council was as much entitled to the publicity of *Hansard* as the Assembly; and they might very well have gone a little further and expressed their intention of carrying out the Council's wishes. This was one of those small matters connected with the convenience of the Upper House to which they were bound to attend—which did not involve much expenditure—and which, if refused, might lead to reprisals which would be both undesirable and undignified. He believed there would be no difficulty whatever in meeting the claims of the Upper House. Mr. Senior would be at the head of the entire staff, in the same way as there was one man at the head of the entire parliamentary staff of the leading London newspapers—such as the *Times*, the *Daily News*, and *Telegraph*, and who was responsible for the debates in both Houses. There would not be the slightest difficulty in making Mr. Senior responsible for the due publication of the debates in both Chambers, and so long as that gentleman was willing to do so, he (Mr. Douglas) need hardly tell hon. members that he was perfectly capable to undertake that responsibility. If some of those gentlemen employed by Mr. Senior at present were taken away from under his control and arbitrarily placed under the control of somebody else, it would lead to confusion, and might break up his staff. But there was no necessity for that. Give him the control of both staffs, and make

him responsible for the due publication of the reports of both Houses, the same as was done on the leading newspapers in London with reference to their reports of parliamentary debates. He would strongly recommend the Premier to meet the wishes of the Legislative Council in this matter. It was a small matter, but if neglected it might lead to an uncomfortable and unpleasant feeling between the two Houses, which was not at all desirable.

Question put and passed.

The SPEAKER announced that he had received the following message from the Legislative Council :—

Mr. SPEAKER,—The Legislative Council having taken into consideration the Legislative Assembly's message again insisting on their disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments in clauses 58, 59, and 74 of the Divisional Boards Bill, while continuing to maintain their right to deal with all Bills which may be before them, do not insist on their amendments in clauses 58, 59, and 74, for the reasons given in the Legislative Assembly's message.

JOSHUA P. BELL,  
President.

Legislative Council Chambers,  
Brisbane, 25th September, 1879.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL No. 2.

The SPEAKER announced that he had received a message from the Legislative Council, returning the Bill without amendment.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: In moving "That this House do now adjourn,"—I wish to afford the House some information on a subject which incidentally cropped up the other day—namely, my projected visit to Europe. It is my intention to leave for Europe by the October mail, *via* San Francisco—I believe within ten days. My hon. colleagues have had the matter under their consideration, and the action I intend to take has their approval. The object of my visit will be appreciated when I state that the floating of the loan authorised by this House will be an important part of my business in England. Another matter, also, of grave importance, demanding the presence of a Minister of the Crown in England is the position of the emigration question at the present time. In travelling through America I shall also have an opportunity of getting practical information, which I have long desired, with regard to the system of cheap railway construction adopted on that continent. That matter will receive my very close attention. Those three objects will, I think, quite justify the course of action I intend to pursue. I shall be absent from the colony not less than six and not more than seven months, I hope, so that on my return I shall have time to consult with my colleagues, and be in position to meet Parliament early in May.

I may intimate at the same time that, on account of the temporary illness of His Excellency, we have considered it advisable to prorogue Parliament by proclamation, instead of following the usual course of prorogation by His Excellency in person, on Tuesday next.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY, as an amendment, moved that the words "till Tuesday next" be added to the motion for adjournment.

Mr. GRIFFITH: I have no objection to offer to the projected visit of the Premier to Europe, as I believe it is very useful on many occasions that the head of the Government of a colony like this should visit Europe in that position. I simply rise to ask a question with regard to a matter of some interest. Who will act as *locum tenens* at the Treasury during the absence of the Premier?

The PREMIER: I think I may intimate, although the matter is not formally settled, that Mr. Buzacott, the Postmaster-General, will occupy my place at the Treasury during my absence.

Question, as amended, put and passed; and the House adjourned at twenty-five minutes to 11 o'clock until Tuesday next.

*Parliament prorogued by following Proclamation in Gazette Extraordinary, Tuesday, 30th September :—*

"PROCLAMATION by His  
"Excellency Sir ARTHUR  
"EDWARD KENNEDY, Knight  
[L.S.] "Commander of the Most  
"Distinguished Order of St.  
A. E. KENNEDY, "Michael and St. George,  
"Companion of the Most  
Governor. "Honourable Order of the  
"Bath, Governor and Com-  
"mander-in-Chief of the  
"Colony of Queensland and  
"its Dependencies.

"WHEREAS the Parliament of Queensland now  
"stands Adjourned to Tuesday, the thirtieth  
"day of September, 1879, and it is expedient  
"to Prorogue the same: Now, therefore, I,  
"Sir ARTHUR EDWARD KENNEDY, in pursuance  
"of the power and authority in me vested as  
"Governor of the said Colony, do hereby Pro-  
"rogate the said Parliament to Tuesday, the  
"eleventh day of November, 1879.

"Given under my Hand and Seal, at Gov-  
"ernment House, Brisbane, this twenty-  
"ninth day of September, in the year of  
"our Lord one thousand eight hundred  
"and seventy-nine, and in the forty-third  
"year of Her Majesty's reign.

"By Command,

"A. H. PALMER."

GOD SAVE THE QUEEN!