

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 2 SEPTEMBER 1880

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 2 September, 1880.

Motion without Notice.—Petition.—Question.—Motion for Adjournment.—Private Bill.—Petition.—Mackay Volunteers.—Insanity Bill—first reading.—Rockhampton Racecourse Bill—second reading.—Manufacture of Colonial Wine.—Steamer Passes to Members.—Adjournment.

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

MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE.

Mr. ARCHER moved—

That all papers and documents laid before the House on the subject of the Contract for and carriage of steel Rails, and all matters connected with Mr. Hemmant's Petition, be referred to the Select Committee now sitting thereon.

Question put and passed.

PETITION.

Mr. GROOM presented a petition from the Trustees of the German Lutheran Church in Toowoomba, asking for leave to introduce a Bill to enable them to sell land.

Petition received.

QUESTION.

Mr. BAILLY asked the Premier—

Has the Attorney-General advised the Government to approve of By-laws under the Divisional Boards Act imposing a Wheel Tax on Timber-getters or others?

The PREMIER (Mr. McIlwraith)—

No.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

The Hon. J. DOUGLAS moved the adjournment of the House to call attention to the fact that some motions which he had placed on the paper ought to have been treated as "formal," but they had been treated as "not formal." The object of the motions was to demand papers which he conceived ought to be in courtesy granted, and which, indeed, members had a right to ask for. These motions should therefore have

been treated in the ordinary way, and allowed to pass as formal. The motion standing No. 3 on the paper to-day, surely, could not be objected to on account of what it asked for. It was hardly necessary to assign reasons for the production of the papers there indicated, nor did he propose to do so; but these papers were well known to exist. Hon. members had a right to see them, and he could not conceive, therefore, why such a motion should be retarded. Lower down there was another motion, No. 14 on the paper, which ought also to be allowed to pass as formal. He had had it now on the paper for three weeks, and the demand was one that might fairly be granted if the papers existed.

Mr. SCOTT rose to a point of order, arguing that the hon. gentleman had no right to discuss the subject of the motion to which he referred.

Mr. DOUGLAS said he was not doing so, but was merely referring to its general character, with the object of showing that it should have been allowed to pass as "formal." Any motion might of course be made "not formal," but when the right of members to ask for papers could scarcely be contested they should hardly be met in that way. The papers which he asked for simply purported to give information which members were entitled to have.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Mr. Palmer) said the discourtesy, if any existed, was as usual from the hon. member for Maryborough. With respect to the motions numbers 14 and 15, they were both to the same effect as far as he (Mr. Palmer) could see. The hon. gentleman asked a question in the House, and got an answer distinctly informing him that there were no such papers as he required, and yet he put these motions down calling for papers, and thereby discrediting the answer he got from himself (Mr. Palmer). The motions had been altered since, once or twice, and the usual notices were given, and his object in making them "not formal" was to enable the hon. gentleman to tell the House what he wanted the papers for. He had been told that such papers as he required did not exist, but that did not appear to content him. There was the ship's report, but that was not correspondence with the Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS: There must be a certificate?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There is not.

Mr. DOUGLAS: There ought to be.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There ought not to be. The hon. gentleman is told that the Surgeon has nothing to do with certifying as he requires; and, with respect to motion No. 3, he has every opportunity of telling us what he wants, for it stands very early on the paper.

Mr. DOUGLAS said he did not wish to argue the matter, but in consequence of the answer given by the Colonial Secretary he was bound to say a few words. The hon. gentleman stated, in connection with the "Scottish Hero" and the papers asked for, that they did not exist, and that that was the reason why the motion was made "not formal." It was easy in that case to make no return; but the hon. gentleman, in reply to his question, said that the Surgeon-Superintendent had made a report on a rather serious question about side-lights, and it was customary, in virtue of the charter-party of merchant ships and of this very ship the "Scottish Hero," to dispose of the second moiety in the terms of the following extract from the charter-party of the ship in question:—

"The second moiety (subject to such deductions not exceeding in any case the penalty of £1,000 specified in

Article 39 as the Government of Queensland may see fit to make for the breach of non-observance of any of the stipulations herein contained) shall be paid by the Government of Queensland to the Master of the Ship, whose receipt shall be a sufficient discharge therefor, unless the said Party of the second part shall authorise and request in writing the Government of Queensland to pay the same to some other person in the colony, whose receipt in that case shall be a sufficient discharge therefor. Such payment shall be made after the Government of Queensland shall be satisfied that all the stipulations of the Charter-party have been properly fulfilled, and within thirty days after there shall have been deposited with the said Commissioner of Trade and Customs at Brisbane, or such other officer as the Governor may appoint to receive the same, the three following documents, viz. :—

"1st.—An account, signed by the claimant, stating the full particulars of the claim.

"2nd.—A certificate signed by the Immigration Agent in the colony, or by such other officer as may be appointed for the purpose by the Government of Queensland, containing a nominal list of all the passengers, and declaring that they have been properly treated during the voyage, and that the stipulations in the Charter-party appear to have been in all respects duly fulfilled, with a note against the name of each individual who from any cause may not be landed alive in the colony, stating the reasons thereof; and must contain a summary at the end, showing the number of persons embarked, the number not landed alive, and the number remaining to be paid for.

"3rd.—A certificate, signed by the Surgeon-Superintendent, specifying the names and ages of all who may have died or left the ship during the voyage, or if none have so died or left the ship, containing a declaration to that effect.

"Provided that the second moiety of the passage money at the above rate shall be paid in respect only of such passengers as shall be certified as aforesaid to have been landed alive in the colony, in accordance with the stipulation herein, and not on any who may have died or left the ship before her arrival, or who may leave the colony by the same vessel."

Mr. SCOTT said he must again rise to a point of order. Was not the hon. gentleman discussing the subject of the motion?

The SPEAKER said that, so far as he understood, the hon. gentleman was not discussing the question, but had moved the adjournment of the House to complain that the motions were not allowed to pass as formal.

Mr. DOUGLAS said he wished to point out that the Colonial Secretary must be labouring under a mistake, because there were three conditions to the payment of the second moiety, which he had read. He hoped, therefore, that the hon. gentleman would, as a matter of courtesy, lay the papers on the table of the House; for, unquestionably, if they did not exist they ought to exist. He had no wish to make a contention of a matter which ought to be purely formal. The first notice standing in his name, with reference to an Executive minute by virtue of which the Treasurer was authorised to act in England on behalf of the Executive, also should have been considered a formal matter. It was well known the Executive minute did exist, and the House was entitled to know what it was.

The PREMIER said that on the 12th August the hon. member asked certain questions with regard to the "Scottish Hero," and the questions were answered by his hon. colleague the Colonial Secretary, who told him that—

"The only document which the Surgeon-Superintendent is required to sign under the Charter-party is merely a certificate of the number of passengers landed alive; but attached to the list of ship's stores I find a certificate signed by the Surgeon, that he has examined them and found them of good quality.

"2. The Government is not aware that the Surgeon has been requested to sign any certificate in connection with the 'Scottish Hero.' They have certainly never asked him to do so."

After that answer was given the hon. member put the motion on the paper asking for documents.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Copies of all correspondence, letters, or telegrams.

The PREMIER said the hon. gentleman was told that those did not exist. He then withdrew the motion and substituted another on the same subject, only with different wording. He afterwards substituted another, and the only object in making those motions not formal was to give the hon. member an opportunity of explaining what documents he really wanted. When he did not understand what he wanted himself, after asking a question and altering his own motion two or three times, how could he expect the Government to understand what he wanted? As soon as the hon. gentleman explained what he wanted to the House in an intelligible form there would not be any objection to any documents being placed upon the table.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: As a matter of explanation, I may say the second moiety is paid on the certificate of the Immigration Agent: the doctor has nothing to do with it. If the hon. gentleman wants the report of the Surgeon of the ship, he should ask for it; but that is not correspondence.

Mr. DOUGLAS: Is not a report correspondence?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said he would take the opportunity of the motion for adjournment to call the attention of the House, and particularly of the Minister for Lands, to an extraordinary document, issued on the motion of the hon. member for Moreton (Mr. Garrick), with reference to the closing of roads on the Canning Downs Run. It was laid on the table on the 12th August. He saw the hon. member, Mr. Garrick, yesterday about the matter, and asked him if there was any meaning in those papers, and whether he intended to take any action, and the hon. gentleman said he did not intend to take any, and stated that he had been asked by Mr. Macansh to call for the papers. To him (Mr. O'Sullivan) the correspondence, from first to last, was very extraordinary. It seemed some complaint was made to the Minister for Lands that certain roads on Canning Downs Run were closed, and some settlers in consequence were deprived of the use of the water in Swan Creek. The Minister for Lands, it appeared, on the complaint being made, wrote to the Land Commissioner, at Toowoomba, requesting him to make inquiries into the matter, but instead of making those inquiries the Commissioner wrote to the party concerned (Mr. Macansh), and Mr. Macansh denied that he had closed any roads at all on Canning Downs. Not content with sending a positive negative to Mr. Commissioner Hume, Mr. Macansh wanted to know who had laid the information, insisting upon getting the name of the party who had given it. He (Mr. O'Sullivan) need scarcely point out to the House that if information of that kind was given by the farmers of a district it would not be very safe for the name of the informant to be given up to a man like Mr. Macansh, who was in the shape of what was called a landlord in Ireland. He was, in fact, the owner of the whole district about Warwick, and it would be exceedingly unsafe for any of the small settlers to make any complaints against him; the consequence would be that their cattle would go to the pound. It appeared to him (Mr. O'Sullivan) that this gentleman was very impertinent in his correspondence, and, not satisfied with that, he told what was not true, and wished the public to know it by having it printed. Mr. Macansh stated positively that there were no roads closed. He (Mr. O'Sullivan) said that there were, and that

he saw them and examined them himself. Complaints about these roads being closed had been made to the Minister for Lands, and he would take this opportunity of asking him whether he intended either to have the roads opened, or to prosecute Mr. Macanish? He also wanted to know whether the Minister for Lands had taken steps to have the roads opened? Hon. members must know that one of those settlers could not take it on himself to go with his team of bullocks or axe and pull down the fences; if he did that he would be subject to an action, and in these times it was quite as much as a selector could do to maintain himself without going to law. The roads in question were proclaimed, and he knew for a positive fact that they were not open at this minute. From what he could learn from the hon. member (Mr. Garrick), Mr. Macanish tried to hedge himself under a miserable little point of law, for he stated that those roads were closed before he bought the property. He (Mr. O'Sullivan) knew that that was not true. He knew that Mr. Macnamara opened one of those roads several times, and when he came next morning he found they were closed up again. Mr. Patrick Macnamara seemed to have written about this matter. He had something like between 500 and 600 acres of land alongside this property of Mr. Macanish's, and it was made utterly useless by the closing of the road. He had had to take his stock away and let the property run wild. There were eight farms, amounting altogether to about 600 acres, made utterly useless by the closure of the roads; and Macnamara had demanded, in a very curious piece of correspondence, why the Minister for Lands had not ordered those roads to be thrown open. The Minister for Lands, of course, knew best whether those two letters of Mr. Macnamara's were ever intended to appear as official documents. At any rate, the man knew very little about writing, but at the same time he was a man who could make himself thoroughly understood. The first part of this correspondence took place about the 7th of last March. The Government wrote to Mr. Macanish to know whether these roads were closed, and he coolly told them that he declined to answer any questions. He was very impertinent, and not truthful in his statements, and, not satisfied with either, he must needs exhibit himself in public documents. He (Mr. O'Sullivan) went to Warwick and saw those roads, and they were exactly as they were last January. The season was very dry, and if the farmers had not facilities for driving their stock to water they must sell them or let them die. He knew for a fact that men in the district had been compelled to carry water several miles on a pack-horse to their places. There was as fine country there kept away from water as he had ever been over. Between five and six hundred acres of land were made utterly useless. He wanted to know what the Minister for Lands intended to do with regard to those roads. Would he have the fences pulled down, or would he prosecute Mr. Macanish for keeping them closed? To get out of it by saying that these roads were closed before he had the property was untrue. One of them no doubt was closed—and he knew that the road nearest Warwick, leading to Macnamara's property, was closed, and that the fence had often been pulled down and was found up again next morning. The man was afraid to come into contact with this gentleman, who was "monarch of all he surveyed," and everyone was terribly afraid when they turned out their horses, goats, or cattle that they would be put in the pound. He intended to keep a watchful eye on the proceedings of the courts in those localities for the next year or so. He hoped the Minister for Lands would explain the matter, and tell the House whether those roads were to be thrown open.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Mr. Perkins) said that no further progress had been made than was disclosed by the correspondence which the hon. member held in his hand. It was very undesirable to bring letters and correspondence from the Lands Office before the House and make them public documents. Very strange stories were sometimes told in letters received in the office, and it would be exceedingly undesirable to have them printed. The inquiry in the present case was initiated on representations made to him at Warwick, Toowoomba, and other places where he happened to meet persons on the railway platforms. It was one of the penalties of his office that he had to listen to people's stories wherever he went. The complaint was that Mr. Macanish had closed several roads on the Canning Downs Run, and after the complaint had been repeated a few times he told Mr. Hume, who had a local knowledge of the district, to make inquiries and see whether those complaints were correct or not. Mr. Tully also entered into correspondence with Mr. Macanish, and the correspondence told its own story, and showed what sort of a gentleman Mr. Macanish was. Mr. Macanish had inherited a large estate on the Downs, having reaped where others had sown; but he had not been over civil in the correspondence, and had not only refused to answer the questions put to him, but had attempted to put the department into chancery by asking others in return. It was not his (Mr. Perkins') disposition, if he could not make friends, to make enemies, and he refused to give up the name of the complainant, for reasons which hon. members could well understand. There had been more complaints than the one that turned up in the correspondence, and it was quite enough for him to be satisfied that Mr. Macanish had closed the roads. He had referred the matter to the land agent at Warwick, for inquiry and report, which hon. members would see in the papers. He found that, to a certain extent, Mr. Macanish had spoken the truth, for he had not closed the roads, but found them closed when he took possession of Canning Downs. Other roads had been closed on an estate that had been linked on to Canning Downs. That was Mr. Macanish's only justification up to that period of the transaction. Afterwards Mr. Macanish commenced a system of bullying and threatening, and finally the matter had been brought before the House. He hoped the House had more important business before it than to deal with a matter of that kind. He (Mr. Perkins) was ready to take action, but he wished to proceed with caution. Through inquiries he had learned that Mr. Macanish and others had closed roads and barred the progress of settlement. When he got the report—which would be in the course of a few days—he should be disposed to act; but he wished to be sure about what he was doing. Mr. Macanish's insolent offensive manner in the correspondence would not help him in the direction he intended to travel; and indeed he had declined further communication with him on the subject. Neither Mr. Macanish nor anyone else had a right to close those roads and defy the public, and if the law provided machinery for re-opening them he (Mr. Perkins) would see that it was put in motion quickly.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said that one road had been closed by Mr. Macanish three times. What was to remunerate Macnamara for the loss of his 640 acres since January?

Mr. KATES said he was glad the hon. member (Mr. O'Sullivan) had brought the matter forward. A large number of roads had been closed on the Darling Downs, and it was the duty of the Minister for Lands to see them opened again.

He objected to the remark that it was undesirable to bring those papers before the House. He happened to know Mr. Macnamara, who was a respectable farmer, and who had sustained great loss from the closing of those roads. He hoped the Minister for Lands would lose no time in seeing them opened again. If such a thing had been done in his district he (Mr. Kates) would have taken an axe and chopped the obstruction down—as anybody had a right to do.

Mr. GROOM said the hon. member (Mr. Kates) was entirely wrong in saying that he could take an axe and chop the obstructions down. Not long ago there had been instances of that kind under the notice of the police magistrates on the Downs, and the result was that a fine was inflicted in each case. The course which the Minister for Lands intended to adopt was the correct one. On one occasion, when Mr. Graham represented the Darling Downs, he had a select committee appointed to inquire into the closing of roads there, and it was found that many roads had been unlawfully closed, to the serious injury of a large class of people. Judging by the notices that appeared in the *Gazette*—one of which lately referred to forty roads leading in different directions—he could understand the difficulty which the Minister for Lands found in dealing with matters of that kind. In this instance Mr. Macnamara had suffered an injustice, and it was satisfactory to have the assurance of the Minister that if the roads could be opened they should be opened quickly. Touching the publication of the correspondence, he was of opinion that it was extremely undesirable. The enormous extent to which “Votes and Proceedings” were growing year by year showed that something would have to be done in connection with the printing of papers. Some supervision would have to be exercised, and only those printed which were of public importance. In New Zealand attention had been drawn to a similar state of things, and the committee appointed to inquire into it had sent up an elaborate report containing many valuable recommendations—which this House might find useful—for considerably abridging the printing, and thereby saving a large amount of time and money.

Mr. DAVENPORT said the looking after the roads ought to form an important part of the duties of the Lands Department. Many roads were now impracticable, and some required closing and others opening in their stead. He trusted the Minister for Lands would devote a good deal of his energies to that branch of his official business.

The Hon. S. W. GRIFFITH said he simply rose to express his astonishment at the statement of the hon. member (Mr. Groom), that persons had been fined by justices on the Darling Downs for removing obstructions to the public thoroughfare. It was the first time he had ever heard of such a thing being done. If he (Mr. Griffith) found an obstruction in the thoroughfare he would pull it down and defy all the justices in the colony to punish him for it.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Mr. Palmer) : I have often done it.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he did not understand how such things could be done. It was a great pity that it should be supposed by any section of the people that anyone had a right to obstruct a public road with a fence. Unless the obstruction was a licensed gate, any person had a right to pull an obstruction down.

Mr. GROOM said he would repeat his statement, for he had been in the courts and seen it done. The bench held that a man must not take

the law into his own hands, but apply to the Commissioner to remove the obstruction.

Question of adjournment put and negatived.

PRIVATE BILL.

On the motion of Mr. RUTLEDGE, the second reading of the National Association Land Sales and Leases Bill was made an Order of the Day for Thursday next.

PETITION.

Mr. GROOM presented a petition from the widow of the late Mr. J. P. Wells, police magistrate at Normanton, praying for a consideration of her case.

MACKAY VOLUNTEERS.

On the motion of Mr. AMHURST, the Speaker left the chair and the House went into Committee to consider of an address to the Acting-Governor with reference to the establishment of a Volunteer Corps at Mackay.

Mr. AMHURST moved—

That an Address be presented to the Administrator of the Government, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be placed on the next Supplementary Estimates a sum of money sufficient to defray the cost of a Company of Volunteers at Mackay.

In doing so he said that the Government, finding retrenchment to be necessary, had cut down the Volunteer vote so close that there was not a sufficient sum on the Estimates to allow of the formation of a volunteer corps at Mackay. He proposed to amend the motion by adding the words “not exceeding £200.” The House would agree with him that the volunteer movement was an excellent one, exhibiting the patriotism of those who were ready to come forward and defend their country in case of necessity. Over eighty names had already been enrolled for the proposed corps ; but in the present position of the colony he felt it would not be right to ask the House to make provision for more than fifty members. The Government allowance, at 30s. a member, would amount to £75 ; £60 a year would be required for a drill instructor, and there were other contingencies attending the formation of the corps which would have to be provided for. A volunteer corps was already established at Townsville, and he thought the House would not object to vote £200 for one at Mackay.

Question, as amended, put.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the application for the formation of this corps came in after the Estimates had been prepared, and he was not disposed then to make any alteration. He hardly thought volunteers were very much wanted at Mackay, seeing that the people were protected to a very considerable extent by their harbour—or rather their want of a harbour. However, as the sum asked for was very small, and the volunteering spirit was deserving of encouragement, he should, on the part of the Government, make no objection.

Mr. DOUGLAS said he supposed the Colonial Secretary allowed the vote to pass on the ground that it was a very small one ; but he did not think that votes of this kind were calculated to do any good whatever. It might gratify the hon. member, and be considered a sort of imaginary glorification to get votes of that kind ; but where there were no means of bringing anything like discipline to bear on the men he regarded the formation of such bodies of volunteers as a means of throwing money away. Even in some of the places where volunteer companies were established they were inefficient and might well be done away with. At the present time volunteers were not required at Mackay. There was no fear of a Russian invasion ; no irruption of the Chinese was anticipated, and

there was not a cloud in the sky so far as our relations with foreign powers were concerned. Of course if this vote was agreed to it was quite clear that a dozen other constituencies must have similar votes—other towns, such as Cooktown, would have an equal right, as well as many of the inland towns which were anxious to raise yeomanry corps. No doubt volunteering afforded a little amusement, and he was far from saying that the spirit of the thing was not a very good one; it brought young fellows together, and if they were made to do work it might be beneficial. But often the formation of corps was simply an excuse for getting a little money expended. His colleague (Mr. King), he was aware, was in favour of the establishment of rifle clubs, and he (Mr. Douglas) agreed with him in the desirability of giving the money in the form of prizes for shooting to those who found their own rifles, but he did not think it would do to distribute rifles indiscriminately. A very much smaller sum would suffice to provide for prizes, and it would do more good than a larger sum expended in forming an inefficient body of volunteers. With its present resources it was not likely that Mackay would be able to get officers to look after the men properly, and he should object to a small amount like that being voted for no good purpose whatever.

Mr. ARCHER said on the subject of volunteers he disagreed with a great many hon. members. There was hardly any description of vote to which he agreed with greater pleasure. History repeated itself, and though he could not quote authorities like the hon. member for Rosewood, the time would no doubt come again when all countries, as in the days of Athens and Sparta, would have to be defended by their citizens and not by hired soldiery. He did not mean to say that time was coming yet; but if steps were not taken in good time to train young men and encourage them to attain proficiency, no country could ever do away with paid soldiers. Even in the great United States a small standing army of 25,000 men was required, although they had no enemies to attack them. This colony was at present free from any embarrassments, but if the time should unfortunately come when war must be waged, it would be better that war should be waged by citizen soldiers and not by mercenaries. With a citizen soldiery a country would take precious good care to keep out of quarrels and avoid bloodshed as much as possible, and for that reason he approved of the movement. If this small sum would do anything towards the formation of a nucleus of a citizen army which would prevent the establishment of that abomination of desolation—a standing hired military service—it was well worth while to vote it. Such services had formed one of the greatest curses of the world, and whatever would prevent their necessity would be of the greatest benefit to the colony.

Mr. FEEZ said he was surprised at the hon. member for Maryborough opposing a small vote of this kind to start a volunteer corps in an isolated place in the north of Queensland. The hon. gentleman was a staunch supporter of education, and no department of education was more important than that of the body—the education of the mind would follow. On that principle he should advocate the volunteer movement, and he could assure the Committee from experience that the greatest benefit would result from the exercise obtained. Immigrants who arrived in this colony from places in Europe where their physical health had been neglected became in six or nine years able to walk erect with chest developed and with brightened prospects in life. No country in the world spent more money, in proportion of population, on education than was

spent in this colony, and he did not see why the Committee should object to vote a small sum towards the formation of the nucleus of a future defence force. Other nations were doing the same, and in consequence of the isolated position of Queensland it was necessary that she should have some means of security to compensate her for the absence of an army. No one could tell what political or religious movement might necessitate the existence of a defence force in one part of the colony or another; and it was cheeseparing to hesitate about voting such a small sum of money. A large sum had been spent on a staff which might be usefully employed in looking after such corps as the one proposed, instead of idling away its time at headquarters.

Mr. KING said he thought the hon. member for Blackall made a mistake in his reference to history, because the illustration he used was rather against his argument than otherwise. The hon. member argued that when countries had citizen-soldiers like the Spartans there would be fewer wars; but he (Mr. King) had gathered the idea that there was never such a fighting people as the Spartans. In this case it would be perfectly safe to establish such a corps and there need be no fear of an onslaught, for the volunteers at Mackay would be so shut in by their harbour that it would be very hard for them to be got at, and it would be equally hard for them to get out at anyone else.

Mr. MESTON said the hon. member (Mr. King) was equally unfortunate with the hon. member for Blackall. It was quite true that the Spartans were a nation of citizen-soldiers, but their fighting proclivities were attributable to the fact that they were called on to defend their homes against the attacks of the surrounding nations who were hostile to them and sought to subjugate them. They were rarely the aggressive power, but were nearly always on the defensive. At the time of the general election, in addressing his constituents on the subject, he expressed an opinion in favour of encouraging the formation of rifle corps by supplying the men with rifles and drill sergeants, offering prizes for shooting, and holding grand central matches every year. A great deal of money was being injudiciously spent at the present time for which no corresponding benefit was received. He should support the vote, believing that every encouragement ought to be given towards the formation of rifle corps. The hon. member for Leichhardt, an old soldier himself, had testified to the value of the movement in inculcating a spirit of manhood, self-dependence, and self-reliance among the young men of the colony. A certain amount of physical training was very essential to the perfect development of the body, and that was essential to the perfect development of the mind. He also agreed with the hon. member for Blackall that standing armies were the greatest curse of all nations, because of their tendency to create a power which might occasionally be antagonistic to the people; and, therefore, he held that the people ought to have to look to themselves for their own defence. In the old Roman days, when Rome was the greatest military power in the world, the soldiers were enrolled from the citizens, and after the wars were over they retired to their ordinary occupations. These fifty men forming the Mackay body of riflemen, after having done their duty in repelling any aggressive force, would retire to their plantations again in a similar manner. The Colonial Secretary had referred to the improbability of any attack being made on Mackay on account of the bad harbour there. He hoped the volunteers had not offered themselves on that account—because they knew there was no chance of attack—at all events, on the

sea-side. He should support this vote, and he thought similar amounts might be voted for corps in other places throughout the colony. If an attack were made the colony might not be able to oppose a landing, and would probably have to rely upon bodies of riflemen. As in the American war of independence the farmers and backwoodsmen fought successfully to secure their independence, so in the future, should occasion arise, the colonists of Queensland would no doubt do as much in defence of their country.

Mr. PERSSE said he intended to support the vote for several reasons. He considered that the volunteer movement well deserved support, and that the people of Mackay had shown a great deal of spirit in this matter. Eighty members had offered themselves, and only a small amount of money was required to start a corps. He thought the Government might go a step further and cause all Civil servants to be enlisted as volunteers, so that they could be called upon to defend the country. He agreed with the hon. member for Leichhardt as to the advisability of developing the muscles of the young men. It would be much better for the colony if instead of putting so much learning into the heads of the youths they put a little more muscle into their arms. As things were manual occupation was spurned—a young man being thought nothing of if he was not in a private office or in the Civil service. They used nothing but their brains, and the consequence was that, physically, they were miserable specimens of humanity compared to what they ought to be. They were mere book-worms who were not able to take proper exercise—such as boating and cricketing. He should always be in favour of well organised and properly conducted volunteer corps.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he should like to point out the change in the opinion of the hon. member for Mackay as to the proper mode of defending Mackay. On the last occasion when the hon. member spoke on the subject he advocated the erection of batteries on the Barrier Reef, but now he had retired from the outer line and retreated into the very heart of the citadel. He should support the motion simply to prove the absurdity of the whole system, but when the Estimates were under consideration he should steadily oppose the vote, and do all he possibly could to stop the whole of the votes for volunteers. Talking of volunteers reminded him of a good story told by Artemus Ward of a company of volunteers which was formed at Baldwinville. There was great jealousy amongst the men as to the ranks which they should hold, and at last it was agreed that they should be all majors-general. That might be an exaggerated view of things, but there was no doubt that something approaching it existed in connection with the volunteer forces of the colony. They had majors, colonels, lieutenant-colonels, colonel-commandants, brigade majors—in fact, there were any number of officers, but very few men. He had once seen a colonel on a white horse, at Toowoomba, but from his appearance it was evident that the officer would have felt more comfortable had he been standing on his legs. He would not say that the same thing was to be said of all the officers: it certainly could not be applied to men who had fought on bloody fields and saved great countries, but of feather-bed heroes, very different from the veteran soldier who represented Leichhardt. If the volunteers were to become efficient it was certain that qualified men would have to be put in charge of them; and unless steps were taken to provide such officers the volunteers must cease to exist. He was rather inclined to think it would be much better to have—as they had in Sydney—a small body of paid men. It was well known that when

Colonel Scratchley or any other officer came to the colony it was difficult to get a fair muster of the volunteers. There were no means to compel them to attend, and the consequence was that they did not do so. They had heard of a quarrel which had taken place between some of the men forming the rifle team who were about to go to Sydney. Lieutenants, captains, and sergeants were at daggers drawn; there was a court-martial, and the result of the quarrel was, that they apologised to each other and were all promoted. The change of opinion by the hon. member for those parts respecting the means of defence for Mackay did not show much of a warlike spirit, although there was plenty of rum in Mackay, and he maintained that rum was a particularly warlike spirit. Indeed in this lay the safety of the place, for that same rum was said to have a wonderfully explosive quality.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said he would like to know whether, in the event of £200 being granted to Mackay, it was to be understood that other towns in the colony would be treated in the same way. Of course, if that was to be understood there would be a general scramble, and he did not know but that he should be inclined to join in it. He agreed with those hon. members who advocated the distribution of rifles throughout the colony; he thought such a plan would result in more good than would be likely to arise from the gathering together at night of small mobs of men who sang and talked of volunteering—that being the sum and substance of what was done by the volunteers. It was a bad excuse for support of the motion that the vote was a small one: the principle was just the same whether the amount was large or small. He could not agree with the suggestion of the hon. member (Mr. Persse) that Civil servants should be compelled to become volunteers. He agreed that drill and the knowledge of how to use a rifle should form part of the education of the young, but the cost should be set down to the education vote. He had always been opposed to volunteering; but he would take that opportunity of stating that, after having seen the movements of the volunteers at the recent review at Ipswich, he was not so strongly opposed to the system as he was formerly. Colonel Blaxland seemed to him to be an able man who thoroughly understood his business, and he fully believed that if there was any possibility of making the volunteers an effective body it would be done under that officer's command.

Mr. FEEZ said that the remarks of the hon. member (Mr. Morehead) as to the non-attendance of volunteers at drill would not apply to the Rockhampton corps. Out of a body of about 100 men he believed that there was an average attendance of seventy at drill twice a week, and he took it that that was some guarantee that the men took an interest in their drill. It had been suggested that rifles should be distributed; but as it would be necessary to instruct people how to use them, would it not be as well to at once have volunteer companies, as the men would then be drilled and taught how to use the rifle? What would be the use of riflemen if they knew nothing about drill? From what he knew of the affairs of the Rockhampton Volunteer Corps, he was certain that the allowance made by the Government did not nearly cover the expenses, and the balance had to be made up out of the pockets of the men.

Mr. DOUGLAS said he trusted that the Colonial Secretary would state definitely what position the Government would take with regard to similar applications. If the vote asked for were granted, they might be sure that Beenleigh, Gympie, Gayndah, and dozens of other places would be making similar applications, and it would not be fair not to grant their requests.

Mr. AMHURST said he rose for the purpose of reminding the hon. member that Mackay was a coast town, and that as there was a defence force at Brisbane, at Maryborough, at Rockhampton, and at Townsville, it was only right that one should be established at Mackay, if the people were willing to devote their time to such an object. As he had already informed the Committee, there were eighty persons at Mackay who were willing to be enrolled as volunteers if the small encouragement he asked for was given. As regarded applications being made by every small town for a similar vote, he did not think there was any fear of money being granted unless there were *bonâ fide* grounds for granting it. As he had already said, his reason for bringing the matter forward in its present form was because he had been informed by the Colonial Secretary that the Estimates had been framed with such regard for retrenchment that the volunteer vote had been cut down so low as not to permit of anything being granted from it for a corps at Mackay.

Mr. MACFARLANE said that the sum which the people of Mackay were anxious to receive to assist them in forming a volunteer corps was certainly very small, but he thought that the danger laid in the smallness of the amount, as every small district in the colony might be induced to go in for a similar sum. On that ground he thought it would be wise for the Colonial Secretary to put down his foot on the proposition of the hon. member altogether. The hon. member for Mackay said that he had the names of eighty persons who were willing to form themselves into a corps. He (Mr. Macfarlane) would like to know whether that list was composed of planters or partly of kanakas, or whether the volunteer force was intended for the protection of kanakas. He considered the Committee would do well in negating the resolution, as they would thus prevent other hon. members coming forward and asking for similar sums for volunteer corps in their districts.

Mr. DAVENPORT said that the motion of the hon. member for Mackay would have his support, as it was his firm conviction that the British were a fighting nation, and bound to hold their own and follow the example of their forefathers. He quite agreed with the hon. member for Stanley (Mr. O'Sullivan) that the use of arms should be made part of the education of the youth of the colony, and that the cost should be included in the education vote.

Mr. STEVENSON said he wished to give his reason for opposing the motion—which was that he had always conscientiously opposed the vote for volunteers, and intended to do so when it came on. He had always looked upon the money spent on volunteers as a waste of money, and upon the volunteer force as a perfect farce. The present was a time when they should exercise the greatest economy, whereas in a case like that proposed the money would be absolutely wasted. He should oppose the motion; and when the volunteer vote was under discussion he should support its being struck out altogether. With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Ipswich (Mr. Macfarlane) about the kanakas, they need not fear any outside attacking power so much as attacks by people in the colony itself; that, however, was not the consideration which led him to vote against the motion.

Question put—the Committee divided :—

AYES, 23.

Messrs. Norton, Davenport, Hamilton, Stevens, Horwitz, Amhurst, Weld-Bitndell, H. W. Palmer, Feez, Griffith, Archer, Kingsford, Groom, Meston, Thompson, Low, Pessie, Dickson, Bear, Perkins, McIlwraith, Palmer and Macrossan.

NOES, 10.

Messrs. Garrick, McLean, Stevenson, King, Fraser, O'Sullivan, Beattie, Macfarlane, Morehead, and Douglas.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

The House resumed, and the Chairman reported that the Committee had come to a resolution.

On the motion of Mr. AMHURST, the adoption of the report was made an Order of the Day for Thursday, the 16th September.

INSANITY BILL—FIRST READING.

On the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, this Bill, received by message from the Legislative Council, was read a first time, and the second reading made an Order of the Day for Tuesday, September 7th.

ROCKHAMPTON RACECOURSE BILL—SECOND READING.

Mr. ARCHER said that in asking the House to read this Bill a second time he should not require to detain them long; but that the House might understand the purport of the Bill he would enter into a short account of its history. In 1862 two portions of land were granted to certain trustees for the purpose of being used as a racecourse for the town of Rockhampton. The selection of that land was made at a time when it was impossible to tell whether it was quite suitable; and, as the races were generally held in winter, when the ground was hard, it was some time before it was discovered that the land, owing to its swampy character, was unsuitable as a racecourse. In 1874, however, another piece of land was granted to the trustees, which gave for the purposes of a racecourse a much larger area than was necessary: but even now they found that the quality of the soil was such as to render the making of it suitable as a racecourse a more costly business than it should be; and the object of the Bill before hon. members was to give the trustees power to sell or exchange certain portions of the racecourse land for other land which was more suitable. If hon. members would refer to the evidence taken by the committee, they would see that the hon. member for Rockhampton (Mr. Feez), who was intimately acquainted with the ground in question, was examined and proved that the character of the ground was swampy and what was called melon-hole—that, in fact, it was perfectly unsuited for a racecourse. The hon. member also informed the committee that there was a piece of ground adjoining the racecourse, which was owned by a private individual, and which would be quite suitable for racing purposes, and that the object of the Bill was to enable the trustees to sell or exchange part of their land with the object of getting this particular piece of land. The Bill itself was exceedingly simple, the drawer of it having enjoyed the advantage of having the Brisbane Racecourse Act of 1875 before him—it was, in fact, almost a complete copy of that Act, except, of course, where names and situation rendered it necessary to make changes. The powers sought to be given to the trustees might appear great, but none of them could be exercised without the consent of the Governor in Council;—the same proviso was attached to the Brisbane Racecourse Act of 1875. The proceedings of and evidence before the select committee would be found to corroborate the particulars he had given with reference to the grants of land; and he would mention that the petition presented to the House contained the names of the whole of the trustees but one, whose name would also have appeared had he not been absent in Europe. The description of the land contained in the schedule was approved by the Deputy Registrar-General; and the necessity for a change in the

racecourse was proved by the evidence of the hon. member for Leichhardt. He was also intimately acquainted with the ground, and could confirm the evidence of the hon. member. Clause 1—the interpretation clause—was a transcript of the Brisbane Racecourse Act of 1875. Clause 2 provided that in the event of the death, resignation, or other removal from office of any of the trustees, the Governor in Council might appoint new trustees. Clause 3 contained power to sell the land; and clause 4 power to exchange it, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. The last-named clause also provided that any land taken in exchange should be held by the trustees under the same trusts as the land given. Clause 5 conferred the power of mortgage. He admitted that clause 6, which contained the power to lease, gave extensive powers; but the proviso that the leases must be approved by the Governor in Council was sufficient to prevent the perpetration of anything subversive of or contrary to the intentions of the Bill. Clause 7 gave the power to make by-laws—and a very necessary power, too, if the trustees were to keep order upon the ground. He would conclude by pointing out that the schedule referred to neither of the two portions of land granted in 1862.

Motion put and passed, and the committal of the Bill made an Order of the Day for the 16th September.

MANUFACTURE OF COLONIAL WINE.

Mr. FRASER moved—

That the Chairman leave the chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the desirability of introducing a Bill to encourage the manufacture of colonial wines and to regulate the sale of the same.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY thought that before the motion was put the hon. member should give the House some information as to the character of the Bill he proposed to introduce.

Mr. FRASER said he had no objection to give the whole of the information at his command. He had only moved the motion formally with a view to save time. The Bill was a very simple one, and its purport was to enable winegrowers or manufacturers and winesellers to do legally that which they now did illegally, and for doing which many of them had been fined. The only Act under which they were empowered to sell the wine was the present Licensing Act. No vigneron was permitted to sell a smaller quantity than two gallons except on the premises where the wine was manufactured. This being the case, there were a large number of small wine-makers who were compelled to have recourse to other modes of selling their wine, and who as a matter of fact constantly sold the liquor in smaller quantities than two gallons. In some cases wine was brought into Brisbane in an unmanufactured condition, and there sold both wholesale and retail. All that the Bill contemplated was to give the vignerons under license power to sell such small quantities as might suit them. It might be argued that the vignerons might sell their produce to the wholesale merchant or the publican. Although the popularity of their wines was increasing, they had not yet obtained that position in public favor to which they were entitled; and it was well known that when the wine got into the hands of the wholesale dealers and publicans it did not come before the public in its natural and pure state. This deterioration of the quality of the wine was of such frequent occurrence that the makers experienced the greatest difficulty in establishing its reputation. The Bill would assist them in their endeavour. It would be remembered that a Bill of a

similar kind was introduced some years ago but that measure contemplated the granting of licenses to restaurants and pastrycooks, whereas the Bill he proposed to introduce did not. Its provisions were confined to vignerons cultivating a certain area of grape. No demand was made upon the Consolidated Revenue, the vignerons being perfectly willing to pay a moderate price to secure the privileges conferred by the Bill he would ask leave to introduce.

Mr. FEEZ said the hon. member for South Brisbane had brought some very good arguments to bear upon the question, but he had not explained in what way the licensed wine sale was to be carried on. Was the wine to be hawked about by small winemakers? If so, he thought there was every probability that the quality of the liquor would be infinitely inferior to that of the worst colonial rum. He thought we might advantageously adopt the Victorian plan of wine licenses, the charge for which was considerably less than that made for the ordinary spirit license. That plan would not only encourage the manufacture of good wines, but would enable the Government to control the sale and see that the liquor sold was not of a quality likely to impair the public health. He could not conceive it possible that the hon. member for South Brisbane meant to encourage the hawking of wine.

Mr. FRASER: The Bill is to prevent it.

Mr. FEEZ hoped that the Victorian plan would be adopted. In Victoria there were wine-shops to which all classes of people resorted; and a good glass of wine could be obtained at a moderate price.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he had expected to hear a somewhat different statement from the hon. member for South Brisbane. The hon. member had utterly failed to show that the makers of wine laboured under any disabilities at the present time. The hon. member had not shown—as he might fairly have been expected to do, having regard for the object of his Bill—that the winemakers had any surplus stock on hand. He happened to know that the manufacture of wine was not infrequently used as a cloak for the manufacture of inferior spirits. A large quantity of spirits which had never paid duty was consumed. What description of colonial wine did we obtain? Could any hon. member tell him that any of the winemakers had surplus stock on hand?

Mr. FRASER: Yes.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he believed there was a manufacturer in the neighbourhood of Ipswich who was endeavouring in a legitimate way to improve the reputation of colonial wine. But what went on elsewhere? He knew perfectly well where the brandy and rum consumed there came from. The colonial wine was for the most part made in March and offered for sale in June—mere “hog-wash” that made people mad-drunk. But what he desired to point out was that there was at the present time no interference with the winemakers. They disposed of their wine by the nobbler, the thimble, or the teaspoon, or, on the other hand, by the bottle, the case, or the hogshead. He would be very sorry to interfere with them. Seeing they were protected by a duty of 6s. a-gallon, what else did they want? Where was the necessity for such a measure? Was it to give them further liberty to extend the system in operation at the present time—to extract brandy for the purpose of fortifying the wine? People did that at present; but he would like to see it done honestly. He objected to a number of persons in trade paying 12s. a-gallon duty on brandy while others were paying nothing at all. He would say this to the House and to the country—that it was not 150 miles from Too-

woomba where what he had described was going on wholesale; and if his hon. colleague the Treasurer could only put the officers of the Customs Department on the track he would very soon recoup the Treasury a large portion of the amount required for the mail subsidy *via* Torres Straits. It was just as well that he should say this in the House as for people to hear it said in the street, in the same way as they heard references to dummied lands and other matters in a general way. It was not for him to say where the men engaged in these practices were to be found; he was not a detective nor an informer, but he would inform the public through *Hansard* that there was wholesale fraud going on at the present time, and that the greater percentage of the spirits consumed in certain districts paid no duty at all. That was what was going on. Whether the hon. member for South Brisbane had discovered that, and was attempting to legalise it, he did not know; but, if the hon. member intended to extend the system in that direction, he had no sympathy with him. He did not know, however, whether that was the hon. member's intention—colonial wine manufacturers were already very well protected. There were some questions that should be answered. What was the amount of wine manufactured? Had it yet been determined that the climate was suitable for the manufacture? Did they not know that the vinegrowers of some districts would have to go and seek fresh fields if they would make good wine? The wine made at present—without expressing any opinion of its quality—did not fetch a very good price, and many of the growers engaged in no other industry whatever; but, as the squatters waited till shearing-time came, so some waited till their acre or two of grapes were ripe, and then sold them. What protection other than they had did the hon. member want? Their liberties were not crippled in any way; they sold wine in the bottle, by the glass, in nobblers, in the keg, and in all manner of quantities. Yet there was a motion put on the paper inviting the House to consider "the desirability of introducing a Bill to encourage the manufacture of colonial wines and to regulate the sale of the same." What more did they want? They had a protective duty of 6s. a-gallon, which shut out a good article, though he was not for removing that duty. He believed the time would come when growers would discover that they would have to go a good deal further west than the limit where the vine was cultivated at present. He was sure that it was not about Toowoomba or about Brisbane that good wine would be made. If they wanted to make good wine they must go in another direction, because in order to make good wine the grapes must be gathered when the weather was dry; and at the time the grapes ripened in these districts there was rain. But there were places in the colony where the season was dry when the grapes were ripe. That was, perhaps, apart from the subject. However, he would just warn the hon. member that if he introduced the Bill, he (Mr. Perkins) would look carefully into it, and take care, so far as his experience enabled him, that no more license should be given to the growers than they enjoyed at the present time. They had more liberties and privileges than any other manufacturers or industries he knew of in the colony. They had a protective duty of 6s. a-gallon, and no one interfered with them. As to the mode of disposing of the vintage, they sold it at the earliest moment possible; and he repeated again that in many cases, under the pretence of making wine, they were extracting brandy for the purpose of fortifying the wine. That system was carried on wholesale, and much of the whisky and brandy and gin and other liquors used in the colony was made at those vineyards and illicit distilleries.

Mr. DOUGLAS said it was scarcely usual to discuss a Bill of this kind at the present stage. Though it was usual that a statement should be made on the introduction of the Bill, it was hardly customary to discuss it. They might as well reserve discussion on the merits of the case till they knew what those merits were. The Bill was not yet before them, and it was not usual to discuss a Bill without seeing it. He was rather amused at the information given by the Minister for Lands with regard to the wholesale distillation going on; but he (Mr. Douglas) thought it would have been better for the hon. gentleman to have retained the information for his own use, and to have taken the best steps to put a stop to the practice. He did not intend to discuss the Bill on its merits just now.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said the hon. member who had just sat down had said just what he (Mr. O'Sullivan) intended to say, only it had been said a great deal better, and he was therefore very glad to have given the hon. member the lead. The matter was now being prejudged. Let them have the Bill on the table and worry it there. There were some remarks made by the Minister for Lands worth noting. From the speech of the introducer of the Bill he could not tell what evil the Bill was intended to cure, but they would know that when the Bill came on. But he (Mr. O'Sullivan) did not know that it was established as a fact that the vinegrowers under the Range, at any rate, had to go and seek fresh fields and pastures new. That statement of the hon. member was very objectionable and incapable of proof. He (Mr. O'Sullivan) was a colonial wine drinker; there was nothing in the shape of poteen, whisky, or anything of that kind, he would not take care to have whenever he could; and he would tell the Minister for Lands that perhaps in no part of Australia was produced better wine than was produced by the two vineyards near Ipswich—those of Messrs. Irwin and Meyer and Isambert. He some time ago was labouring under a severe sickness, and the doctors attending him recommended some of that wine as the best that could be got.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: What do the doctors know about it?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said he recovered very soon acting under those instructions; in fact, he was very fond of the wine. The Minister for Lands asked what did the doctors know about it? He thought nobody knew better than the doctors; they certainly knew better than the hon. member, who thought that because he turned out hogsheads of Perkins' beer nobody could make wine, and that he knew all about it. The hon. member complained, and possibly justly, of the 12s. a-gallon duty on imported brandy, while that made in the colony paid nothing. The answer to that was, that it was always the case; high duties always encouraged illicit distillation and smuggling. It was a great mistake to have high duties. It was the same with respect to public-houses: the moment the public-house was gone the sly-grog shop sprang up. He had nothing more to say than to beg the hon. member not to prejudice the Bill, but let it be laid on the table and then worry it.

Mr. GROOM said he had known Toowoomba for a considerable number of years, and knew many men engaged in the cultivation of wine, but whether that was of the very best quality he was unable to say, though some of it was appreciated by a great number of persons. It was perfectly true that to ensure good wine the grapes must be collected in the dry season, and that just as the grapes ripened the season was often not favourable. But he believed that the land about Toowoomba was pre-eminently suited to the growth of the vine, and that it would be better to cultivate it than wheat exclusively.

If the farmer would confine his attention to grapes of the best class they would pay better than wheatgrowing. He agreed with the Minister for Lands that the western district about Roma was one of the finest winegrowing districts in Australia; and if people in the neighbourhood of Toowoomba who at present confined their attention to an acre or two went further west and cultivated a hundred acres, it would be a very good thing. The duty of 6s. a-gallon was a great encouragement to the industry: but he did not know what would be the nature of the Bill proposed. As the Minister for Lands had said, winegrowers were able to sell their wine on their own premises in single bottles or single glasses, or in dozens of bottles, and had no license to pay. At present they had great advantages, but whether the Bill would curtail or extend them he did not know. It was one of those Bills that required a considerable amount of watching. He agreed with the Minister for Lands in another thing—namely, that there was a great deal of illegal distillation going on somewhere. He had not seen it, but he had reason to believe that some of the spirits he had seen drunk had not been imported. Where they were distilled it was not his business to inquire. It must be borne in mind that publicans paid £30 a-year for their license, and wine and spirit merchants also paid a heavy license, and they should not allow the illicit distillation of spirits to be carried on to the injury of those persons.

Mr. MOREHEAD said all the debate might have been avoided if the hon. member who introduced the motion had been more explicit and given the information they were entitled to receive. From what had fallen from hon. members, the motion seemed to be a proposition to amend the Licensing Act, and not a motion to consider the desirability of introducing a Bill to encourage the manufacture of colonial wines; otherwise he did not know why it was introduced. Therefore, they had a perfect right to complain. The hon. member had only himself to blame for the debate which had ensued, and he (Mr. Morehead) declined to move any further unless he got more information from the hon. member in charge of the motion. There might be a great deal said with reference to the good or the bad effect of selling colonial wine, but he did know that in South Australia the effect was in many cases insanity. He was not speaking of anything to be laughed at, for he had been told by Dr. Patterson, the head of the lunatic asylum in Adelaide, that there was more insanity caused by the use or abuse of newly-made colonial wine than from all the spirits in the colony.

The House divided:—

AYES, 23.

Messrs. Macrossan, Fraser, Macfarlane, Dickson, Griffith, Scott, O'Sullivan, Miles, Rutledge, Horwitz, Stevens, Weld-Blundell, Davenport, H. Palmer, Feez, Thompson, Archer, Amhurst, Cooper, Hamilton, Kates, Swanwick, and Kingsford.

NOES, 8.

Messrs. Morehead, Hill, Stevenson, Perkins, Palmer, Beor, Low, and Persse.

Question, therefore, resolved in the affirmative.

The House having gone into Committee,

Mr. FRASER said it would be unnecessary to say anything further on the subject at that stage of the discussion. The object of the Bill was to prevent that which was now done without legal authority. He would content himself, therefore, with moving—

That in the opinion of the Committee it is desirable to introduce a Bill to encourage the manufacture of colonial wines and to regulate the sale of the same.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported and adopted.

STEAMER PASSES TO MEMBERS.

On the motion of Mr. O'SULLIVAN, the House went into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

That an address be presented to the Administrator of the Government, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause provision to be made on the next Supplementary Estimates for providing free passes for members of the Legislative Assembly by steamers from Brisbane to and from the northern ports once in each year, when travelling on purely political business.

In moving the resolution, the hon. member said he wished to alter the words "Legislative Assembly" to "Parliament."

Mr. MOREHEAD said he objected to the proposed alteration. He should oppose the resolution in committee, as he had before opposed it in the House. He had before him the volume of *Hansard* containing the report of the action taken by the hon. member (Mr. O'Sullivan) when he introduced a similar motion last session, and he gave the hon. member credit for being perfectly consistent on both occasions, although in both the resolutions submitted were rather vague. He failed to understand what "purely political business" meant. Who was to decide whether a man was travelling for purely political business? The thing appeared an absurdity, and if the resolution was to pass those words had better be omitted. The arguments adduced by the hon. member showed that the resolution ought only to apply to members who were required by the necessities of travel to go to the northern ports, and not to every member of the House. On both occasions when the hon. member moved the resolution he carefully avoided touching on that particular point. Last year the motion was for passes to be given to members twice in each year. This year the hon. member had become more moderate, and they were only to go once in each year. If the Committee did their duty, and threw the resolution out, perhaps next year the hon. member would not bring it forward at all. He wished to point out the strange action of the Premier and the Colonial Secretary. He had taken the trouble to look up the division list of last year, and found that both those hon. gentlemen voted against the resolution, while on this occasion they both voted for it. He should like to have some explanation of that change. He held with the remarks of the Premier last year, when he said—

"He had been a strong advocate for payment of members, but it was one of those political doctrines which he had lived to repent of. On theoretical grounds better reasons could be given for than against it; but they had had the opportunity of seeing it in operation in the other colonies, and the results would bear out the contention that it would be a hazardous thing to adopt here. If the matter of payment of members should come before the House he would do all in his power to resist it. The motion sought to insert the thin end of the wedge, and he did not wish to see that done, and should therefore oppose it."

That was the argument used by members who were opposed to the resolution, and he should like to hear from the Premier what had caused him to change his mind in that extraordinary way in reference to it. He knew of nothing in the history of the colonies where payment of members had been introduced, that had occurred within the last twelve months, to induce any hon. member to change his opinion with regard to payment of members. Therefore, when they saw such an extraordinary somersault thrown by the Premier on what he (Mr. Morehead) considered an all-important question, they ought to have some explanation from him as to the reasons which had led him to believe that what was not good then was good enough now to be supported by him. He was quite prepared to obstruct the resolution in committee—hon. members might call it stonewalling if they liked, but

it would be for a purpose; and he would give his reason for doing so. He held with the views expressed by the Premier last session that it was the thin end of the wedge of payment of members; and there was nothing that so well deserved stonewalling as any attempt, no matter how fair it might seem, that would ultimately tend to payment of members of that Chamber. And if that Chamber was paid it would follow that the Upper House must be paid also. Hon. members holding his opinions on the subject would be perfectly justified in using any forms which the House allowed to prevent payment of members being sanctioned in any shape whatever. He held a very strong opinion on the subject, and he was just as likely to be wrong as right; but, according to his way of thinking, it was the right opinion. When they looked at Victoria the majority of those who had considered the question at all would agree with him that payment of members had not been an unmixed good. Holding that view, he was strongly opposed to the resolution. He was as consistent as the hon. member had been in this matter; but the hon. member had never made it quite clear why passes should be granted to all members of the House. He agreed with the remarks made by the hon. member for the Gregory, the other night, that if steamer passes were given it would be necessary to go still further and give passes to hon. members who represented western electorates and who travelled by coach. Whether the member lived in his electorate or not did not affect the question, because it must be necessary for him to visit it occasionally, and he had then a right to equal privileges with other members. Every member representing an outside district should, under those circumstances, be franked to his district by coach in the same way that members representing coastal towns were to be franked through the medium of steamers which might be under contract with the Government. The fact of members having free passes on the railways had been used as the basis of the argument that the Government, in making contracts with coasting steamers, might insert a clause giving members the right to be carried free. But hon. members of the Committee who considered the matter for one moment would see that the argument was untenable. The railways were the property of the State, and the cost of working them was very little increased by the fact of members travelling up and down on them. Then, again, he maintained that the interior of the colony was quite as well worth seeing as the coast, and that it would be just as reasonable to bring forward a resolution in favour of giving free passes by Cobb and Co.'s coach to hon. members to be used once in each year. That would mean a very considerable additional cost to the Government for no appreciable benefit, and at a time when the colony was little able to afford any increase of expenditure. If this proposal were to be put into practice no hon. member could say where the thing would stop. It would be better to try the question on the broad issue of payment of members rather than in the way in which an attempt was now being made to try it. Hon. members must admit that, if free passes were to be given, say from Thursday Island to Brisbane, it would be only just that hon. members travelling in a westerly direction by Cobb's coach should receive free passes. After what he had said he trusted the Premier would give some explanation of his change of front, and that the Colonial Secretary would say why he had reversed the vote he gave last year.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said the hon. member (Mr. Morehead) no doubt thought he had made a wonderful impression. If he (Mr. O'Sullivan) could buy the hon. member's speech at his price and sell it at the hon. member's he would make a

considerable profit. The hon. member said he (Mr. O'Sullivan) was consistent, but had come down a little; the hon. member was equally consistent, for last year he characterised the resolution as absurd, the other night he called it absurd, and to-night he called it absurd. He was wearing the word threadbare, and must have a very limited choice of language if he could not find another one. A word like that might be repeated too often. Although the hon. member had pronounced the resolution absurd he had not shown how it was absurd; but perhaps the hon. member thought assertion was argument. The hon. member wanted to know why the Government—and the Premier especially—had changed front. It was very strange if a man could not change his mind—a great man had said that a fool only could not change his mind—and no doubt the Premier would be perfectly well able to give any explanation. The hon. member wished to make out that members going west by Cobb's coach should have the same privilege as hon. members travelling by steam vessel, and he said that carrying members would not make much difference in the working expenses; but if the members travelled in special trains it made a great difference, and that was quite as much the thin end of the wedge as granting steamer passes. He (Mr. O'Sullivan) had always maintained that northern members should enjoy the same privileges as other hon. members. In making new mail contracts an agreement to carry members up and down the coast free would probably not make any difference. The question of payment of members was not now before the House; if it was he should not be afraid to take the affirmative side against the hon. member, and he should be able to show very good reason why hon. members should be paid. They gave a great deal of time to the discharge of their duties, and the labourer in that capacity was as worthy of his hire as those who worked anywhere else. There was nothing else to reply to in the remarks which had been made, except the objection taken to the phrase "purely political business." The hon. member wanted to know what that meant, as though the whole fate of the resolution hung on the meaning of that expression. Under the present circumstances he did not think any change he could make would make his meaning clearer, and he would leave the matter in the hands of the Committee. So far as he was personally concerned he was indifferent whether the resolution passed or not.

Mr. STEVENSON said the hon. member (Mr. O'Sullivan) had not made a very weighty or satisfactory reply to the hon. member for Mitchell. He had taunted the hon. member for using the word "absurd" so often; but anyone who considered the wording of the resolution would see that it was absurd, and he did not think, under those circumstances, the word could be used too often. At all events, no answer had been given to the question of the hon. member for Mitchell—"What is purely political business and what is not?" He (Mr. Stevenson) was one of those hon. members who opposed a similar motion to this, brought on last year. He represented a northern constituency—or at least a constituency to which he travelled by steamer; but he did not want his passage to be paid, and he was prepared to look at the matter from an impartial point of view. Perhaps he was one of the members who were presumed to be benefited by the motion. The objections he entertained would come with special force from him. He had no doubt that this was simply the thin end of the wedge to payment of members, and to his mind that was a most objectionable system. The hon. member for Mitchell had taken Victoria as an example of the evil effects of payment of members. The system had been a curse there, and he would go further and point to the results

which had followed from the adoption of the system in America. With regard to special trains, he made a practice of never travelling on free passes, and he should be prepared to vote for their abolition at any time, because he held that nothing tending in any way towards payment of members should be instituted in the colony. At the same time, as the railways were in the hands of the Government, he did not see how the practice of granting free passes on the railways could be used as an argument for granting free passes on steamers which were out of the control of the Government. That would simply mean a payment of money. The introduction of payment of members or free passes would not be likely to result in the return of better representatives. Political adventurers would be encouraged, and there were enough of them in the House already. In some cases there might be instances of exceptionally good men being unable to bear the expenses of representing a constituency. Then it might be desirable for a constituency to pay the expenses of a member, and he had known cases where it had been done. He did not see why, even in such a case, the member should not pay his travelling expenses just as he paid his living expenses in Brisbane. The motion simply meant the thin end of the wedge to payment of members, and it was absurd because it applied to members of the Assembly only. Why should not members of the Council enjoy the same privilege? The idea of a member travelling once a year "on purely political business" was fatal to the motion. If the system was to be introduced why should hon. members not be allowed to go to Rockhampton once a week to transact their business? Hon. members would go up to look after their private business, but they would be returning on purely political business. Why should not hon. members from the north be afforded equal facilities to town members for the transaction of their private business? The argument would apply with equal force both ways. He considered the system of payment of members was pernicious and one which ought not to be adopted, and, believing that the motion meant the thin end of the wedge to that, he should oppose it to his utmost.

Mr. KINGSFORD said he thought the mover of the resolution ought to be thankful to the hon. member who had just sat down, because the hon. member had advocated the motion most thoroughly. It would be time enough to talk about payment of members when the question arose. He could not see that any serious results would follow from hon. members having the privilege to take trips to the north to see what was going on there. He was quite certain that southern members would be able to deal with the affairs of the country in a more satisfactory way if they were better informed as to what was being done away from their immediate circle. Speaking for himself, he would say that he knew little about what was being done in the north; but he would not refrain from going to the north because he was not allowed a free pass. There might be many members who could not afford the time or the money to take trips to the north for the simple purpose of gaining information, and he thought it would be advantageous to the country as a whole if members had the privilege which the motion proposed to give to them. At all events, the sharp angles which the southern members were notorious for would be rubbed off, and there would be less occasion to charge them with being ignorant and of not being able to see beyond their noses. They need not talk about bringing in the thin end of the wedge to payment of members. The wedge would be brought in *holus-bolus* some day, and he would do his best to keep the thin end of it out.

Mr. STEVENS said that the speech of the hon. member (Mr. Kingsford) sounded like shutting the stable-door after the horse was stolen. If the hon. member would read the speeches which were made last week he could not fail to see that the motion meant the introduction of the thin end of the wedge to payment of members. He should vote against the motion and do his best to prevent its being passed.

Mr. PRICE said it seemed to him that the hon. member (Mr. O'Sullivan), and other members from the south, wanted trips to the north; but as a member of the central district of Northern Queensland he objected to a southern member making such a motion. He wanted to know whether the hon. member meant the motion to suit his (Mr. Price's) interests? He should like to have a free pass to go home from Thursday to Tuesday, and if the hon. member would assure him that the motion would be to his interests, as well as to those of the southern members, he should support it. He certainly could not make out the meaning of the motion. He trusted that, under any circumstances, the southern members would visit the North more frequently in the future than they had done in the past. He really did not see why northern members should not have free passes by steamers the same as southern members had by rail. The southern members could go home when they chose free of cost, but a trip to the north once a-year did not suit him or any of the southern members.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he hoped that some explanations would be offered by Ministers, three of whom expressed opinions adverse to the motion last year, and two voting against it. The Minister for Works voted for the motion last year, but in his speech he condemned it. The hon. member said—

"Without entering into the subject of payment of members, he should support the motion if it were confined to northern and central members; but he did not feel inclined to give free passes to southern members to enable them to travel about for their own pleasure."

The motion now proposed would give facilities to southern members to travel about for their own pleasure. Would the hon. member, Mr. O'Sullivan, explain what purely political business meant? Suppose some hon. members went to the electorate of the Minister for Works electioneering, would that be political business? Suppose the hon. member for Darling Downs (Mr. Thorn) went to Townsville for purely political reasons—he was perfectly certain the hon. member would not go there for other reasons—would he be entitled to a free pass? Was there anything to limit the use of the passes to members of the south? He was not sure whether he, as a representative of a central district, would not be entitled to a pass. Then what about members representing northern constituencies who lived in Brisbane? Would the hon. member (Mr. Paterson), for example, be entitled to a pass? If it could possibly be avoided, the system should not be introduced. He wished to ask the three members of the Ministry the reason for their sudden rattling—their turning round and voting in an entirely opposite direction to what they did on a former occasion? It was not through any action of the Opposition that the previous motion was carried; that result was brought about through the action of the Ministry. If the hon. members who voted against the motion last year would do so now it would be negatived. The whole onus rested on the three Ministers, and it was only fair to the Committee that they should offer some explanation. He certainly thought inconsistency in action within a few months was greatly to be censured, unless satisfactory reasons for the changes were offered.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said he should get the censure of the hon. member (Mr. Morehead) because he was going to be inconsistent, not within a few months, but within a couple of weeks. He should not have spoken had it not been that he intended to vote against the motion, whereas he voted in favour of that passed last week. He felt, therefore, that his action needed explanation. He voted for the former resolution because he thought it would be pleasing his constituents, and because he knew that by going into committee the matter would be open to further consideration and he could come to a final conclusion respecting it. He could not conscientiously vote for the payment of the passage of members to the northern constituencies. When the previous motion was brought forward a plausible ground in its favour was that the system would give southern members opportunities to go to the north, which he considered very advisable. If he thought the motion would result in the attainment of that object he should vote for it, but he did not think it would; further, he was of opinion that if the motion was carried not a dozen southern members would take advantage of it. He looked on the motion as simply meaning the payment of the to-and-fro passages of northern members. The proposal was not a fair one, as had been stated by the hon. member (Mr. Morehead). If northern members were to have their passages paid, why should not western members have their coach fares paid? It was as it stood simply a partial measure. If it was to be believed that southern members would go to the northern ports in consequence of this measure being passed, that might certainly do something towards waiving the objection there was to it. But if they were to pay the passages of one set of members, they certainly ought to pay those of the other set. It might be said that hon. members living in the neighbourhood of Brisbane had their passages to and from their houses paid because they were provided with railway passes, but that was a fortuitous circumstance which arose from their living near Brisbane, and tended to enable those members to attend regularly to the public business. Another thing was this, that even if the resolution would have the effect of inducing southern members to visit the north, he did not know that that should be a sufficient recommendation, as he not only considered it bad that members should be paid—and he did not say that this resolution, if carried, would be the thin end of the wedge—but he submitted that members should be prepared to attend to their political duties at their own expense. It was their duty, no doubt, to make themselves acquainted with the northern districts, but they ought not to be bribed to do so. He thought it was a bad thing to give pecuniary assistance to members in any form—they ought to be left without any such assistance—as there was nothing more calculated to keep the House, or rather the members of the House, pure than to abstain most strictly and rigidly from offering any pecuniary assistance to them in the performance of their public duties.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said that he voted for a similar motion last session, and he intended to vote for the motion now before the Committee. He wished the motion had been made more comprehensive than it was, and that it went further than to give southern members an opportunity of visiting the north. He intended to vote for it for a different reason altogether, as he held that members coming from the interior or the northern districts of the colony should have their travelling expenses to and from Parliament paid. He would here inform hon. members that what he intended to say was entirely his opinion as a private individual, and not that of the Government, as there had been no

conference or meeting of the Cabinet in regard to the question. He was not unmindful of what was going on in another colony, and he was quite willing to borrow his ideas and take his experience from what had happened to people elsewhere; and he was of opinion that the payment of members in this colony would introduce an element into Parliament that would be very undesirable. As an illustration of the desirability of paying the travelling expenses of northern members and those from the interior, he might mention that there were many hon. members from the interior who had been for seven or eight weeks past attending to their duties in Parliament at great inconvenience to themselves and to the neglect of their families and their own business, whilst there were hon. members opposite—he did not include all—who had nothing to do but to walk about the town and look after their private business. The objection of the hon. member for Mitchell, that it would be impossible to say whether a member went on political business or not, was more of a shadow than a reality. He took it that, no matter what a man might have been before, when he was returned to that House and had the title of honourable affixed to his name, there should be sufficient honour in him to judge what was political business to prevent him from travelling at the public cost on purely commercial or private business of his own. As to this resolution being the thin end of the wedge of payment of members, he knew that in Victoria, formerly, in all mail contracts there was a condition that members of Parliament should be carried to and from their constituencies free of charge. That was continued until railways were made, and then members had railway passes. That system did not operate badly in Victoria, and he did not see why it should here. They all knew at what great inconvenience hon. members living in the interior attended to their Parliamentary duties, as they had no meeting-house of their own in Brisbane where they could be rounded up at any time they were wanted. He contended that it would be for the reputation of the colony that it should not be left to members of a meeting-house, or to any meeting-house organ. It was high time to look at the thing boldly in the face, and if men had the pluck and spirit of enterprise to come down from the far interior to attend to Parliamentary duties—without calling it the thin end of the wedge—such members should be recouped their actual travelling expenses. It was for that reason that he wished the hon. member in charge of the motion had extended it so as to include those hon. members who came from the interior. He did not believe that the expense would be so great as some members supposed, as he thought that those who would avail themselves of free passages would be very few. There were many hon. members who had not the courage to go north, who were too fond of their own firesides to leave them. A good many he knew would be willing enough to go to the Flat Rock or Bribie Island, but that would be the extent of their journey; and if they were taken outside and a good southerly-westerly sprung up they would soon wish to come back again. There were many gentlemen who made a sort of playground of the House every evening—who might have a business or not; at all events, they were regular attendants at the House every day at half-past 3 o'clock, when the Speaker took the chair, without putting themselves to any inconvenience. It was only right, therefore, that some inducement should be held out to men who came from a long distance, by providing that they should not be at any pecuniary loss when travelling to and from Parliament. There were many of those hon. members who had no business occupation in Brisbane, and, without being an

advocate for payment of members, he would support any scheme that would induce respectable men—men of sound sense of honour, who had the manliness to do so—to offer themselves to constituencies in the interior, by recouping them their expenses, both in coming to and returning from their Parliamentary duties.

Mr. STEVENSON wished to reply to some remarks which had been made by the hon. member for South Brisbane (Mr. Kingsford). That hon. member said that some arguments he (Mr. Stevenson) had used went far to justify the action taken by the hon. member for Stanley in bringing forward the motion, and also to justify carrying that motion. The only thing he had said that would at all tend in that direction was, according to the hon. member, this—that he (Mr. Stevenson) had just as much right to go home once a month to look after his business as hon. members in Brisbane had to attend daily to their business;—but what he really said was, that, if the system was good at all, he had just as much right to go home every month to look after his business as hon. members on the Darling Downs, who were allowed the means of doing so by free passes by rail. Carrying the argument further—as it had been alluded to by other hon. members—he would have as good a right to go by coach to his residence, 400 miles west of Rockhampton, as often as he liked, as hon. members had to go up to Ipswich and the Darling Downs every night of every week. But that was no argument in favour of the motion; and he did not think the hon. member for Ipswich had a right to say that he justified the step taken by the hon. member for Stanley.

Mr. KATES said he would point out that there was a great difference between providing passes for members for the Darling Downs and providing steamer passes for hon. members from the north. No additional expense was incurred by hon. members travelling by train, even if an additional carriage were put on; but the provision of free passes by steamers would entail a considerable expense.

Mr. BAILEY said that if there were no free passes the railway revenue would benefit considerably—the increase, in fact, would be far greater than the sum the hon. member for Stanley proposed to pay for steamer passes. Hon. members, or “dead-heads” as they were familiarly called, did not scruple to use their railway passes for the conduct of their own business or even for pleasure trips.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said the Minister for Lands seemed to believe that if the resolution were agreed to there would be an additional inducement offered to men to come forward as candidates for the representation of constituencies in the northern and interior portions of the colony. He maintained that there would be nothing of the sort. The return steamboat fare—and they could always avail themselves of return tickets—would be a mere bagatelle side by side with the other expenditure which members necessarily incurred when they came down to Brisbane. He happened to reside 400 miles inland from Rockhampton. If hon. members from the north had steamer passes, why should he not have a pass to his place of abode? If they stirred at all in the matter they had far better go the whole hog, and take in the amendment which was proposed last week by the leader of the Opposition—paying reasonable expenses. In that way they would get their hands into the public purse in a peaceful and easy manner—as the Victorian Parliament succeeded in doing. Hon. members should bear in mind that they came there voluntarily—of their own free will. They were not obliged to come there. They offered themselves voluntarily to their constituents and were re-

turned. And again, if the constituents—and that had never yet happened—could not obtain volunteers of whom they approved, it would still be open to them to offer to pay their representatives' expenses. It had also been said that it should be left to the honour of hon. members to determine the purely political business which would justify them in the use of the proposed passes. He questioned the wisdom of that proposition, as far as some hon. members were concerned. In trusting to honour they might find that they were trusting to a shadow. He was much more inclined to regard this motion as the shadow of payment of members—to which he was thoroughly opposed. He objected to anything like the thin end of the wedge of that principle. He would even go the length of supporting a motion to do away with free passes. Although the issue of free passes was not quite so glaring a proceeding as payment of members, it was nevertheless rather humiliating to travel with a free ticket. But if they gave steamboat passes they would be going still further, because in that case members would not only get their travelling expenses but also their board at the expense of the country. That was totally wrong, to say the least of it. They might as well pay the board and lodging of hon. members during the whole of the time they remained in Brisbane. He strongly objected to the motion and would vote against it, although he would not go to the length for which the hon. member for Mitchell was prepared.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that after the repudiation on the part of three-fifths of the Government of the action they took last year, and as they were still prepared to vote as they voted the other night, it was no use for an humble Government supporter like himself to endeavour to throw out the motion by obstruction. If the motion were agreed to he would cast the whole blame upon the three members of the Government to whom he had already referred.

Mr. NORTON said he voted for the motion to go into committee because he thought it would give the hon. member for Stanley an opportunity of having his proposal thoroughly discussed. He did not see how, if the motion were agreed to, hon. members would be placed upon an equal footing. Hon. members from the north would be put in a very little better position through the payment of their fare to Brisbane and back. To place them on an equal footing with other hon. members it would almost be necessary to bring down their wives and families, give them a house to live in, and provide someone to look after their residences in the north while they were absent. It was easy to begin the system, but it was very hard to see where the end would be. Perhaps hon. members would like the parliamentary place of meeting changed. He could find a nice little spot near Gladstone, or possibly the meeting place might be shifted to Flat-top Island. He was sorry to oppose the motion of the hon. member for Stanley; but he did so because he believed it would not attain the ends which the hon. member had in view—namely, the placing of hon. members upon an equal footing, and the education of southern members in the requirements of the northern ports.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that when the motion for going into committee upon this matter was proposed, he pointed out that his main reason for voting for it was that it might give southern members some knowledge of what was required by the northern ports. He also said that if the motion were proposed as the thin edge of the wedge for the payment of members he would decidedly vote against it. As he had previously said, he did not believe in the payment of members. He had expressed his opinion upon that subject most decidedly. All the argu-

ments he had heard seemed to show that the object which he understood the hon. member for Stanley had in view—that of inducing members for the southern districts to go north and see how the public money was expended, and of educating them up to some knowledge of the colony which they were called upon in some measure to govern, would not be attained. None of the southern members who had spoken seemed to show the slightest intention of visiting the north for the purpose of educating themselves. They seemed determined to stick to the means of educating themselves which they had hitherto adopted, and, under the circumstances, he would advise the hon. member for Stanley to withdraw the motion.

Mr. GROOM could not see that there was any great harm in the motion—indeed, he thought it hardly went far enough. He did not believe payment of members was the unmixed evil which some hon. members seemed to imagine it. He could not perceive that in Victoria, even, any great harm had resulted from the adoption of the principle. Then, again, what harm had resulted from the principle as applied in New Zealand? In that colony members had the right of travelling free in all conveyances which took Her Majesty's mails, their letters upon public business were franked, they received an honorarium of a guinea per day every day they attended in the House: what evils could result here beyond evils which had been noticeable in New Zealand? The gentlemen who had successfully conducted the obstructive policy of Sir George Grey, and those who now supported Mr. Hall, were the outcome of payment of members. It must be distinctly understood that in New Zealand they had not adopted a fixed salary, as in Victoria, to which he at once admitted there was some objection. When the House was not in session members had no right to be paid for their services. He believed the policy of New Zealand in regard to this matter would yet be adopted in Queensland. As the Minister for Lands had pointed out, if in the interior portions of the colony they were to have local representation they would have to resort to some plan of the kind. Many men could not afford to leave their businesses for four or five months, and, in addition, pay their travelling expenses to and living expenses in Brisbane. The fact that men were now forced to do these things was nothing short of a barrier to good men offering themselves as candidates. No man was more thoroughly aware of that fact than the Minister for Works. When Mr. Fife represented Rockhampton he was presented by his constituents with a purse of sovereigns to recoup him for the expenses he incurred in his attendance to public business. Did hon. members mean to say that harm had resulted from that? In the case alluded to the gift was, of course, a tax upon the constituents; and he thought it would be far better to adopt the New Zealand plan, some of the details of which he had already mentioned. He believed the payment there was limited to sixty days, and if members prolonged the session they did not get any honorarium beyond that time. Then, again, Canada might be alluded to, possessing as it did some of the most eminent statesmen to be found in any British dependency. He did not think the legislators of Canada would compare unfavourably with members who did not receive pay, and they certainly could not be called political adventurers. Of course, there were some who had their own personal ends in view; but, as a rule, it was their laudable ambition to serve their country. He did not see that any degradation attached to any member accepting pay any more than to Ministers of the Crown, or the Speaker, or the Chairman of Committees, who were paid for

1880—2 P

the services they rendered. He believed no great harm would accrue from the motion, but thought it did not go far enough. He should like to see a comprehensive motion, setting forth the same principles as those in force in New Zealand.

Mr. ARCHER said he viewed the question in the light of the teaching they had from the legislatures of the world. In the English legislature there was no payment of members in the sense they were considering; but at one time, about 200 years ago, Walpole carried corruption to such an extent that he said every man had his price. In the present day a seat in the House of Commons was looked upon as a great honour, and was contended for by the very best men in the country. Contrast that with the United States of America. There was no nobler set of men than the men who represented the people when the thirteen States met after they gained their liberty. The first President of the Republic was a man of whom all the world might be proud, and the representatives were of the highest kind; but those men were not paid. Then, unfortunately, they introduced payment of members, and though all could admire the rapid progress and the energy of the American people, they could not admire the Congress or the Assemblies of the different States. The life of the American nation was the life of a people who had progressed in spite of a corrupt legislature, and he did not see why Queensland should adopt plans which had tended amongst other things to make America corrupt. It was not long since the American legislators voted themselves a thousand dollars a-year extra remuneration. They had leave to travel, and at each adjournment of the House a man living in San Francisco could go there and live during the recess at the expense of the State. Those things were done, and tended to make the name of politician in America a name without honour. When he was at home he was told by a friend who was travelling from America how he got very intimate on the voyage with an intelligent American gentleman. It appeared there was another American gentleman on board who was a bright, active, smart fellow, but who expressed sentiments which his countryman did not at all like, and which enabled him without much trouble to determine who the fellow was. Two or three days afterwards he went to his friend and said, "I know who he is now—he is a damned politician; you need not expect any good from him." Ought they, with the example of the United States before them, to change the present system for another? They knew for a fact that men of honour shunned the Legislative Assembly in America. If he opposed the present motion—which he did not pretend to say was for payment of members—it would be simply because it might ultimately lead to payment of members. At present everyone who came to the House was at some expense;—he did not come to fill his pockets. If payment of members were instituted they might here and there get a better man than the one at present in the House, but that would not be the rule, and it was certain there would arise a class of politicians who would make politics their living, and who would depend upon their attendance in the House as the means of living during the rest of the year. That was not at all desirable. But there was a way in which a member could be paid, and well paid—a way which, instead of corrupting him, kept him not only free, but was the proper way of paying members: it was the old English way when boroughs were not excused from sending members. A long time ago, when they were poor, they very often sent a petition to the King not to summon a representative to parliament. It was the habit of the borough that sent a

member to parliament to pay his expenses for him, and one of the most distinguished men in English history—not so much from his own high character as from being the friend of Milton—was Andrew Marvel, who was member for Hull, and was paid by Hull. There would not be the slightest difficulty in paying members in the colony in the same way. If an electorate subscribed the necessary funds they could get a poor man with brains to represent them; but if they did not like to do that they could take a man with more money than brains, who would represent them the best way he could. Members should not be paid by the State, but by the electorate. That was the old English plan, and they were very much in the same situation as the English were at one time, and ought to act in the same way. A great many electorates in the colony might have people in their confidence who were without the means to represent them; whereas a wealthy man, who would be otherwise able to represent them, might not have the brains. Then, let them pay the man they wished to represent them, and the whole thing was done. As to the question before the House, if it went to a division he should vote against it; but if the majority were found in its favour he should not go in for obstruction either now or at any subsequent stage. Holding the opinion he did—that, as a rule, as far as they were able to judge the legislatures whose members were paid were more apt to become corrupt than the unpaid legislatures—he should vote against the motion, but would subsequently bow to the voice of the majority.

Mr. DOUGLAS said the hon. member (Mr. Archer) had delivered a really interesting speech on the payment of members. He would not follow the hon. member, but would say a few words in answer to some of his remarks which seemed characterised by disparagement of the great branch of the British race carrying on the Government of the United States of America. The hon. gentleman went back to the period when the Republic was founded, and seemed to imagine that at that day there was nothing that was not heroic, nothing that was not perfectly pure, and that party politics then ran on in a very even stream. But if the hon. member turned back again and looked at the legislators of that period he would find that party-spirit ran as high in the time of Washington, and that as spiteful things were said and done then as now. But the people in those days were nerved by the great necessities before them, as was generally the case with men who had to face difficulties. But they did not less rise to the magnitude of the great circumstances they had to contend against when they fought the southern slavers. The representatives of the people at that time did not indicate that they should become debased by corruption. They showed that by their system the greatest and the noblest men came to the front; and he failed to see in the position of the American people any degeneracy from those from whom they sprang. It was true that at the present time the Parliament of England was a very noble assembly, the members of which were no doubt drawn from men of culture and wealth, and men, also, of public spirit. Those who represented the people of America might not possibly be such men of culture as the members of the British Parliament at the present time; but they represented the people, and were fully capable of effecting the objects they had in view. It was admitted on all hands that the administration of the United States, defective as it was in many respects, and especially in the fact that they were constantly changing their civil officers—it was admitted that in the administration of the great departments they did not fall behind even the English Parliament.

As it was, in many respects they were more capable. Only the other day he saw a striking example in the experience of an able Indian administrator who was travelling through the United States, and who bore high testimony which was directly in the teeth of any diminution of efficiency in the great departments of the State in that country. He (Mr. Douglas) declined, however, to have America brought up as an example of anything which had fallen below the standard of our circumstances in the present day. No doubt in the present day we were governed by motives of utility rather than the sentiments which in our earlier history were said to have had sway. What could be a more flagrant example of corruption than the times of Walpole, to which reference had been made; and there had been eras of corruption even in modern times, in the House of Commons. The corruption which might have existed in the Congress of the United States—for there was no nobler body in the world than the Senate—had its origin in the large contracts and land-grant system, and not in the mere system of payment of members. In his own mind he suspected there was much to recommend the principle of payment of members. Before sitting down he would admit that he had, perhaps, digressed somewhat in the course of his remarks, but it was in consequence of the dissertation of the hon. member for Blackall. Much might be said on both sides; but he rose simply because it was the duty of an Englishman, whenever anything was said in disparagement of the great branch of his nation across the Atlantic, to say what he could in defence.

Mr. ARCHER said he must utterly deny that the greatest men in the Northern States came to the front during the last war. The greatest men in the South had come to the front, but not in the North; and the consequence was that the war, which might have been finished in one year, was prolonged for four years. Anyone who had read the history of that war must come to the conclusion that a meaner piece of legislation, and a more corrupt way of advancing men who knew nothing of the business in which they were engaged, was never seen than the way in which the generals were appointed. He denied that the Civil servants of America were as good as those of any other part of the world. In some departments there was no fault to find, and he admitted that the Supreme Court department of the United States was one of which Americans might well be proud; but it was well known that corrupt judges were commoner in America than in any other country in the world. The Civil service in America, as a whole, however, was not good. It was notorious that the Collector of Customs in New York looked upon his situation merely as a chance of making a fortune. It could not be denied, and he had never attempted to deny, that the Americans were a nation of whom anyone might feel proud, and the striking thing was that they had deserved this eulogy in spite of mal-administration. He said this much lest it should be supposed that he coincided with the hon. member for Maryborough.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he was not going to compare England with America, although he might say that in Great Britain men of the greatest wealth, best education, and highest character were to be found in the legislatures, while in America the representatives of the people were men gathered from all parts of the world, and many of them were adventurers. He was of opinion that payment of members would be an advantageous thing to introduce into the legislature of any country, especially in countries like the colonies. Many hon. members were perfectly willing to vote away large sums of money with a lavish hand every

year upon persons outside the House, but with a modesty that ill became them they refused to do anything for themselves, and looked upon a motion of this kind as an attempt to get in what was called the thin end of the wedge. It had been urged that the hon. member for Stanley's was a bad precedent, and that it was the duty of hon. members to do everything from the highest of motives, and sacrifice all their time for the benefit of the country; but they must not do it for any advantage to themselves! They were perfectly willing to give advantages to everybody else, but none to themselves. Going to the motion of the hon. member for Stanley, what could be the harm of giving a pass to a member of the House who desired to visit the northern ports once in a year at the expense of the country? It was a very small matter indeed. It would not take very much money. They paid away to people outside the House, at least, £8,000 a-year, and it would not cost £800 to take any members who were willing to go to the northern ports. He did not think he would take advantage of the motion supposing that it was passed, but he believed that very few southern members knew much about the north. A considerable number of members who had spoken did not support the motion because they thought it would lead to the payment of members—it was the thin end of the wedge. The proposition made by the hon. member for Toowoomba would have a beneficial effect indeed if it were adopted by the House. It was known to most members that there was a difficulty in finding a man to represent the country in the far west and far north. He was sorry that the hon. member did not embody the idea that Mr. Groom spoke of in his motion, which was to pay all travelling expenses, and give a small sum, say, a guinea a day, to each hon. member while he was in Parliament. Some such system as was described by the hon. member would be preferable to the one spoken of by the hon. member for Blackall, when he said that if constituencies wished to pay their members they could do so; but it would not look well to see one constituency paying its representative and another not. Each member who represented a constituency should receive the same amount for his services. There was far too much mock-modesty amongst hon. members when they said they could not receive, at the expense of the country, any sum for services rendered. Members were quite entitled to it, and as the sum in question was a very small one he should support the motion.

Mr. STEVENSON said what they wanted was practical men of experience, honour, and good common-sense to govern the country, and not men who knew nothing about the subjects brought before the House. The hon. member for Maryborough (Mr. Douglas) talked about men of high education and culture coming to the front in America. That hon. gentleman pretended to be a man of high education and culture, but as a politician he was certainly not the brightest ornament of the House or the one best adapted to legislate for the country. He would rather see men of less education and culture, from the hon. gentleman's point of view, but of greater experience, who would legislate according to their convictions. They had had ample proof within the last fortnight that that hon. gentleman was not the ablest legislator for the country. If the hon. gentleman was a sample of high education and culture as a politician, the fewer they had of them the better. If the free passes on the railway had been abolished, so that southern members could not go up and down the line as often as they liked, and if they had to stay in town far away from their homes and business as he and others had, there would be very little stonewalling done. That was a very good reason why the resolution should be rejected.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said the hon. member (Mr. Stevenson) had remarked that if there were no free passes there would be no stonewalling. He would remind the hon. member that many of them had travelled up and down the line to attend to the business of the country while he was at home. The subsection had been very busy to-night, and the second lieutenant of the party had spoken no less than three times on the motion. The hon. member (Mr. Stevenson) had bitterly complained of the loss he was at in coming here, by the neglect of his business, and he displayed great ill-feeling against the thing called payment of members. Was not the hon. member a paid member? Was not the leader of the subsection a paid member? Was he not a squatters' agent paid to sit in the House? Was not the hon. member for Normanby a paid agent of that section in Brisbane? Did they not come here as the squatters' mouthpieces and paid agents? What brought the hon. member (Mr. Stevenson) from his business, but to look after the interests of his own run? The hon. member said he ought to get paid for coming up from the Gregory, and that if his constituents would find someone else to put in his place they were welcome. What constituents had the hon. member got?—only bullocks. It was, of course, in the interests of those hon. members to oppose payment of members. They wanted the country to be governed by wealth and ignorance as opposed to intelligence, and that was the very thing that would suit them. He had seen men with a bullock-whip in their hands as intelligent as those hon. gentlemen, but they could not afford to enter the House. It was exactly the same in Ireland; no one was able to enter Parliament but the great landlords. This was a young colony, with only about 200,000 inhabitants, very few of whom had made fortunes, and the representation of the colony—for a very few years more, he hoped—would be in the hands of one party, the rich and often ignorant party. The hon. member for Blackall (Mr. Archer) delivered a very nice lecture, which, however, would have been more in place in the School of Arts. What had it to do with his motion? The hon. member said that in America he met somebody whom he called his friend's friend, and he told him that the corruption of members resulted in something that would amount to something else. What had that to do with the question? The hon. member need not go to America for corruption—he might have gone to Gracemere for it. When the hon. member brought in a Bill to make himself a present of half of his own run—was not that payment of members? By that Act of Parliament the hon. member lost to the country more than this resolution would cost in ten years. What beat even that was, that when the run was measured after half of it had been taken off, the half that was left was found to be as big as the whole was before! While that Act was being passed the hon. member was paying thousands to surveyors measuring out the best parts of his run. And yet those men came here and put on side, and assumed dignity, and talked about corruption! If they were going in for payment of members, let it be done openly, and not indirectly by manipulating runs and coming here to look after their own interests. Payment of members had no terrors for him. He had a perfect right to insist on being paid by the State. His time and labour for the last twenty years had been given here, to the neglect of his own business, and if he was not worth paying he was not worth being here at all. It would be better to get it direct than to steal it by taking half a run. It was amusing to see the terror of the subsection for fear anybody else entered upon their bed. As sure as payment of members was allowed, the members for Gregory (Mr. Hill) and Normanby (Mr. Stevenson)

would have to retire. Those bull-headed gentlemen who assumed so much, and were at bottom really so ignorant, would have to stay behind to mind their sheep and cattle. There were plenty of men with more intelligence, though not with so many sheep and bullocks.

Mr. STEVENSON said the hon. member's outburst of temper would not help him to get his motion passed. As to the subsection representing their own runs, he wished he was representing his own run at home now.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: You are representing it in a better place.

Mr. STEVENSON said he was not aware that he was a paid member. What did it cost members from the outside districts to come down here and spend four, five, or six months away from their own business? For himself, he would have given several hundreds of pounds not to have had to come down this session to attend Parliament. He would not mind spending a few weeks on good hard work for the country and then going home again; but when he found members on the other side opposing everything that was proposed by a Government that wished well to the country, he thought he should be much better at home looking after his own interests. He failed to see how the members for Mitchell, Gregory, and Normanby were paid members any more than any other member of the House was. He had never got a sixpence for representing his constituency, and he was not likely to take it if it was offered. In all sorts of ways he had tried to benefit the central districts and had never been selfish in his politics. He was sorry that the hon. member should have got angry. The hon. member had a good chance of carrying his resolution before he got into a temper, but he was afraid the hon. member would have very little chance of carrying it now. Next time the hon. member brought it forward he hoped he would be a little more temperate in his language.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he only arrived in the House in time to hear the last part of the speech of the hon. member for Stanley, who, it appeared, had been making wholesale charges against the squatters. He did not see that a man who had a stake in the country, whether as a squatter, merchant, landowner, or selector, was any the less qualified on that account to legislate for his country. He considered one of the best proofs of a man's ability to legislate was the fact that by his own ability, energy, and perseverance he had been able to render himself independent of the aid which it was proposed hon. members should vote to themselves. To raise a class question of this kind in the House was very bad policy on the part of the hon. member, because the people of the colony generally did not esteem a man the less on account of his having raised himself to a position of independence. The hon. member had got into a temper about nothing, and in doing so would defeat his own purpose. Had he (Mr. Lumley Hill) been purely selfish he should have employed his time with more profit to himself in looking after his own business, instead of devoting himself to the interests of his constituency and the country.

Mr. ARCHER said he did not think the hon. member for Stanley, by what he had said, had put the carrying of this motion any further; but it was necessary to answer some of the charges he had made. If the charge against him (Mr. Archer) was that he had cheated the country of a run of which he had the leasehold, he did not feel at all angry—the charge was too absurd altogether. If he had done so, the hon. member himself was his chief assistant in the House. He (Mr. Archer) proposed to the Government that they should take half of the squatters' runs and throw them open to selec-

tion; and let the squatters have the other halves for ten years. The Government did so, and he (Mr. Archer) got half his run for ten years. As to the half being greater than the whole, that was one of those flights of imagination in which the hon. member sometimes indulged. At all events, the hon. member was the agent in the House who helped to work the enormous swindle, thinking that he was doing a great benefit to the country. But perhaps the hon. member referred to something else which occurred when he (Mr. Archer) was not in the country. Whilst he was at home a petition was drawn up by the selectors on the greater part of the run of the company of which he was a member, and in consequence of that petition the House granted a private Bill which enabled the company to purchase 12,000 acres of land at a certain price. When he heard what had been done he was quite surprised. He then learned that the men who had selected on the run were so satisfied with the way the company had behaved to them, both before they selected and after, that they petitioned the House to allow that purchase to be made. If the hon. member for Stanley fancied that he was ashamed of being good friends with his neighbours, who had interested themselves in his prosperity, the hon. member was very much mistaken. Instead of quarrelling with his poorer neighbours, or doing anything to injure them, or prevent them from selecting, he had behaved to them in such a way that they themselves petitioned the House to pass that Bill. That was one of the few things of which he was really proud, and it would be a long time before the hon. member for Stanley would have anything to be equally proud of.

Mr. AMHURST said, as one member of the select committee appointed to inquire into the Gracemere affair, he could say that the transaction was thoroughly fair, and no favouritism was shown. If the hon. member for Stanley would read the evidence he would come to the same conclusion, and repent of having made any hasty statement. With regard to the resolution, he (Mr. Amhurst) did not regard it as the thin end of the wedge, and he should vote in favour of it.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—

AYES, 25.

Messrs. Mcllwraith, Macrossan, Perkins, McLean, Meston, Douglas, Miles, Amhurst, Cooper, King, Perse, O'Sullivan, Davenport, H. W. Palmer, Swanwick, Low, Beattie, Garrick, Thompson, Groom, Bailey, Macfarlane, Price, Hamilton, and A. H. Palmer.

NOES, 12.

Messrs. Griffith, Dickson, Stevens, Beor, Stevenson, Norton, Lumley Hill, Morehead, Weld-Blundell, Grimes, Horwitz, and Archer.

Question, therefore, resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN moved—That the Chairman do now leave the Chair and report the resolution to the House.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that before the question was put he should like to say a word or two. He was informed that whilst he was out of the House the hon. member for Stanley—for reasons best known to himself—had chosen to make a gross personal attack on him and on other hon. members. He was not aware that he deserved such treatment at the hands of the hon. member, because throughout the discussion on the question he had treated the hon. member with courtesy, which he expected to receive from the hon. member in return. He was particularly guarded in any remarks he made so as to avoid casting reflections on anyone; yet the hon. member attacked him and other hon. members by referring to their means of living, and the means by which they got into the House. He did not know that he got his living dishonestly, or that he got into the House by dishonest

means, or that he had acted dishonestly in any way since he had been in the House. He really thought that the hon. member had gone beyond the bounds of parliamentary debate. Was it fair that because he held a different opinion to that of another hon. member he should be maligned? The hon. member had great powers for maligning other people, and it was a custom, not a fancy, of his to do it. He had heard that the hon. member actually accused the hon. member for Blackall of dishonesty in connection with the acquisition of part of a run. If the hon. member wished to bring the question to an issue, if he wished to accuse hon. members of earning their living dishonestly, or of getting into Parliament by dishonest means, let the charge be definite, and let it be fought on those lines, but not on a question into which it could not be honestly introduced. He was quite willing to accept the defeat on the question until the Estimates came on, and then he should take what steps he considered to be right according to his lights, to oppose what he believed to be a gross action which would not tend towards good government, and which would lead to the introduction of a system of which he thoroughly disapproved. He thought the hon. member for Stanley used language which was quite unjustifiable, and if the hon. member had any self-respect—which he (Mr. Morehead) believed he had—he would apologise to those members whom he had attacked.

Mr. ARCHER : I want no apology.

Mr. MOREHEAD said for the matter of that, he did not want an apology, but he should like the hon. member to repeat what he said. He should be glad to listen to the remarks of the hon. member, and if they were true he would admit it, and if they were not true he would refute them. The hon. member had certainly lowered himself in the estimation of many members of the House. The hon. member, no doubt, would say that he did not care two straws, but that was of no consequence to him, and he was sure it would not be of consequence to any other members.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said it would be better if the hon. member could only keep his temper, and find out what was really said before attempting to make a reply. The hon. member had replied to something what he knew nothing about.

Mr. MOREHEAD : I had my information on good authority.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said what he said was that the hon. member was a squatters' agent in the House.

Mr. STEVENSON : Yes ; and paid for it.

Mr. MOREHEAD : That is a lie.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said, the hon. member might say it was a lie if he liked, but that was not the first time that the hon. member had used gross language of that kind. The hon. member might think that he would shrink from anything he said, but he would not. He cared not the dirt of his shoe for what the hon. member might say. He had as clean fingers in the House as the hon. member had. What he said was that the hon. member was a squatters' agent in the House, and that he was paid indirectly by them—he would say that to the hon. member's face.

Mr. MOREHEAD : And I would simply repeat the expression I made use of before.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported, and ordered to be received on that day fortnight.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. DOUGLAS said it seemed rather early to rise seeing that there was such a large amount of

business on the paper. He had a motion on the paper for the production of a copy of the instructions given to the Treasurer authorising him to act in England on behalf of the Executive, and he thought they might continue till that was disposed of.

Mr. GRIFFITH asked the Premier whether he could state what business would be likely to be brought on on Tuesday?

The PREMIER said the business likely to be brought on on Tuesday was the second reading of the Railway and Tramways Extension Bill and the Post Card and Postal Note Bill. After that the business paper would indicate as closely as possible what would be taken.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at twenty minutes to 10 o'clock p.m. until Tuesday next.