

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 1881

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 14 September, 1881.

Gulland Tramway Bill.—Messages from His Excellency the Governor.—Correction.—Adjournment.—Formal Business.—Goldfields Act Amendment Bill.—Supply.—resumption of committee.—Ways and Means.—Appropriation Bill.—Supply.

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

GULLAND TRAMWAY BILL.

Mr. FOOTE, as Chairman, presented the report of the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the Gulland Tramway Bill.

The report was ordered to be printed, and the second reading of the Bill made an Order of the Day for the 29th instant.

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY
THE GOVERNOR.

Messages were received from His Excellency the Governor, recommending to the Legislative Assembly a Bill authorising James Gulland to construct a branch line of railway connected with the Southern and Western line; a Bill to make further provision for maintaining the Public Peace; and a Bill to amend the Local Government Act of 1878.

The messages were ordered to be taken into consideration on Tuesday next.

CORRECTION.—ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER (Mr. McIlwraith) said he desired, in rising, to correct an error that he inadvertently made yesterday when speaking about the proposed loan and investment company which Messrs. Henry Kimber and Company were asked to float on behalf of some gentlemen in Queensland. He then stated that the Hon. Charles Stuart Mein was one of the proposed directors of the company, but he now found, on reference to a memorandum, that he was wrong; the gentleman was only the solicitor of the company, and he (Mr. McIlwraith) now desired to correct what he had said. In doing so he would read a memorandum which he had received from Mr. Henry Kimber on the 18th April, 1881, giving him a detailed list of the proposed directors and other officials of the company. They were—The Hon. S. W. Griffith, Esq., Q.C., M.L.A., and leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly of Queensland; W. Miles, Esq., grazier, near Dalby; Sir Ralph St. George Gore, Bart.; another who was a private gentleman in the city who had no connection whatever with politics, and he would therefore not mention his name; and the solicitor was Charles Stuart Mein, leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council.

The Hon. S. W. GRIFFITH said he should like to make a statement with reference to what the hon. Premier had said. He understood the hon. gentleman to state last night that he had got a copy of the prospectus containing those names. He (Mr. Griffith) said he had never seen the prospectus, and now the Premier said that he got this list from Mr. Kimber on the 18th April. Since he (Mr. Griffith) spoke in the House last evening, he had discovered that the first time he ever had any communication with Mr. Kimber was on the 21st April, when he called at his (Mr. Kimber's) office. That was the first time he had ever any communication with him directly or indirectly. He did not know where the information came from; but the information which the hon. Treasurer gave to the House now was not given to him (Mr. Griffith), nor had he heard it in England, or anywhere else, until now.

The PREMIER said perhaps the hon. member—

The SPEAKER: There is no question before the House.

The PREMIER said he would move the adjournment of the House. On the 20th of March, 1881, he had a letter from Henry Kimber and Company to the following effect—this was six weeks before the hon. member left England:—

“Sir,—Referring to remarks of your political opponents on the second reading of the Queensland Railway Companies Preliminary Bill, it appears that in their view we should prove we are ‘respectable persons,’ to use a phrase of their own. We don’t complain of this; for, although our reputation will probably take care of itself in this city, it has perhaps yet to be made in Queensland. We therefore refer you to our bankers—the Imperial Bank, the Capital and Counties Bank, and the Continental Bank.”

And then followed a long list of the banks and firms in England, which were well known throughout the world, and references as to the character of the firm that had been named by the hon. member. The letter closed with this paragraph:—

“We may mention incidentally that we have been considered good enough by a highly respectable citizen of your capital, Brisbane, and by the Australian Bank who introduced him to us, to be entrusted with his business here, and also to be consulted upon another Queensland enterprise, in which, among other highly respectable names, are those of the two leaders of your Opposition.”

“Any further information which may be reasonably required we shall willingly give.”

This was six weeks before the hon. member left England. He moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. GRIFFITH said really he thought this was very funny.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Sir Arthur Palmer): Very.

Mr. GRIFFITH said if he chose to float a dozen companies in England what business was that of the Premier?

The PREMIER: What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he considered himself perfectly free to have done anything of the kind, but he did not do so; he had no more to do with that company than the hon. member himself had—perhaps not as much. As to the respectability of Mr. Kimber, he (Mr. Griffith) had already said that he believed Mr. Kimber to be a highly respectable man. After the hon. the Premier had left England, Mr. Kimber called upon him (Mr. Griffith) and offered him a list of references, and asked him, if he had any doubt as to the respectability of his firm, to refer to them. He (Mr. Griffith) told him he was perfectly satisfied as to their respectability, and he declined to take the list of persons to make inquiries from. He believed Mr. Kimber was a highly respectable man, and a very proper person to deal with. He did not see what it had to do with any question that could possibly come before this House—whether he had or had not, before the Premier’s departure from England, had an interview with Mr. Kimber on such business. As a matter of fact, he had not. But if he had met Mr. Kimber a hundred times a day upon private business or upon the business of mercantile men of this city, it was not a matter which concerned that House; and he considered it unworthy of the Premier to attempt to introduce such subjects into a discussion of this kind.

Mr. DICKSON said he had heard something of this cock-and-bull story, and he found it had been industriously circulated by members of the community who professed to support the present Government. He could not say where the report came from, but it seemed a remarkable fact that the first rumour he had heard as to his hon. friend having gone home in connection with a land mortgage company certainly emanated from, and was communi-

cated to him by, a few gentlemen resident in this city who were well-known supporters of the present Government. He supposed they must have received some inspiration upon the matter. Whatever motive had been assigned for the visit of his hon. friend to England, he had never heard the people who took such great interest in circulating those reports attempt to give any explanation of the reason of the Premier going to England. He thought there was very little credence to be given to the report, especially as he felt himself constrained to say that the information that he had heard was given by members of the community who were Government supporters.

Mr. REA thought they were getting a new light as to the origin of this affair. He thought it had come from the other side altogether. When he came to see that a subordinate officer of the Government, Sir Ralph Gore, was snubbed by his superior officer, of even less rank than himself, for having belonged to that company, he could not help feeling somewhat surprised that such a very strong view was taken of the conduct of an official for having his name as a director of a company, whereas the Colonial Secretary himself never thought of taking his own name off the list of directors of the Queensland National Bank. If it was such a heinous offence on the part of Sir Ralph Gore to be a director of a company that he must either resign his billet or give up the directorship, he (Mr. Rea) wondered the Premier did not turn round and say to his colleague, “You must give up your billet as Colonial Secretary or you must give up your position as a director of the Queensland National Bank.” In no other place would such a distinction be allowed to be made by a member of the Government; and he thought that the bringing forward of a case of no importance like this by the leader of this House showed that he was very careful that the interests of his own supporters in this House should not suffer; that they might have interests of a private nature conflicting with public ones. The only answer they could give to that gross position—gross in this way, as tending to cause a rivalry between private interests and public duty—the only way they could divert the public attention from that was to manufacture a company of this sort, that he supposed had emanated from some men in Brisbane, who said it to try and blacken the character of hon. members on the Opposition side, by placarding their names as men who had done almost the same things as had been done by other gentlemen who held positions in private offices, and still held ministerial offices under the Crown. He thought there ought to be some assertion on the part of that House that they would not allow any public officer of the House receiving an income from the country, also to hold at the same time a private office, even though that officer should be the leader of the Government.

Mr. MILES said that, as his name had been dragged into this discussion, he thought he might be allowed to say a word or two upon the subject. He was at a loss to understand why this matter should have been dragged before the House at all—why any private arrangement entered into by private individuals, even though they were members of that House, should be dragged before the House. All he knew about the matter was this—and he had not the slightest hesitation to state the whole facts of the case, and give names. He was interviewed by a gentleman on this subject, who told him that he was a Mr. Parker, who was going home for the purpose of endeavouring to float a company for the purpose of lending money on investments. He said he had the concurrence of Messrs. Parbury, Lamb, and Company, and of certain other individuals in good positions in Brisbane, to do it. He

asked him (Mr. Miles), if he objected to his making use of his name in connection with the floating of the company. He (Mr. Miles) said that before he gave him permission he must know exactly what he was going to do. This gentleman, whose name he believed was Mr. Parker, was, he thought, an accountant in Brisbane, and was pretty well known, and a very respectable gentleman. No doubt he (Mr. Miles) came to the conclusion that Mr. Parker expected something for his trouble in trying to float this company, and was doing so under the belief that he was going to get a billet—either to be appointed secretary or manager of the company. He (Mr. Miles) told him that he did not understand what use he was going to make of his name in connection with this company; but if he would let him see what he was to be committed to he would allow his name to be used. These were the facts of the case; and why the Premier of the colony should get up and lay so much stress upon this matter he was at a loss to understand. It was a private speculation; the country was not to be affected by it; the country was not going to be robbed or swindled by it, and why it should be brought before them he was at a loss to conceive. Did the hon. member suppose that he would rake up something concerning the little peddling questions he was in the habit of referring to? Well, these were really peddling questions in comparison with what the hon. leader of the Opposition had referred to. He (Mr. Miles) maintained that every private individual had a perfect right to enter into speculation upon his own account, so long as the money of the country was not made use of—so long as the public funds were not made use of. The hon. member had accused them of always asking peddling questions, but they had not had the experience of the Premier; they were not in the habit of tucking their shirt sleeves up to the elbow and dipping their hands into the public Treasury, so they would not be likely to think these peddling questions. He would like to know why this matter was brought before the House at all. Surely they were acting properly if they saw their way clear to lend money on secure investments and make a profit of it. Was there any objection to that, or any damage to come to anyone because of it?

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: You were lucky to have it to lend.

Mr. MILES said he heard the hon. member for Gregory say he was a lucky man; well, he had not been so lucky as the hon. member.

Mr. STEVENSON: What has that got to do with this question?

Mr. MILES said it would be as well if the hon. member for Gregory would keep his remarks to himself. He hoped, at all events, he (Mr. Miles) had sufficient common sense not to commit himself to anything in a matter of this kind without exactly knowing what he was doing. He did not see why an arrangement should not be entered into for the purpose of lending money on good security and in a legitimate way, and why there should be any objection to it. He was not afraid to enter into speculation himself, but he must first know all the particulars—who were to invest and what they were to invest in. That was all he had to do with the matter, and he did not care whether it was known or not. He did not think he had done anything wrong, and if he had he was prepared to take the consequences.

Motion for adjournment put and negatived.

FORMAL BUSINESS.

On the motion of the PREMIER, it was resolved—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as will admit of resolutions of the Committees of Supply

and Ways and Means being reported on the same day on which they shall have passed in such Committees, and of an Appropriation Bill being passed through all its stages in one day.

GOLDFIELDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

On the motion of Mr. HAMILTON, leave was granted to introduce a Bill to amend the Goldfields Act of 1874.

SUPPLY—RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the Speaker left the chair, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply.

The PREMIER moved that there be granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1881-82, a further sum of £100,000 towards defraying the expenses of the several departments of the Public Service.

Mr. DICKSON said there could be no objection to granting this further sum for appropriation to the service of the State; but he thought the Treasurer ought not to take this as a mere matter of form, but should favour the Committee with some information as to the expenditure of the appropriation which this would place him in possession of. On the 1st of July, the Treasurer was in possession of about £107,000 of appropriation. Since then he obtained £100,000, and now he wanted a further sum of £100,000, so that he ought to show what amount of expenditure this would cover. Would it cover the disbursements up to the present time? It would be desirable, if the hon. gentleman had stated what was generally added on these occasions, that the appropriation would be dealt with on the scale of the Estimates of last year. That was to say, that none of the increases which had yet to come under consideration would be paid until they had been ratified by the Committee. It was customary to obtain that information, and he hoped the Treasurer would not object to him asking for it.

The PREMIER said the appropriation asked for in this Bill was necessary to carry on the Public Service. Of course, the appropriation would be made on the same scale as last year; there would be no alteration in the meantime.

Question put and passed.

The CHAIRMAN left the chair, and reported that the Committee had come to a resolution. The resolution was adopted, and the Committee obtained leave to sit again at a later hour of the evening.

WAYS AND MEANS.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

The PREMIER moved—

That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year 1881-82, a sum not exceeding £100,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue of Queensland.

Question put and passed.

The resolution was reported to the House, and leave given to the Committee to sit again tomorrow.

APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PREMIER introduced a Bill to give effect to the foregoing resolution.

The Bill was read a first and second time, and the House went into Committee to consider it in detail.

Clauses 1, 2, and 3 having been passed;

On clause 4—"Short title"—

Mr. DICKSON pointed out that the 1st clause of the Bill was wrong. The reference was to the

Appropriation Act of the present year, and was very indefinite. It would be well to recommit the Bill to add the words "No. 2." In previous Appropriation Acts reference had been made to the preceding one by naming the one before the House as No. 2 or 3, as the case might be.

The PREMIER asked what could "a further sum of £100,000" possibly mean but an additional sum? The only chance of confusing it was with the general appropriation at the end of the year. It was "a further sum," and there was not the slightest chance of confusion.

Mr. DICKSON said, as this might afterwards be referred to as a precedent, it would be better to follow the old precedents. The alteration would involve very little additional trouble, and would make the matter clear.

The PREMIER said that if the hon. member would look at the short title, and at the reference in clause 2 to a "further sum," he would see that the expression could only mean Appropriation Act No. 1.

Mr. REA said the fact of the Chairman having to move into and out of the chair so frequently was an evidence of the careful observance of forms required by the Constitution, and yet the Treasurer said, by implication, that the forms of the House were of no use. He held that the House was bound to see that these forms were exactly carried out as they were in other countries.

Question put and passed.

The Bill was reported to the House without amendment, read a third time, passed, and ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Council by message in the usual form.

SUPPLY.

The PREMIER moved that the Speaker leave the chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he had intimated yesterday that he should take this opportunity of calling the attention of the House to some matters which he considered of importance. The matters to which he proposed to call the attention of the House on this occasion were the relationships existing between members of the Government and corporations having contracts with the Government. Some few days ago he had asked in this House questions which, if answered, would have had the effect of placing distinctly on the "Votes and Proceedings" of the House the extraordinarily anomalous position occupied by the Government with respect to the Government bank. The answers, however, were not given by the Premier, to whom the questions were addressed; but the facts of the case were sufficiently well known. The facts were that the Government had a contract with a banking company for the transaction of all its banking business; that there were three directors of that bank, of whom two were members of the Government; that the Colonial Treasurer himself, who was supposed to be the officer of the Government specially charged with the conduct of negotiations with the bank, was also a shareholder in the bank; and that enormous sums of the public money—at the present time, something over two millions—were deposited in that bank. He desired to call the attention of the House to that matter. In addition to that another extraordinary thing had since been disclosed: the Postmaster-General of the colony had become the agent for the mail contractors; so that, as Postmaster-General representing the country, he would have to deal with himself and others as representing the mail contractors. The Premier had been pleased on more than one occasion to refer to these matters as matters of trivial importance—small, peddling

things. He was sorry that the hon. gentleman's opinion was so. His opinion was that they were matters of the vastest importance to the country, and that they were matters of the gravest scandal, calculated not only to destroy confidence in the administration of public affairs within the colony itself, but also to bring the whole colony into disgrace outside. If there were any persons who thought that these matters were of trivial importance, it was time they were educated into a better opinion. In what he was about to say he should not confine himself to enunciating his own opinions, but should give the opinions of the most eminent authorities which he had been able to find anywhere, every one of whom condemned in the strongest possible manner any such relationships existing in any relation of life. If such a thing was improper in any relation of life, was it not doubly so when the persons engaged in it were members of the Government of the colony? He took it that the position of the Government, like all public servants, was that of agents or trustees. They were in a fiduciary position of the highest character, in which their employers, the public, were entitled to look for the disinterested exercise of their best ability and diligence for the exclusive benefit of those employers. That was a position which would not be disputed anywhere, unless within the walls of this House. He would make bold to say that, and he would establish it by authorities which would convince almost anyone, and which, he trusted, would convince the public of this colony. A majority of this House might do a great many things: they might condone offences; they might decline to punish misconduct as it deserved; but one thing they could not do—they could not alter the nature and character of a transaction. They might decline to visit it, if improper, with the proper consequences; but they could not make what was not honourable, honourable—nor a position which was not reputable, reputable. He had been pleased yesterday, when attention was called to the anomalous position supposed to be occupied by the present Acting Agent-General from the fact that he had been a member of a corporation which was contemplating dealing with the Government, to hear the manner in which that action was at once repudiated by the hon. member for Blackall. It was a glimmer of light in the darkness to hear the hon. member so suddenly, quickly, eagerly repudiate the existence of such an anomalous position; but what was that position so eagerly and properly repudiated by the hon. member for Blackall compared with the position of members of the Government to which he was about to advert? It was a principle of jurisprudence of all nations, as well as of the morality of all nations, that no one should place himself in a position where his interest and duty conflicted or might conflict. That was a proposition which he should illustrate in many ways. Would it be said that the interest and the duty of members of the Government did not conflict when they represented on one hand the contractors to the Government, and on the other hand the people of the country? Was it impossible that there might be a conflict of interests? He would take, for instance, the interest of the Government bank. At the present time they had a very large sum, something like two millions, of Government money in their possession—seeing that there was over a million pounds on the 30th June last, and since then another million had been raised—and they were paying interest on, he believed, £400,000.

The PREMIER: That is not a true statement.

Mr. GRIFFITH: Then they are paying interest on part.

The PREMIER: That is not a true statement, either.

Mr. GRIFFITH said they were either paying interest on some, or they did not pay on any. He did not care which. It might be a question of importance to the country, which had to pay interest on the whole amount at the rate of 4 per cent., to consider whether that money should be placed with some banking institution who would be prepared to pay interest. Supposing a question of that kind to arise, whose interests would be considered—the interest of the bank who desired to retain the money without paying interest, or the interest of the country, to whose interest it might be that the money should be placed where it would earn interest? Supposing a question should arise as to whether it was desirable that so large a sum of money should be retained in the hands of one institution or whether it should be distributed according to the invariable practice adopted in this colony up to the time of the present *regime*, and also observed in Victoria and a great many other places, whose interests would be considered—the interests of the bank who desired to retain the money, and whose customers might be uncomfortably affected if it were withdrawn, or the interests of the public whose interest it might be that the money should be distributed in other hands? Supposing the possibility of a loss, whose interests would be considered? Could anyone for a moment pretend that there was not a conflict of interests. Did not the mere existence of a contract between two parties involve the idea of at least a possible conflict of interests? In this case there must be a very real conflict. He had not been a member of a Government for many years without learning that in the case of a Government banking contract many questions must arise between the Treasurer and the bank. The Treasurer had to view matters from the point of view of the interest of the public; the bank looked at them from the point of view of their own interest. Questions of that kind must continually arise. Whose interests, under such circumstances, would be first considered? To which of their employers would these members of the Government be false—for they must be to one—to the public their employers, or to the shareholders their employers? Where there was a conflict of interests, no man could serve two masters. He would now pass to the other contract. The contract for the mail service was one under which a great deal was left to the discretion of the Postmaster-General, the person named in the contract. Fines might be imposed by him; and various harassing restrictions—or what might be considered such by the contractors—might in the interest of the public be enforced by him. During the currency of the last mail contract differences of opinion were continually arising; but the Postmaster-General represented the Government only, and it was his duty to consider all questions solely from the point of view of the interests of the Government. How would such a course be reconcilable with the position now taken by the Postmaster-General of agent—he presumed, paid agent—of the contracting company? How was it possible for a man to occupy the position of paid agent of two contracting parties, expected by each party to look after its own particular interest? If a conflict of interest arose, to which of the two parties would he play false? The position was one which would not bear scrutiny for a single moment, and he would challenge not only the members of the Government and their supporters, but the universe, to produce a single instance where such a transaction had been upheld as upright, honourable, and proper in any civilised community. The jurisprudence of all civilised countries—even of those countries which were not regarded as

models of strict rectitude in the conduct of their public affairs—condemned such a transaction, even by private persons, with the most inexorable severity. They declined to consider for a moment whether harm had actually been done; the mere existence of such relationship was enough, and they said that in the interest of mankind such things could not be permitted. In order to complete the vicious chain and to illustrate what might occur—though probably the very idea would be shocking—there ought to be a railway constructing company of which the Minister for Works was a chairman or director, and the Minister for Lands ought to be the chairman, director, or even a shareholder of a land-grant railway company negotiating for the purchase of lands. The very idea of such a thing would, he apprehended, at the present time, even considering the state of demoralisation into which some people in the community seemed to have sunk, excite horror. He was happy to think that such a thing would excite horror and disgust now; but, had anyone suggested twelve months ago that the Postmaster-General would have become the agent of the mail company, the idea would probably have excited just as much horror. At the present time it appeared as though people were becoming familiarised with all kinds of transactions, and amongst them these which he had felt it his duty to call attention to. He was not going to say much upon his own authority; he had searched in vain among books on constitutional law and history for an instance of such things. Amongst the records of the improprieties of Governments in the past there was nowhere to be found an instance where the member of a Government had himself been in the position of dealing with the Government as the agent of a contractor to the Government. In other positions of life, however, there had been plenty of instances, and he should refer to some of them. He would first point out that the distinguished jurists whose authority he was about to quote, when dealing with such matters from a very much lower point of view, had always been careful to lay down the rule that the matters they were dealing with were not what a man of honour would disdain or disclaim, but only those things which were contrary to some positive rule of law. He believed he was using the exact words of a most eminent authority on the subject. “The question is not whether the transaction be such as a man of honour would disclaim and disdain; but it must fall within some settled definition of wrong recognised by a court of justice.” He (Mr. Griffith) would show that these transactions, to which he had called attention, were transactions which fell within such definitions of wrong as were recognised by courts of justice. How then would these transactions be supported when contrasted with such transactions as a man of honour would disclaim or disdain. The relationship, as he had pointed out, between the members of the Government and the public, was that of servants, or agents, or trustees, from whom the public were entitled to receive their disinterested services—disinterested services for their exclusive benefit. If Ministers differed from any other agents, they differed in this—that a more rigid rule ought to be applied in their case. The impropriety of allowing a man to occupy a dual position—to put himself in a position where possibly his interests and duty might clash, or where possibly the interests of one of his employers might clash with the interests of the other of his employers—was thus spoken of by so high an authority as Lord Chancellor Manners, of Ireland:—

“The only doubt that can be found in any of the cases upon this subject is whether the Court ought to allow such a dealing between principal and agent under

any circumstances; and, indeed, there is such a conflict between interest and duty that it would be well the practice were abolished altogether."

This was said at the beginning of the present century. He would illustrate it in another way by supposing a case where there were directors of a company whose interests might clash with those of the shareholders. That was a position in which directors were continually placed. How did the court view them?—and he would again remind the House that he was simply dealing with the lower view of law, not the higher view—the course which a man of honour would take.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: You have not the least idea what the man of honour should take.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he would quote on this point the language of Lord Justice Giffard.

Mr. STEVENSON: No relation to Sir Hardinge?

Mr. GRIFFITH: The learned judge said—

"It is plain to my mind that any directors who were disinterested in this subject, who could exercise their discretion without bias, and would, if they had any regard to the due interests of their shareholders and of the company, have made the call as it was their plain duty to do on that day. I have no hesitation in saying that I can find but one reason why the directors did not make the call, and that reason was, that their duty and their interests lay in totally opposite directions. And if persons having to exercise a fiduciary power choose to place themselves in this position, that their interests pull one way while their duty is plainly to do something quite different, and for that reason they abstain from exercising that power, they must be held to all the same consequences as though the power had been exercised."

He should now turn to another learned judge—Lord Justice James, who died two or three months ago—one of the most eminent judges on the English Bench during the present century, and who said—

"It appears to me very important that we should concur in laying down again and again the general principle that in this Court no agent in the course of his agency, in the matter of his agency, can be allowed to make any profit without the knowledge and consent of his principal; that this rule is an inflexible rule, and must be applied inexorably by this Court, which is not entitled in any judgment to receive evidence or suggestion or argument as to whether the principal did or did not suffer any injury in fact, by reason of the action of the agent, for the safety of mankind requires that no agent shall be able to put his principal to the danger of such an injury as that."

He should next turn to the language of another eminent judge, Lord Justice Thesiger, who also died when he had just become a distinguished ornament to the Bench—

"In dealing with the case we have put aside one topic which was discussed in the argument, but which is beside the real question between the parties, among the righteousness or unrighteousness of the transaction impugned. The law under which an agent is prevented from making a profit out of his employment, by acting as a principal instead of as an agent, is wholly independent of consideration of this kind; and it is most important in the interests of commercial honesty in general, that the honesty of the agent concerned in the particular transaction should not be inquired into as a question upon which its validity depends, for by this strictness the temptation to embark in what must always be a doubtful transaction, is removed."

So much, then, for some of the utterances of eminent members of the English courts dealing with the matter from the lower point of view, simply what was declared to be positively wrong by the law, and not from the higher point of view as to what a man of honour would disclaim or disdain. That was the jurisprudence of England. They were not accustomed to look to America or to Spain for illustrations of the very highest rule of propriety in transactions of any kind. But even in these countries the rule was laid down, and laid down in the most emphatic terms; and if any hon. member still retained any doubt as

to the law in regard to those placed as directors or any persons in a fiduciary position, he would read them the opinion of an eminent judge of the United States, Mr. Justice Story, who said in his book on agency:—

"In this connection, also, it seems proper to state another rule in regard to the duties of agents, which is of general application, and that is, that in matters touching the agency agents cannot act so as to bind their principals where they have an adverse interest in themselves. This rule is founded upon the plain and obvious consideration, that the principal bargains in the employment, for the exercise of the disinterested skill, diligence, and zeal of the agent for his own exclusive benefit.

"It is a confidence necessarily reposed in the agent that he will act with a sole regard to the interests of his principal, as far as he lawfully may; and, even if impartiality could possibly be presumed on the part of an agent, where his own interests were concerned, that is not what the principal bargains for; and, in many cases, it is the very last thing which would advance his interests.

"If, then, the seller were permitted, as the agent of another, to become the purchaser, his duty to his principal and his own interest would stand in direct opposition to each other; and thus a temptation, perhaps in many cases too strong for resistance by men of flexible morals or hackneyed in the common devices of worldly business, would be held out, which would betray them into gross misconduct and even into crime. It is to interpose a preventive check against such temptations and seductions that a positive prohibition has been found to be the soundest policy, encouraged by the purest precepts of Christianity. This doctrine is well settled at law, but it is acted upon in Courts of Equity to a much larger extent, not only in cases of persons confidentially entrusted with the management of the property of others, but in cases of other relations of a confidential nature, involving the rights and interests of the employer. And it is by no means necessary in cases of this sort that the agent should have made any advantage by the bargain. Whether he has so or not, the bargain is equally without any obligation to bind the principal.

"Hence it is well settled (to illustrate the general rule) that an agent employed to sell cannot himself become the purchaser; and an agent employed to buy cannot himself be the seller. And upon the same principle it is held that a contract made by one who acts as the agent of both parties, may be avoided by either principal."

So much for Mr. Justice Story. The reason of the rule as stated by Chancellor Kent, the great American Jurist, was that in such cases the court of equity presumed the existence of fraud inaccessible to the eyes of the law. The law presumed in such cases that there must be something wrong. He would pass to what had been said by another American Judge, Mr. Justice Davies, in a judgment quoted in a note in the same book. This learned judge said:—

"The cases relating to the dealings of an agent or trustee with the property in reference to which his agency or trust exists may be arranged into two classes. First—cases in which a trustee buys or contracts with himself, or several trustees of which he is one, or a board of trustees of which he is one; and it will be seen by reference to the authorities hereinafter cited that the incapacity to purchase applies to all these cases."

"As to the first class of cases, the purchase or contract is voidable at the option of the *cestui que trust*, without reference to the fairness or unfairness of the purchase or contract. For the reason before given, the disqualification of the party purchasing or contracting is a conclusion of law, and is absolute. The leading case in this State, and which has been followed without qualification, so far as I have been able to ascertain, is that of *Davoue v. Fanning*, 2 John, ch. 252. In that case an executor, on making sale of the real estate of his testator, caused the same to be purchased for his wife and conveyed to her. The sale was made at public auction, and for a fair price, and was *bona fide*; yet the sale was set aside at the instance of the *cestui que trust*; and it will be observed that the trustee was not the purchaser, but a third person for the benefit of his wife. Chancellor Kent says:—Whether a trustee buys in for himself or his wife the temptation to abuse is nearly the same; though the money he was raising was to go to his wife it was no reason why he should be permitted to buy in for her *the estate itself*. His interest interfered with his duty. . . . The case, therefore, falls clearly within the spirit of the principle that if a trustee, acting for others, sells an estate and becomes himself interested in the purchase, the *cestui que trust*

is entitled to come here, as of course, and set aside that purchase, and have the property re-exposed for sale."

But it would be said, no doubt, that the cases to which he (Mr. Griffith) referred were cases of corporations—or some other excuse by which the law could be evaded. In the same judgment from which he had just read he found a declaration of the law of Scotland on that point:—

"In *Taylor v. Watson*, decided in Scotland, January 20, 1846, Lord Jeffrey said, 'The principle involved in this case is a very familiar and general one in our laws—that no person can be actor in *rem suam*. The stringency of the maxim has been ruled and held settled by the House of Lords, in the case of *Mackenzie*. It is now *presumptio juris et de jure*, that where a person stands in these inconsistent relations of both buyer and seller, there are dangers, and it is not relevant to say that it is impossible there could be any in the particular case. I should be sorry to think that any doubts were thrown on this rigorous principle which has been established both here and in the other end of the island.'

"In the case of the *Aberdeen Railway Company v. Blaikie*, July 20, 1854 (1 *McQueen*, 461), the House of Lords, reversing the judgment of the court below, held that a contract entered into by a manufacturer, for the supply of iron furnishings to a railway company of which he was a director or the chairman at the date of the contract, was invalid and not enforceable against the company."

A man could not even deal with a company in which he was a director. This was the lower rule laid down by the courts of law:—

"Lord Cranworth, in delivering the opinion of the court, says, 'A corporate body can only act by agents, and it is of course the duty of those agents so to act as best to promote the interests of the corporation, whose affairs they are conducting. Such an agent has duties to discharge, of a fiduciary character, toward his principal; and it is a rule of universal application, that no one having such duties to discharge shall be allowed to enter into engagements in which he has or can have a personal interest conflicting, or which possibly may conflict, with the interests of those whom he is bound to protect. So strictly is this principle adhered to that no question is allowed to be raised as to the fairness or unfairness of a contract so entered into. It obviously is or may be impossible to demonstrate how far, in any particular case, the terms of such a contract have been the best for the *cestui que trust* which it was possible to obtain. It may sometimes happen that the terms on which a trustee has dealt, or attempted to deal, with the estate or interests of those for whom he is a trustee, have been as good as could have been obtained from any other person; they may even, at the time, have been better. But still so inflexible is the rule that no inquiry on that subject is permitted. The English authorities on this subject are numerous and uniform.'"

The judgment proceeded:—

"The same subject has had a full and careful discussion and examination in the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Michoud v. Girod*, cited *supra*. The opinion of the court, by Mr. Justice Wayne, is distinguished for its clear analysis and elaborate review of all the cases bearing on the point. He says, 'The rule, as expressed, embraces every relation in which there may arise a conflict between the duty which the vendor or purchaser owes to the persons with whom he is dealing, or on whose account he is acting, and his own individual interest.' The same rule obtains in the civil law, with some modifications not necessary to notice.

"The language of Pothier is distinct and unequivocal: '*Nous ne pouvons acheter, ni par nous-mêmes, ni par personnes interposées, les choses qui sont partie des biens dont nous avons l'administration.*' (*Tr. du Contrat de Vente*, part 1, p. 13.) The rule of the civil law, without qualification is adopted in Holland: '*Quæ vero de tutoribus cautæ, ea quoque in curatoribus pro curatoribus, testamentariorum, executoribus, aliis, similibus, qui aliena gerunt negotia, probanda sunt.*' In Spain the rule is enforced without relaxation, and with stern uniformity. Judge Wayne, in the case of *Michoud*, in his opinion, cited the rule from the "*Novissima Recopilacion*," in these words: 'No man who is testamentary executor, a guardian of minors, nor any other man or woman, can purchase the property which they administer; and whether they purchase publicly or privately, the act is invalid, and, on proof being made of the fact, the sale must be set aside.' It is thus seen that the rule by which agents or trustees are prohibited and rendered

incapable of purchasing or dealing with the property of their *cestui que trust* is one of universal application, justified by a current of strong and high authorities, and is adhered to with stern and inflexible integrity; and the consequence of such dealing and purchasing is, that the agent or trustee is liable at any time, on the application of the *cestui que trust*, and as a matter of course, and without reference to the fairness or unfairness of the transaction, the adequacy or inadequacy of the price paid, or any other equities of the agent or trustee, to have the sale set aside; such has been the uniform administration of the law in England, and where the civil law prevails, and in this country. No reason is suggested why rules thus founded on the soundest morals, which have been maintained with such uniformity and steadiness, should now be relaxed. On the contrary, it is seen that every consideration arising from circumstances surrounding us, and the unparalleled multiplicity of corporations, who can only act by trustees or agents, and the very large proportion of the wealth of the country invested in them, and placed under the control and management of agents and trustees, forcibly demands of courts of justice a firm adherence to these principles, and a stern application of them to every case coming within the sphere of their action.

"Nay, the rule, as applicable to managers of corporations, should in no particular be relaxed. Those who assume the position of directors and trustees assume also the obligations which the law imposes on such a relation. The stockholders confide to their integrity, to their faithfulness, and to their watchfulness, the protection of their interests. This duty they have assumed, this the law imposes on them, and this those for whom they act have a right to expect. The principals are not present to watch over their own interests; they cannot speak in their own behalf; they must trust to the fidelity of their agents. If they discharge these important duties and trusts faithfully, the law interposes its shield for their protection and defence; if they depart from the line of their duty, and waste, or take themselves instead of protecting, the property and interests confided to them, the law, on the application of those thus wronged or deplored, promptly steps in to apply the corrective, and restores to the injured what has been lost by the unfaithfulness of the agent. . . .

"There can be no question, I think, at the present time, that a director of a corporation is the agent or trustee of the stockholders, and as such has duties to discharge of a fiduciary nature towards his principal, and is subject to the obligations and disabilities incidental to that relation. . . .

"Neither are the duties or obligations of a director or trustee altered from the circumstance that he is one of a number of directors or trustees, and that this circumstance diminishes his responsibility, or relieves him from any incapacity to deal with the property of his *cestui que trust*. The same principles apply to him as one of a number, as if he was acting as a sole trustee. It is not doubted that it has been shown that the relation of the director to the stockholders is the same as that of the agent to his principal, the trustee to his *cestui que trust*; and out of the identity of these relations necessarily spring the same duties, the same danger, and the same policy of the law.

"In the language of the plaintiff's counsel, it is justly said, 'Whether it be a director dealing with the board of which he is a member, or a trustee dealing with his co-trustees and himself, the real party in interest, the principal, is absent—the watchful and effective self-interest of the director or trustee seeking a bargain is not counteracted by the equally watchful and effective self-interest of the other party, who is there only by his representatives, and the wise policy of the law treats all such cases as that of a trustee dealing with himself.

"The number of directors or trustees does not lessen the danger or insure security that the interests of the *cestui que trust* will be protected. The moment the directors permit one or more of their number to deal with the property of the stockholders, they surrender their own independence and self-control. If five directors permit the sixth to purchase the property intrusted to their care, the same thing must be done with the others if they desire it. Increase of the number of the agents in no degree diminishes the danger of unfaithfulness."

This was the opinion in America from the lower point of view—that of a court of law. Was there any word in that eloquent discourse on trustees, and their relationship to their employers, that did not apply with tenfold force to the Government, entrusted as it was, with the affairs of the nation? If it should be disputed in this House

to-day, he would venture to say it would be the first time in the history of the world that such a proposition had been disputed by anyone. He ventured to say that the law in respect to public officers was even more stringent than that. What, between individuals, was a mere breach of duty for which an action at law might be made, was, as regarded officers of the Public Service, an indictable misdemeanour. He doubted very much whether the members of the Government whom he had referred to were not liable to be indicted for an offence against the laws of the realm.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : Indict us.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he meant a criminal indictment. There was no law in this country for impeachment. If there were, of course, so long as a majority of the House of Assembly approved of such transactions there would be no possibility of bringing them before the proper tribunal. But he was very anxious that the public should understand thoroughly the true nature of the transactions he referred to, and that they should know what was thought of them by other people—by independent authorities not in this country, not influenced by party feeling, not influenced by any anger or any emotions that might lead them from expressing the soundest and most impartial opinion. Before he sat down he might refer to a case which would serve as a salutary example. In the beginning of this century, a gentleman named Davison was appointed agent of the Government to purchase stores for the War Office. He was a merchant employed on behalf of the King to purchase stores for the military forces, at a commission of 2½ per cent. He supplied some of his own stores, and charged the commission. He called evidence to show that the goods supplied were more than 2½ per cent. below the market price. He was indicted for being an agent of the Government and dealing as a principal, and was convicted, and he (Mr. Griffith) would just read as much of the sentence of the court which was pronounced upon him as would show the nature of the offence with which he had been charged:—

“The sum of your offence is very accurately described in the different counts of the information. It is that you, receiving a stipend from the King to check the frauds of others, to prevent extortion, and ensure the best commodities at the cheapest rate, became the tradesman and seller of the article, and had thereby an interest to increase your own profit and to commit that fraud which it was your duty to prevent. It is in order that those who sell to the public may deliver the articles at the lowest price at which they can be charged and of the best quality, that a person who is supposed to have no interest either in delivering articles fewer in number or inferior in quality is allowed to receive a commission by way of percentage upon the price of the articles; and a man who in these respects does his duty has no interest in permitting a worse commodity to be delivered for a better, or in allowing the tradesmen to enrich themselves at the expense of the public. To prevent this very mischief the public placed you in the office and paid you a commission, hoping that you would prevent that fraud which avarice and the base thirst of lucre might prompt persons to commit. Instead of that you became a seller interested to deliver the worst articles at the highest price. Your office, therefore, became useless, and your commission misapplied. You placed yourself in a state of temptation which human nature found it too difficult to resist—that of charging a high price for the worst commodities and committing the frauds and abuses which your office was instituted and you were paid to prevent.

“I have shortly stated the offence as consisting in the fraud committed on the public by pursuing the method which you adopted—namely, instead of an agent or factor for the public you became a tradesman.

“The loss which the public and the country may have suffered by what may have been produced by your raising—artfully and unnecessarily—the price of the commodity, as the doing so might be convenient for your purposes, has not been ascertained; and, therefore, that which you have paid is more in the nature of a debt to the public. For this offence justice demands a

farther sentence, which may operate as a punishment upon you and as an example to others.

“For this offence, therefore,”—

But he would not read it—the language was really too severe. They gave the man twenty-one months' imprisonment.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN : What year was that?

Mr. GRIFFITH : 1809. This was the law as laid down by the eminent authorities he had named, and the interests of mankind required it in the case of a man employed by another in a position of trust. He would not suggest that the Government had up to the present time sacrificed the interests of the public in these contracts; but he said they had placed themselves in a position where they were any day liable to be asked to determine which of their two employers they should serve—the country or the contractors, for whom they were also agents. He had shown that by the opinions of the most eminent authorities. It was of no use to say, “There are others: I am one of several.” They were entitled to have the undivided, unbiassed, and unprejudiced attention of the Government on any question that might arise. The country was entitled to have the unbiassed judgment of the whole of the members of the Government on the subject, and could they, when as a matter of fact the majority of the directors of the bank corporation were also members of the Government? Was this a position in which the interests of two parties were not conflicting? The same person could not be agent for both. The other case which he had referred to he could not have believed possible a year ago, but he now knew it to be a fact. He thought it his duty to call attention to these matters because he was anxious that the public opinion of this country should not be corrupted, and that the people should hold what was held in other countries—namely, that transactions of this kind—ambiguous and dangerous transactions—were not to be tolerated; that they should not wait until some grave injury had been done—until some great wrong had been inflicted on the country, perhaps a ruinous wrong; that they should at once say, when they saw these dangers incurred—“This must not be: we are very glad to get your services as members of the Government, and no doubt others would be glad to get your services as their agents; but you must choose which of the two masters you will serve. It is impossible for you to determine between the conflicting interests of two masters when you are in the service of both.” He did not found any motion on this to-day, because he was sorry to think that the House had become so accustomed to these transactions that a motion would only result in giving an apparent formal sanction to these transactions. He had hesitated whether he ought not to found a motion on it, but he was satisfied to take the means which he had taken in order to call the attention of the House and the country to it.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : Hear, hear!

Mr. GRIFFITH said he had no doubt that he should call also the attention of other colonies to it. He was glad to see that the vigilance of the other colonies was watching our public affairs and public men, and, as they had expressed their opinions on other transactions, he had no doubt that this would also be commented on. If the Government could find a single independent newspaper, or section of the Press in any of the colonies, or anywhere else, ready to justify the ambiguous, dangerous, abnormal, and improper position to which he had called attention, he should be indeed very much surprised. In the meantime, he was satisfied that these things could not continue. They might be continued for a little longer, but the good sense

of the public would not allow them to continue very long. He had done his duty in calling attention to them. He did not call these matters small matters as the Colonial Treasurer did; he called them matters of the vastest importance, and every man seeing abuses of this kind creeping through the State and not calling attention to them became a party to the wrong. He conceived it to be his duty—it had not been a pleasant one—to say what he had said. He did not care for the laughter or the jeers of hon. members on the other side of the House. He had said what he had to say, and was satisfied that what he had said would bear fruit, whether this year or next did not matter.

The PREMIER said the hon. gentleman had taken a long time to rise to a sense of duty. He remembered well, when he was a colleague of that gentleman in 1874, that at that time the banks of the colony were in a very different position from that which they occupied at the present time. It was a matter of importance to them to get deposits from all sources, and of course it was a matter of considerable importance to get them from the Government. He was a director of a bank at that time, and he was also a member of the Government of which the member for North Brisbane was also a member, and he never heard it suggested by anyone of his colleagues that he was in an anomalous position. He never felt during the whole of that time that his duty as a bank director conflicted with his duty as a member of the Government. If there was a necessity for a director of the bank to be out of the Government now, there was a greater necessity then. The hon. gentleman had taken them back about ninety years to get precedents to show them that bank directors ought not to be members of the Government, and especially that they ought not to be members of the Government which kept its account in that bank. Well, he did not see that one of the cases which he quoted was applicable in the slightest degree. He thoroughly agreed with the rulings he had quoted, and believed that the judges who gave them were perfectly sensible, upright, and honest men; but he was astonished that the hon. gentleman could see their applicability to the present position at all. Now, with regard to his position as a bank director—or, rather, of his colleagues as bank directors—for he was a bank director when he became Treasurer, but he thought it was incompatible with his duties as Treasurer to be a director. The work done between the bank and the Treasury was done by the Treasurer, and he saw that the two duties must clash and that he could not perform both: he could not serve both, and must serve one. The hon. gentleman surely would not say that he ought, from simply being a shareholder of the bank, to have refused to accept the office of a Minister of the Crown?

Mr. GRIFFITH: No.

The PREMIER asked, then what did the hon. gentleman mean by insisting on having on the records of the House that he (Mr. McIlwraith) was a shareholder in a certain bank? He was a shareholder of the Queensland National Bank, but he could assure them he never remembered being influenced in the slightest degree in his public conduct by his connection with the bank. He said it plainly, and he believed the House believed him. He was a shareholder in a great many other companies, and the action taken by this House and the country had a great deal to do with their success, but he never found that he was in the slightest way compelled to do other than his duty by being a shareholder. Were every

man to put himself in the ideal position shadowed out by the hon. member, he would have to strip his clothes—not only strip himself of wealth, but of his clothes—and come naked into the House before he could come up to the ideal of the hon. gentleman. Well, he resigned his position as bank director because he considered the position of Treasurer incompatible with that of director. His colleague was a bank director; but he (Mr. McIlwraith) had never seen, from that day to this—and he remembered perfectly well all that had taken place in the Cabinet—he had never seen one single question arise in which his position as bank director was in antagonism with his position as Minister of the Crown. He was giving the experience of three years, and if the hon. gentleman wished to prove his position he would bring one case forward in which the interests of the country were neglected in favour of those of the bank. He (Mr. McIlwraith) could prove that the colony had benefited immensely by the arrangements made with the bank, but the position that the hon. member ought to be able to maintain was that the colony had actually suffered from bank directors being also members of the Government. He (Mr. McIlwraith) defied him to prove his position in any such way. The hon. member said this position had never been taken up by any statesman in the other colonies. He (Mr. McIlwraith) remembered Sir James McCulloch being the chairman of directors—if there were more than one in the colonies—of the London Chartered Bank of Australia, which bank had intimate relations with the Government account. He remembered that the case was well discussed, because Sir James McCulloch was, he believed, Treasurer as well as bank director. Taking the colony of Victoria, he had no doubt that if he looked back—he did not know that the hon. member was going to bring this matter forward to-day—he could find precedents from Victoria of Ministers of the Crown being directors of the bank in which the Government account was held, or partly held. He could go to South Australia and give examples there; he could go to New South Wales and give examples there—

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Mr. Watson, in Sydney.

The PREMIER said Mr. Watson in Sydney was an example. What he said was that the positions were not incompatible at all; and if a limit such as the hon. member had indicated—namely, that no bank director was to be a member of the Government—a limitation without sense or reason was imposed. Did the hon. gentleman mean to take the position of asserting that a director of the bank in which the Government account was held could not be a member of the Government? It was absurd. In his experience it was to the interests of the country that such should be the case. What was there behind the action of the hon. member at the present time? Why, the constant agitation kept up by the other bank directors to disturb the position of affairs. He knew what actuated him, and he knew what actuated the directors of the other banks in the colonies. That was the banking influence—the banking influence which had been so strenuously exerted; but he (the Premier) was perfectly used to that sort of thing. He knew perfectly well what was going on by what the bank managers were doing in town. He said conscientiously that since he had been Premier he did not remember one single case brought before the Cabinet in which the position of any of his colleagues who were directors had been antagonistic to his position as a Minister of the Crown. The only case that ever came before the Cabinet was in connection

with the Queensland National Bank accounts, and then his colleague (Sir Arthur Palmer) who happened to be a director of that bank, retired. He (the Premier) was perfectly well aware, when the Postmaster-General joined the Ministry, that he was a director of the Queensland National Bank. That gentleman asked him did he consider his position as a director antagonistic to that of a Minister of the Crown, and whether he ought to resign? He (the Premier) said to him, "Most undoubtedly not," as he thought there was nothing incompatible in his being a bank director and holding a seat in the Cabinet. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Griffith), with an avidity which suited his purpose, but without sufficient examination, had founded a long dissertation to the House with regard to the Postmaster-General, who, he said, was agent for the Government contractors—namely, the British-India Company. If the hon. gentleman, before doing an injustice to a friend, as he might call the Postmaster-General, had only taken the trouble to inquire into the matter, he would have got full information. The hon. gentleman asserted that Mr. Morehead, the present Postmaster-General, was actually the agent of the company which carried the English mails. He probably also meant it to be inferred that Mr. Morehead received a commission for that purpose, and perhaps a salary. Now, Mr. Morehead was not the agent of the company, he never was, nor would he be while he was a member of the Government.

Mr. GRIFFITH: Why?

The PREMIER: The hon. gentleman asked why. If he had made inquiry beforehand he would have got such information as would have prevented him from bringing the case before the House; but for the satisfaction of the House—not of the hon. member, who did not deserve an explanation—he would explain. The three firms—Gibbs, Bright, and Company; Parbury, Lamb, and Company; and Morehead and Company, had been a combination for years for the purpose of loading ships going home. They took up ships, and worked with one another to load them with wool. This course had been followed with the mail steamers, and it had had the effect of destroying the trade with the small ships, as he (the Premier) predicted it would do. Still most of the wool went by those ships. Morehead and Company were simply one of the combination to load ships with wool, and they got the usual 5 per cent. That firm had, perhaps, the largest wool export trade in the colony; and were they to be deprived of the use of the mail steamers for sending home wool because Mr. Morehead was Postmaster-General? The thing was perfectly absurd. He was surprised that the hon. member had had the hardiness to read them such a lecture on the responsibilities and duties of office after the revelation last night of his connection with such a suspicious subject as Mr. Kimber.

Mr. GRIFFITH: Is Mr. Kimber a suspicious subject?

The PREMIER: Mr. Kimber was a suspicious subject with the hon. gentleman until he (Mr. Griffith) wished to become under an obligation to him. He (the Premier) liked to see the conduct of public men criticised. He believed it was the business of public men as much as possible, and especially in that House, to be under no obligation to the Government, and to be as free as possible from anything that would possibly hinder them from making fair and unbiassed criticism. But in this colony it was utterly impossible for a man who held any property at all to put himself in a position of that kind. The Minister for Lands, for instance, might have a selection of his own, and he acted as a Minister of the

Crown. Would anyone say that there was anything wrong in the performance of both his duties as a selector and as a Minister? If he were in doubt as to whether the duties would clash, then he should either resign or hand his duty as a Minister over to one of his colleagues. The thing could always be got over. He did not know one of his colleagues who, in such a case, would do the work himself; they would pass the work over to someone else. If there was one thing which had characterised the present Ministry more than another, it was the fact that they had kept private interests distinct from any suspicion of being connected with public matters. He should not have reminded the hon. member for North Brisbane of this fact had he not wished to show the difference between this Ministry and some that the hon. gentleman had been connected with. When the hon. gentleman was a Minister did he show a scrupulous sense of honour? Four years ago he (the Premier) purchased several stations in the Townsville district. There was a piece of land of some sixty or seventy acres, forming portion of the same estate of R. Towns and Company, which he could also have bought; but knowing the place, and remembering that it was going to have a railway at that time, he determined he would not buy it. He reasoned in this way: No matter how the railway came into Townsville, it was bound to go through that paddock, and that, therefore, the proprietor of that paddock could not be entirely disinterested as to what the Legislature would do with regard to the railway. He thought that it would prevent him taking an unbiassed view of the railway in that district if he became the owner of that land. On that account he declined to buy it. He felt perfectly sure that his private interests would clash with his public duty. But the present leader of the Opposition, who was then Minister for Works, he thought—at all events he was a Minister of the Crown—

Mr. GRIFFITH: When; how long ago?

The PREMIER: It was four years ago—in 1877 or 1878; he forgot the exact date. At all events, the Minister of the Crown, Mr. Griffith, went and bought that land.

Mr. GRIFFITH: After the railway had been decided upon.

The PREMIER: It was in 1877 or 1878. The hon. member was, he believed, Attorney-General, and it was before the railway was decided upon that he purchased that property.

Mr. GRIFFITH: I did nothing of the kind.

The PREMIER: He knew the hon. gentleman had said that before; and he had repeated in this House that he had nothing to do with the matter. But the sale was in this way: The hon. gentleman had a partner, and the deeds were not made out until the railway had passed this House.

Mr. GRIFFITH: The hon. gentleman's statement is entirely without foundation; it is pure fiction.

The PREMIER: Well, the hon. gentleman and he were passengers in the same steamer, and he consulted him (the Premier) as to the purchaser. He (the Premier) knew quite well that the hon. gentleman's name did not appear on the deeds for a long time; he took good care not to have his name there until the railway was passed. That was a transaction that he (the Premier) declined to have anything to do with. That would be taken as a sample of what a member of the Opposition would do. The hon. gentleman said the other matter—that of Kimber and Company—was a private matter, and that they had no business to say a word about it. If

the hon. gentleman had not referred to the private business of another gentleman (Mr. Archer), now the Agent-General, and had not been so minute in his references to his (the Premier's) private business and that of his colleagues, it was very likely they would not have mentioned it. But the hon. gentleman must remember that what was "sauce for the goose was sauce for the gander." The hon. gentleman was not to be pitied at all; he had put himself in that position. He had thought it his duty last year to refer to the railway syndicate, of which Kimber and Company were the solicitors. He called the members of the syndicate scoundrels. He called the directors and solicitors by some low terms, and said the solicitors were living on the garbage work of the city—floating companies of a low class. But when the hon. gentleman went home he at once put himself in the position of an applicant to those solicitors.

Mr. GRIFFITH: I did nothing of the kind.

The PREMIER: He would take the denial of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman had said that he never asked Mr. Kimber to float a company of which he was to be a director. He would take that denial, and would say that somebody had tried to get Mr. Kimber to float a company, of which the hon. member and Mr. William Miles were to be directors. Did they think for a moment that in such a position their duties would conflict with the transcontinental railway, of which Kimber and Company were the solicitors, when it should come before the House? Did the hon. gentleman see that there would be a conflict of duties? It was quite possible to put a great deal worse construction upon it, and a great many people would do it. It might be said that the hon. gentleman would take advantage of his position in this House to force terms from those men. He (the Premier), however, had put the mildest construction on it that he possibly could. The hon. member had used some very strong words in respect to the Ministry. He said that they had been engaged in transactions that any man of honour would disclaim.

Mr. GRIFFITH: I did not say that.

The PREMIER: He would take the hon. gentleman's denial, though he took the words down at the time. The hon. gentleman had assumed a horror at finding the Government in such a position that he was compelled to bring charges against them. He thought the hon. gentleman might have found it more convenient to give them less law and more common sense. All those quotations which the hon. gentleman had given would make a fine speech, and no doubt leading articles had already been sent to the Southern papers about the assault made on Ministers by the leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman knew that he got very little credit in the House for having brought forward this subject against the Government and against the Queensland National Bank. He ought to be ashamed to have delayed acting in a matter of this sort. His duty as the leader of the Opposition was to have brought the matter before the House long ago, if he thought there was so much in it. He ought to have brought it before this House in the form of a resolution that members who were bank directors should not sit as Ministers. Who ever heard of such a flimsy reason? The hon. member knew he would be defeated, and for that reason he says—because he did not want the victory to be placed on the records of the House—therefore he would not bring it forward. It had been proved by the hon. member himself that he had not performed his own duty, because, if so, he would have protested against his (the Premier's) position in 1874; and, as leader of the Opposition, would have brought the question for-

ward in 1879 in a more definite form. The hon. member had made a long struggle to turn the House into a court of law, and must have been clean worked out of politics when he thought he was giving them a treat in that way. Let him talk politics, and they would answer him; but they did not care a twopenny ticket about the cases he quoted. The opinions quoted were, no doubt, the opinions of decent, honest men, and the hon. member himself should take a lesson from them. He thought the hon. gentleman had had quite enough of law, but he was giving it to hon. members cheaper than usual. He had better secure another victim next time, and go at the Queensland National Bank or the agent of the British-India Company; perhaps he had had enough of the trustees of the owners of the Scottish line of ships. The hon. member might go in for law with the agents for the Royal mail steamers, when he might find himself like the gloomy hon. member sitting behind him—counting his losses.

Mr. GRIFFITH: Don't halloo till you're out of the wood.

The PREMIER said the hon. member might follow the course of the hon. member for Darling Downs and see how he would get on. No doubt he would succeed just as well; at any rate, it would be a good thing for the legal profession. The hon. member since he had been in the House had done nothing but find food for the lawyers, who were no doubt a very good lot of people, especially when on the right side of politics, but should not be considered above everything in the colony. He remembered when the hon. member became a Minister of the Crown the burning cry was—"Down with the dummies," "Land reform"; and on that cry the Ministry took up their position; but, to the astonishment of everybody, the hon. member came forward with the extraordinary remedy—go to law. And he did go to law, and, no doubt, very much to the improvement of his banking account, for he got the best pickings. That was how the hon. member acted; and he had already shown how the present Government had acted. He (Mr. McIlwraith) was a civil engineer, and used to make his bread in that way. Suppose on some of the extensive railway works in the colony he got the Minister for Works at loggerheads with the contractors, and then drew his salary as Minister and pocketed fees for settling accounts with the contractors: if he were to do so he would be doing exactly what the leader of the Opposition had done. He would have got up quarrels with contractors from his connection with the Ministry, and would then have received fees as a civil engineer for settling them. But he had never done so, though he did not see why a civil engineer should not have the same privileges as a lawyer. He did not mean to give the House warning that he was going to do any such thing, but was showing the contrast between the conduct of members on his side and that of hon. members on the other side. The hon. member's pretended horror they had seen long ago; but they did not care one straw about the opinion of the hon. member regarding them. They knew the hon. member's opinion. They knew that they would never be able to do anything good until the hon. member sat on the Government side of the House. They would be worth consideration when they sat on the other side of the House, provided the hon. member was not there too—because the chances were that he (Mr. Griffith) might not then be on the Government side. There would not be many quarrels about who were contractors and directors; and the hon. member would be glad to become a director of the Queensland National Bank or any other bank

before he was much older. He would now let the matter drop and give his hon. friend a chance of going on with his Estimates. The hon. member had bottled his remarks up for three weeks. He made the first part of his speech three weeks ago, and by a mischance gave it over again to-night. His advice to the hon. member was to drop the law and come to politics.

Mr. GRIFFITH, in explanation, said the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government had made statements respecting him (Mr. Griffith) which had been made before in the House and contradicted. He had asserted that some time before the Townsville Railway was sanctioned by the House he (Mr. Griffith) acquired an interest in some land there, but did not allow his name to appear on the deed till the railway was sanctioned. There was not the slightest foundation for any one of those statements; they were absolutely untrue. He heard nothing about the land until the railway had been twice passed by that House and by the Legislative Council, and did not have anything to do with it till several months afterwards. Those were the facts of the case. One member of the Government had apologised for having stated otherwise; and the Premier—if he knew anything about the matter—knew that it was exactly as he (Mr. Griffith) had stated. If the hon. member had any curiosity to see the document he was perfectly welcome, for he (Mr. Griffith) was open to the fullest inquiry.

The PREMIER, in explanation, said the transaction took place in 1877—he could supply the date, because the property was offered to him at the time. The hon. member's present partner bought the land shortly afterwards, but his (Mr. Griffith's) name did not go into the agreement till after the railway was passed.

Mr. DICKSON said that, whatever were the merits of the Premier's speech, he had certainly made the best all-round speech of the session. He commenced in an apologetic manner, pointing out that he was convinced of the impropriety of a director of a bank holding a contract with the Government while acting as Colonial Treasurer; then he digressed into matters of a private character in connection with the leader of the Opposition, which were more worthy of a private inquiry office than of that Chamber; and finally he gave his advice, which he dared say would be properly estimated by his hon. friend. But the hon. member (Mr. Griffith) was more serious in introducing his remarks in connection with what he well pointed out to be the growing tendency of the members of the Government to occupy the dual position of directors or agents for companies which were connected by contracts with the Government; and his remarks had received greater force on account of what had been freely commented upon—the position apparently occupied by the Postmaster-General in being agent for the new line of mail steamers. He did not think the Premier had placed this matter very clearly before the House. He (the Premier) had not denied that the Postmaster-General participated in certain profits from that agency, but led the House to infer that the Postmaster-General was simply acting in combination with two other firms in the matter of wool freight. But the hon. member had not denied the inference every reasonable man must draw—that in addition to the profits resulting from wool freight the Postmaster-General would derive profits from other sources in connection with that line of steamers. He was not going into details, but, as one of the public, accepted the announcement that the Postmaster-General, with two other firms, was acting as agent for the mail steamers. The Premier had pointed out very clearly the evils, trifling as they were, which had exhibited them-

selves in connection with the position the Colonial Secretary—

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. DICKSON: Occupied in his capacity as director of the Queensland National Bank. The Premier's words were to the effect that when any matter connected with the banking affairs of the colony came before the Cabinet—if they related to the Queensland National Bank—the Colonial Secretary left his seat.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: He said there had been no such question.

Mr. DICKSON said that the Premier stated that if any question arose he was convinced that the Colonial Secretary would leave his seat; in fact, he said the hon. gentleman did leave it. But for the Colonial Secretary to have retired at such a time was a grave dereliction of public duty. He should have maintained his seat at the council board in the interests of the people of the colony. Here was an illustration furnished by the Premier, which showed even at this early stage the inconvenience that might arise when hon. gentlemen occupied a dual position. They could not advocate the interests of the people of the colony and advocate the interests of the shareholders equally well. He would give the hon. gentleman opposite the credit of performing the duties of director and Colonial Secretary with integrity, and with a desire to discharge those duties to the best of his ability in a straightforward manner; but, at the same time, questions would undoubtedly arise in connection with the conduct of the banking business which would demand the exercise of a resisting influence on the part of the administrators of the Government. The present bankers had treated the colony most liberally. They had paid interest on a sliding scale on the whole of the public funds in their coffers, which they were not bound to do by the letter of their agreement. But, suppose there was a sudden change of policy introduced by the bank, it would be the duty of the members of the Government to endeavour to insist, as far as possible, on getting the very best terms. How would this be enforced by the retirement of the Colonial Secretary and the Postmaster-General from their seats at the council board? Therefore, he repeated that the admission of the Premier fortified the objections raised by the leader of the Opposition; and he was sure that, though this constant reiteration concerning the inconveniences of the position occupied by two Ministers of the Crown had been made this session and last session, they would continue to be repeated; and no doubt in some future House a distinct resolution would be shaped to express the opinion of the representatives of the people as to whether those things ought to continue. He did not wish to insinuate that abuses were permitted by the present Government in connection with these matters; but at the same time, even if they were men of superlative integrity, they ought to be alive to the weaknesses of their fellow-mortals, and to the fact that they might be succeeded by men of—he would not say less integrity, but of less determination; and it was an example which ought not to be permitted to remain any longer than they could help. It was a bad example for succeeding statesmen, and he should always denounce the fact of members of the Government being placed in such an improper position. He had been made acquainted by correspondents in different parts of the colony with the manner in which notices of the postal arrangements were circulated. He had intended to bring this matter before the House under a distinct motion for adjournment, and might possibly do so yet; but he now wished to show

that, on account of the Postmaster-General being one of the agents for the mail steamers, the correspondents he alluded to did not consider him accessible to their representations in connection with the Postal Department. He had letters from Dalby and other inland towns, pointing out that no notice whatever was given in the public papers, or even at the post-offices, of the departure of mails other than by the Torres Straits route.

The PREMIER: He is agent for all. He is sole agent for the Orient and San Francisco lines.

Mr. DICKSON said he was well aware that he was; but the Postmaster-General, being agent for the line of steamers under contract with the Government, was in a position to favour that line at the expense of the others, and was unable, at any rate, to occupy that position of impartiality which he should occupy in the interests of the country. His informants complained of the absence of information relating to the departure of the mails by the Orient, San Francisco, and P. and O. steamers, by which they would be inclined to send their correspondence, on account of dispatch, though the tariff was heavier. It was the duty of the Government to see that such information was properly supplied, and instances had been mentioned where correspondents had been placed at great disadvantage, and suffered considerable loss of time, in consequence of the action of the Postmaster-General. He had mentioned one town—Dalby; but would refrain from mentioning the name of his correspondent, who was one of the leading citizens of that town. That gentleman would have made his representations to the hon. member for Dalby (Mr. Simpson), but he was apprehensive that that gentleman would not see the demerits of the postal service of which the Government were so enamoured; and he would not make his representations to the Post Office on account of the relationship existing between the Postmaster-General and this line of steamers.

The PREMIER: Do you mind me giving the name?

Mr. DICKSON said he did not wish to protract debate on this subject, but rather preferred to hear hon. members on the other side express their opinions. It would be advantageous to the country that a question of this magnitude and importance should receive some expression of opinion from hon. gentlemen who supported the Government. He was sure they must all concur with the Colonial Treasurer in the very proper feeling he had shown in considering it due to his office to hold himself entirely aloof from the embarrassing position of, while acting as Colonial Treasurer, being a bank director of an institution which was under contract with the Government; and he (Mr. Dickson) only wished that the same sense of propriety which induced him to relinquish that position had induced his colleagues likewise to retire from a position which undoubtedly was an anomalous one, and which furnished very proper ground for the remarks of his hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition. The hon. member for Blackall, last evening, in advertent to the position which it was inferred was occupied by the gentleman who was administering the office of Agent-General, to his (Mr. Dickson's) mind had already expressed himself on this subject. He showed a very proper sense of officers connected with the Government, whether as Civil Servants or Ministers of the Crown, being entirely aloof from private interests. They had in that Legislature denied to several of their chief Civil Servants the right of identifying themselves with private institutions in the capacity of directors or managers; and, indeed, the Colonial Secretary last night, in dealing with this rumour which had been put

in circulation by the Government concerning a financial company to be floated in London, of which his hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, an hon. member of the Upper House, and Sir St. George Ralph Gore were stated to be interested, said that upon learning of this rumour he deemed it his duty to ascertain whether Sir St. George Ralph Gore was connected with this company. He said that if he were to be a director of an institution of that sort, the Colonial Office would not find a place for him. His (the Colonial Secretary's) action was quite right; but the force of his example, if he had discontinued to be a leading member of the Government or had given up the directorship of this banking institution, would have been much more satisfactory to the country, and would have carried much more weight, than any remarks he might make upon the impropriety of Sir St. George Ralph Gore occupying the dual position. The Colonial Treasurer had stated that the speciality of the present Government was to hold themselves aloof from any suspicious or embarrassing positions where private interests might be supposed to come in conflict with public interests. That was what he said was the distinguishing characteristic of the present Administration. If that were so, the hon. gentleman and his colleagues had exhibited their ideas of occupying such a position in a most remarkable manner—in a manner which certainly would fail to carry complete conviction to the country or would fail to be interpreted by a large majority of the people as identifying their administration with such a speciality. He must say that this was a subject which was unpleasant to descend upon; and although it might appear to the House and the country as though it were an individual attack more than one dictated on the grounds of public policy, yet he was sure that a majority of the people of this colony, and he might add, he believed, a majority of the hon. members of that House—if they could only express their convictions apart from appearing to censure the Government—would concur in the propriety of the views of his hon. friend and denounce the ambiguous position occupied by Ministers of the Crown in the dual capacity of administering the government of this colony, and also having to look after the interests of either an institution or a company dealing directly with the Government of the colony.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said the hon. member for Enoggera said he would like to hear the views of some of those who supported the Ministry. He was perfectly prepared to give the hon. gentleman his views. To him it seemed rather a subject of congratulation that people who were placed in positions of trust outside of that House by the people of the colony were also the people who occupied positions of trust on the Ministerial benches. He thought that with the limited population they had in this colony, and the few men who could spare the time and trouble to come to the House, if they cut off from themselves every man who had any interest whatever—by applying this rule wide enough, to its fullest extent—they could have no man who had any business connection with the Government at all in this House. No leaseholder would have a right to sit there. The Speaker himself, he believed, would not be in the House, for he believed that hon. gentleman leased some antimony mines from the Crown. The argument of hon. members on the other side would go to show that people who came into this House, and whom they were to look to to govern this colony and hold the reins of government, ought to be people without a vestige of property—without anything at stake. So far as his vision went he must say that he thought a

man who was able to manage his own affairs—who had shown tact and ability to manage the affairs of other people as well—was also a man to be entrusted with the management of affairs of the State. He could only attribute the attack of the leader of the Opposition—which, indeed, he must say was a very feeble one—to real downright feelings of envy and jealousy of those who were in a better and a more trusted position than he or his followers were or could ever hope to be. Take, for instance, that little financial company that was tried to be started in London and which they made such an abortion of. They could not even get the money to start with. He doubted whether they could even get people to take money from them. He should have been very sorry to have borrowed money from them; and, certainly, he should have been sorry to have trusted any money with them. He would not trust them far enough to lend them anything. They had an example of that in Victoria a short time ago, when the Berry Ministry boasted that they had not a banker, a merchant, or landed proprietor—or, in fact, anybody who had any stake whatever in the country—in their Government. Whether it was a good thing for the country or not it was for this House and the people of this colony to judge. One thing he could say was, that that state of affairs was a very good thing for this colony, because it sent any amount of capital here, which had been a great means of developing the resources of our inland country, which were languishing from very want of capital. There was plenty of room for more, and the capital that came here would never do any harm to the working man. He could assure hon. members opposite, and the working men whom they pretended to be so anxious about, that the more capital they got the more employment there would be for them, and the better would be their position in every way. They need not attempt to legislate against capital here. He remembered hearing the hon. member for Enoggera (Mr. Rutledge)—whom he was sorry not to see in his place—go so far as to boast and almost thank God devoutly that he had not got a share in the Queensland National Bank. He (Mr. Lumley Hill) did not see anything in that to be thankful about. That was some time ago; but was it anything to boast about—not having anything at all? He (Mr. Lumley Hill) was a shareholder in the Queensland National Bank, and he did not regret it at all. He did not see that his interest should be allied to that of the Government the least in the world. He was not a shareholder to any very large extent; but he had the utmost confidence in the directory of the Queensland National Bank as it stood, and he had confidence in the Government to a very considerable extent—at all events, so far as their relations between the bank and the colony went. Look at the specimen in the last Government they had, where there were three lawyers. The hon. leader of the Opposition would not be satisfied without a legal Government. He (Mr. Griffith) came into that House and talked law, and very old law too. The Premier met that very fairly by asking the hon. gentleman why he did not confine himself to politics. The last Ministry comprised three lawyers on the Treasury benches. He (Mr. Lumley Hill) maintained that a Ministry composed of lawyers was a little too much of a good thing. They did not want to see lawyers coming into that House, monopolising the business of the country, and making capital for themselves by framing laws, and, subsequently, going into a court and twisting them to any interpretation that suited them. He was very glad that they had only one lawyer in the Ministry, and he was also glad that the Ministry was composed of men who commanded the confidence of a large majority of individuals

outside the House as well as of a majority of hon. members inside the House.

Mr. STEVENSON said he did not wish to prolong the debate, but he should like to say a few words on the question raised about the Postmaster-General acting as agent for the mail service. So far as the question which had been raised respecting the directory of the Queensland National Bank was concerned, he did not wish to say anything, because they had had that brought up often enough before; and the same speech that the hon. member for Enoggera had delivered to-night he had delivered over and over again to the House, and it had been replied to over and over again, and very satisfactorily replied to, too. With regard to the position that the hon. Postmaster-General had taken up, he thought that if the hon. leader of the Opposition had done what the hon. Premier said he ought to have done, and made some inquiries on the subject, he would not have put himself in the position he had done to-night by making this very weak attack upon the Government. It was pointed out by the hon. the Premier that the Postmaster-General was simply acting now as he always had acted with regard to the mail steamers before his name appeared in the advertisement at all. As had been pointed out, he was not agent for the mail service. So far as the mail service contract went he had nothing to do with it. He (Mr. Stevenson) would read a portion of the first paragraph of the circular issued by the joint agency for these steamers: Messrs. Gibbs, Bright, and Company, Messrs. Morehead and Company, and Messrs. Parbury, Lamb, and Company. The part he referred to was this:—

“We beg to inform you that we have made arrangements to load the Royal Mail Steamers for London, as joint agents.”

Where was there any contract with the British-India Company in that? He could not see it. He knew for a fact that Mr. Morehead had never had so much as the scratch of a pen from the British-India Company. He knew for a fact that no contract had been entered into whatever between Mr. Morehead and the Company, and that Mr. Morehead had held the same position all along of simply supplying the steamers of the Company with loading. He would like to know if Mr. Morehead, simply because he was Postmaster-General, was to give up his business in Brisbane and was not to be allowed to send people's wool away for them. It was absurd on the face of it. On looking over the exports this morning he noticed the amount of wool sent away by the “Merkara” was 1,174 bales, and he further noticed that the whole of that wool was shipped by Mr. Morehead's firm. Besides that they shipped 3,200 cases of preserved meats; and it was proposed to-night that they should deprive people from sending this wool and meat home by that mail steamer, simply because Mr. Morehead happened to be Postmaster-General. It was preposterous to think that Mr. Morehead was not to be allowed to act as agent for people inland, and send their goods home by these steamers, simply because he was Postmaster-General. What had he to do with the line of steamers? Nothing whatever. What were they to look for next? Perhaps, since the Opposition were being reduced to all sorts of straits, the next stage would be some motion from the leader of the Opposition, or some of his followers, to prevent the supporters of the Government, who were squatters, from raising beef or mutton to send home by these mail steamers. At any rate, he hoped hon. members opposite would believe what had been said about Mr. Morehead's position in regard to this mail service. He had nothing whatever to do with the British-India Company. As had been pointed out, sailing vessels had been

pretty well run out of the line by the success of these mail steamers. Hon. members opposite were, no doubt, greatly disappointed at the success of this mail service; but it had been proved to be a success, and, he believed, was very likely to prove a greater success still. But why people should be deprived of their agents because Mr. Morehead was Postmaster-General he (Mr. Stevenson) failed to see. They had had a very great deal of maudlin talk this evening, and one or two lectures about what was termed the immorality of public men. They had had quotations from books one hundred years old, and from utterances delivered about one hundred years ago with regard to the position people ought to take up and the relations of one man to another—that buyers could not possibly be sellers, and that sellers should not be buyers. That was all very well in theory, but they did not always find it carried out. It often happened that the buyer had to be the seller and the seller the buyer. He had known a similar instance in the case of a man who lived not 100 miles from Brisbane. He was an auctioneer, and the carriage he drove in was actually sold by himself and bought by himself, and he certainly could not say that that man was not an honest man because he both bought and sold that carriage. He could not see where the dishonesty came in; it might have been of very great benefit to the man who placed the carriage in his hands for sale. He should hope that gentlemen on the other side of the House would not be prepared to consider that man a dishonest man because he bought the carriage himself. He would like to ask the hon. member for Enoggera, who had delivered them a lecture to-night, what he would think of a man who, for the sake of getting a purchaser for an article placed in his hands, bought it himself. He certainly could not think him dishonest. The leader of the Opposition had quoted for them a case in which a man got twenty-one months for that kind of thing, and he returned the commission; but here the auctioneer did not give back the commission, and he did not think that for that reason he was a dishonest man. In fact, he thought he put money into the pocket of the man who left the carriage in his hands. They had had too much of these maudlin lectures, and if the hon. gentlemen who gave them these lectures were a little more honest and right-minded they would have a little less suspicion of other people.

Mr. GARRICK said he could not let this discussion go without saying a word or two upon the subject of it, and he agreed in the main with what had been said from that (the Opposition) side of the House about the inadvisability of members of the Government being directors of financial or other companies having contracts with the Government. Reference had been made to the oldness of the cases quoted by the hon. leader of the Opposition. But he (Mr. Garrick) had yet to learn that a principle which was recognised a century ago, and had never since been departed from from that time to this, was not a good one. He had always learnt that a principle which had stood the test of time gathered strength by its age. With reference to the directors of the Queensland National Bank, he should, perhaps, have said nothing if only one of the directors of that institution had been in the Ministry; but it was now found that another director was also in the Ministry, and that in a Ministry composed of six persons two were the servants—or, at any rate, the agents—of a financial company having a contract with the Government. He had no wish to say a word against the integrity of any of the members of the board of directors or of the members of the Ministry—he put that out of the question altogether. But the point which he main-

tained was, that the shareholders of any institution ought at all times to command the united strength of the board which had charge of their affairs, and in the same way the people of the colony were entitled, at all times and under all circumstances, to have the united strength of the Ministry of the day in the consideration of matters of public importance. The Colonial Treasurer himself, when he assumed that office resigned his position as a director of that bank, showing at once that in some positions he did not consider the two things consistent. He understood the hon. gentleman to say that there had never been any matter of difference or dispute between the Government and the Queensland National Bank; but, at all events, at one time there was a subject which came up for consideration—namely, the acceptance of the Government contract. At that time he understood the Premier to say the Colonial Secretary was a director of the bank; and when the consideration of that contract came before the Cabinet, the Colonial Secretary retired, and did not consider that question. Now, he maintained that the people of this colony were entitled to the united strength of the Cabinet; and that if in the consideration of such a question the withdrawal of one member became necessary the Cabinet was to that extent weaker, and the people were deprived of that strength which they had a right to expect in the administration of their affairs. If hon. members would read the contract they must come to the conclusion at once that it was possible at any moment that very serious questions might arise between the Government of the colony and the directors of the bank; and, if such question arose at the present time, it would be necessary for not one member only, but two members of the Cabinet, to withdraw, involving the loss of one-third of its strength. Where was that sort of thing to stop? If two of the directors could be in the Cabinet, why not three? In that way the people of the colony might at any time be deprived of a large part of the assistance which they had a right to look for, and the action of the Government indicated no limit to the application of the same principle. He had said that differences might arise, and he would now point out from his remembrance of the contract how such differences might arise. According to the Financial Statement, it appeared that on the 30th June last there was lodged in the hands of the Queensland National Bank in London and the colony upwards of £1,300,000 of the public money. Under the contract the bank was not compelled to pay interest on more than £400,000; to the extent of £150,000 they had to pay for rest moneys placed in their hands for three, six, and twelve months the same interest as the public received; and beyond £150,000 for similar deposits they had to pay $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. less than the public received. The House was told by the Premier in his Financial Statement that, although the whole of that £1,300,000 remained in the hands of the Queensland National Bank, and, although by their contract the bank was not compelled to pay interest on over £400,000, yet, as a fact, they were paying interest on the whole amount at the same rate as they contracted to pay on the £400,000. In order to earn money to pay that interest the bank must employ their funds, and they had now not only the £1,300,000, but also the proceeds of the new loan, bringing the total deposits of the Government up to over £2,000,000. Not a single deposit, according to the Statement, was in the hands of any other bank. He did not know whether any others had been invited and had declined to receive deposits.

The PREMIER: All of them.

Mr. GARRICK said it was a fact then that no other bank had a single shilling. To enable them

to pay dividends to the shareholders the bank must spread that money out to earn interest, and the Government had power to call it in at any time from the bank at two months' notice. Supposing any circumstances to arise rendering it necessary for the Government to call in a large part of their deposits, would it be convenient to the bank to do so? Would it not be inconvenient to the customers of the bank if money which had been employed in ordinary discounts were withdrawn, and the bank called in its advances, or made only short credits? Seeing that within the last year there had been a difference of 10 per cent. in the value of the debentures of the colony, it was not unlikely that changes might occur compelling the banks to call in money. Those in charge of banks knew, and their customers knew, that such a movement would be very inconvenient. The Government might fairly consider whether £2,000,000 was not too much money to have in one bank—whether they were not carrying too many eggs in one basket. The position of two directors of that bank in the Ministry might at any time be a position of conflicting interest, and, apart altogether from the question of their integrity—which he did not say a word about in any way whatever—he maintained that it was an inconsistent position, and one which they should not occupy. For that reason he held that it was inadvisable, particularly at a time like the present, that the directors of a contracting institution should also be sitting in the Ministry. He understood the Premier to say that when he occupied the position of a colleague of the leader of the Opposition he was also one of the directors of a bank; but he would remind the hon. gentleman that at that time the Union Bank had the Government contract, and not the bank in which the hon. gentleman was then interested. The hon. gentleman seemed to be trying to fine the matter off infinitesimally by replying to the leader of the Opposition by assertions of that kind. Some hon. member had also said that other hon. members were shareholders in banks; but that case was very different, and the Constitution Act, by expressly exempting from the operation of certain clauses those who were interested in companies of more than twenty members contracting with the Government, showed that no objection attached to persons occupying the position of shareholders in large companies. With reference to the retirement of the Colonial Secretary from the Cabinet on a former occasion, to which the Premier had alluded, he would point out that as the bank contract was for three years, and would probably expire in September of next year, it would soon become necessary for the Government again to call for tenders. The same condition which necessitated the withdrawal of the Colonial Secretary some time ago from the Cabinet would again arise; but when the necessity for arranging those financial matters occurred again the contingency would affect a majority of the directory of the bank, and one-third of the Ministry. With regard to the position occupied by the Postmaster-General he was not perfectly acquainted with the facts of the case. The hon. member for Normanby had referred to the position of the three firms offering to find freight for the steamers as being the same as the position occupied by other merchants; but it would be interesting to know whether those firms had anything to do with the import trade, or whether they received commission from the shipowners on freights inward and outward. From what the hon. member for Normanby stated he assumed that those firms did not discharge the ships as well as load, and did not receive commission from the owners for inward

or outward freights. He thought, however, that it was advisable in all cases that Ministers of the Crown should have nothing whatever to do with Government contractors.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that, in the few words that he intended to address to the House—and he did not wish to detain hon. members—he would begin with the speech of the last speaker. The shareholders of the Queensland National Bank ought to be exceedingly obliged to him and other hon. members on the other side of the House for the interest taken in their concerns. In his opinion, however, the shareholders were able to take care of their own concerns without the assistance of any members of this House. If the shareholders of the bank thought their directors did not suit them, the remedy was in their own hands, and they could use it as they pleased. They ought to be the best judges, and, as for the opinions of members of the Opposition, he (the Colonial Secretary) did not care three straws for them. He was quite certain that it would be exceedingly embarrassing for some gentlemen on the other side of the House to find themselves in the dual position of director of the bank and member of the Government. And why so? Because they must distrust themselves, and they thought of others as they thought of themselves. He believed that the leader of the Opposition would feel himself in a very embarrassing position if the question arose between two interests. He (the Colonial Secretary) had no such feeling. He was not in the least degree alarmed that the country would have any suspicion, where the interests of the country and the bank came together, but that the directors, who were also members of the Government, would know their duty, and do it. The hon. gentleman, the leader of the Opposition, had made his speech that night apparently to convince people of his erudition, and to show his deep reading of ancient tomes. He had quoted opinions which had nothing whatever to do with the question before the House. The hon. gentleman said that no question had arisen between the two parties, and he (the Colonial Secretary) said that no question at all was likely to arise. The contract was a written contract. The terms and specifications were very clear. "He who runs may read." They contracted to do a certain thing and they would do it. Speaking for himself, he could safely say that if any question ever should arise—which he did not think the least likely—he, for one, would have no hesitation in deciding what his action would be. If any question of doubt on the matter of the contract were to come up, he had no serious doubt whatever what he should do; but it would be quite time enough to take the steps he would have to when such an occasion arose. The same argument he had used would apply to the case where a Minister was a shareholder in a company. He (the Colonial Secretary) was not there either by the wish or with the assistance or concurrence of any member of the Opposition. If the majority in the House thought there was any impropriety in his position they had only to say so. It was not in his option whether he should retain it or not. He would have to go out, but he would not allow any member of the Opposition—nor the whole of the Opposition, so long as they were in a minority—to dictate to him what should be his line of conduct. This subject used to be brought up by a gentleman who was no longer a member of the House, and he (the Colonial Secretary) believed he answered that hon. gentleman in a few minutes very effectually. The Opposition members, speaking as they did of the dual position, showed what they thought they would themselves do in it. They might, however, be very good judges of themselves, but they were very bad judges of others.

It was not likely that he was going to discuss the affairs of the bank in public in reply to the hon. member for Moreton. Such affairs were best discussed in the bank parlour, and no doubt would be so when necessity arose. It was exceedingly bad taste for the hon. gentleman to bring the question forward in the way he did. It was thoroughly bad taste on his part. He made a bad allusion in the latter part of his speech to the three years' contract. Did the hon. gentleman remember how the members of the late Administration had nothing whatever to do with the contract which was made by Mr. Hemmant when he was Treasurer? Mr. Hemmant entered into an additional contract with the Union Bank for three years without consulting any other member of the Ministry—solely from his authority as Treasurer, and without consulting the House in any way.

Mr. GRIFFITH: He consulted his colleagues.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said there was nothing to show it. He supposed it was something in the manner in which, as they heard from the hon. gentleman himself, the hon. member for North Brisbane acted as Attorney-General. He (the Colonial Secretary) did not know what business he had to carry on communications with the President of the other House. Where was his authority? He was not Premier. He never was Premier. He (the Colonial Secretary) would like to know by what authority the Attorney-General so acted?

Mr. GRIFFITH: That was the Premier's business.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. gentleman never was Premier. No doubt he assumed the right. He (the Colonial Secretary) had often said that the hon. gentleman was the horse working in the team. And he was. In this way the House got a little insight into what amount of power the Premier of the late Ministry had. He (the Colonial Secretary) would like to see the Premier of the present day allowing one of his colleagues to conduct communications with the President of the Upper House. In the last Ministry the Premier was simply nowhere, and the Attorney-General was everybody. He (the Colonial Secretary) had listened with amazement to the remarks of the hon. member for North Brisbane. They had heard all sorts of rumours of what that hon. gentleman was going to do in the way of hauling the Ministry down on their marrow-bones. If, however, his speech had fallen still-born on the previous day, what an abortion was this one! What had the House to do with the opinions of eminent jurists which nobody ever doubted? They were truisms, but they had no application in this matter at all. They had no application to the question he tried to weave them into. One man had got twenty-one months for what a gentleman who was not twenty-one miles from the hon. gentleman did very much like.

Mr. GRIFFITH: Do you mean yourself?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not mean himself. He had never worked in conjunction with the hon. member, and was never likely to do so in any one possible way. The deduction he drew from the speech of the hon. member for North Brisbane was pretty much what had been drawn from it by other members on this side of the House. No man was to hold any property in conjunction with a part in the ruling of this country. If they carried out the hon. member's principles properly—to the bitter end—they would have a Ministry selected from Dunwich, and perhaps they might be allowed, by the grace of God, to have an Attorney-General from St. Helena. That was precisely what the speech of the hon. gentleman led up to, and nothing else. Then the House had heard about the Postmaster-

General as being an agent for the Royal Mail Steam Service. This was a mare's nest like that which the hon. gentleman discovered on the previous evening about the Acting Agent-General. Hon. members could have his (the Colonial Secretary's) word that the hon. gentleman had no more to do as agent for the Queensland Royal Mail Service than he (the Colonial Secretary) had.

Mr. GRIFFITH: Why does he advertise them?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Because he chose. His hon. colleague was one of three agents who sent their produce to the ships, but not one scrap of writing, he knew, had passed between the company and that firm. The arrangements were made by Gibbs, Bright, and Company with these firms. He (the Colonial Secretary) made the hon. gentleman a present of the mare's nest. He would recommend him to bring it before the Supreme Court, which seemed to be his ultimate idea of justice and legality. He did not know whether the hon. gentleman was so fond of it now as he was before. At all events, the case was open for trial.

Mr. REA felt that every loyal person would regret very much that Her Majesty the Queen had not been present in the gallery that night, in order that she might have heard her last new knight win, not his spurs, but his bullock-whip. That would have been a new sensation for Her Majesty, but she would have experienced a great difficulty if she had heard the speech, for she must have changed the locality of the order and have given them a new territorial designation: instead of Knights of Malta, Knights of Cockatoo Island. For the present emblem, too, she would have had to substitute a small metal ring, a little above the ankle, with a chain to it, and a new motto would have to be supplied: "Flames and brimstone to him who differs from me." That would be a proper designation for the gentleman who had that night disgraced the place he held as a Minister of the Crown in referring to the lowest dregs of the colony as his successors in office on the Treasury benches. The word seemed to have gone forth on the other side of the House: Brazen it out, brazen it out, brazen it out! That seemed to be the reason of the short speeches they had heard. But he would remind them how Sir James McCulloch had the same band of servile followers in Victoria and established the iron hand; but when the country was appealed to he experienced the same fate as the hon. the Premier would experience. He never dared to show himself in the House again from that day to this. And that would be the fate of these hon. gentlemen for their delinquencies. He would, therefore, ask hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to take warning from the fate of that gentleman. What were they to think of the boastings of the Premier of the colony, ignoring as he did the acts of his predecessors? Had it come to this, that he could think of deluding every man in Queensland into the belief that this Ministry above all others had kept themselves furthest away from temptation? They would have to get the poet laureate of England to immortalise this Ministry as it deserved. They all remembered the glorious words by which he immortalised those self-sacrificing men at Balclava, when he wrote that ode on "The Charge of the Six Hundred"; but he would have to take the whole of that ode and designate it as the "Charge of the Sixty Thousand," in order to meet the present case. Who did not remember those memorable words—

"Guns to the right of them,
Guns to the left of them,
Guns in front of them,
Volleyed and thundered."

But, to describe this Ministry, it would have to be—

Freight contracts to right of them,
Rail contracts to left of them,
Mail contracts in front of them—
Each worth 60,000.

He was quite sure, when the people of Queensland read the Premier's speech to-morrow, they would see that they had been dreaming during the past few years. He (Mr. Rea) was compelled to jot some of his statements down, to see whether he had not been dreaming himself; but, in spite of the Premier's assertion and that of his colleagues, the general public believed that the contract with the bank was brought about by surreptitious means, and that no other bank could have the contract, no matter what was done. If it were put to the vote of the constituents of his hon. colleague of North Brisbane to-morrow, he would soon be satisfied what the opinions of that constituency were with respect to it. The House had been told that it had nothing whatever to do as to how the bank was carried on. This was a curious state of affairs when the disposition of the public money was in the hands of a bank—a bank whose age counted by months as that of others counted by years—and, if he was informed correctly, a bank whose paid-up capital was not more than four times greater than the amount it had to pay for the outlay of its head office; and yet the people of Queensland were not to be concerned in it. Did it not concern the taxpayers of the colony; and did it not concern hon. members on this side of the House sent there to guard the money of the colony? Was there ever a more brazen-faced statement than that made by the hon. the Colonial Secretary? The whole country knew that the present Ministry was composed of two brothers-in-law, the scratch of whose pen guided the destiny of the whole colony. The Colonial Secretary boasted that so long as he could get a following he would pay no attention to what this side of the House might say with reference to the conduct of business. Would he deny that many of his following had got discounts from the public money lent to the bank? And would he deny that Ministers themselves had got discounts? He was amazed that Englishmen had been brought to this state, in a colony boasting of manhood suffrage, that the followers of any Ministry could back it up in such statements. These astounding statements grew so numerous that he was really puzzled to know how to comment upon them. The statement was made by the Premier that the Postmaster-General's position with respect to the mail contract was a mere matter of form, and that he was only one of the agents of that company. Did hon. members not know that in his agency he shared commission; and was that not being a contractor? The Premier seemed to think that, because up to the present moment he had escaped the dominion of the law, he could go to any length; but he (Mr. Rea) hoped that the liabilities of directors in Her Majesty's dominions would be dealt with in London in a very different manner from that in which it had been dealt with here. The actions of the Government had been characterised like those of the racecourse, where they saw the three-card trick and thimble rigger; everything being done so craftily that they could get no books or records to see how it was done. The members of the Opposition were told that they were making unfounded charges; but what would they say when they came to the charge which was attempted to be made against the leader of the Opposition? Nothing could show how hard pressed the Ministerial supporters were to find some excuse for their own acts than the trumping up of this charge against the leader of the Opposition.

Because there was an agent who wanted to get respectable men in Queensland to put their names on a prospectus—

Mr. GRIFFITH: It never amounted to a prospectus.

Mr. REA said he was told it never amounted to a prospectus; but because, being a former Minister of the Crown, and in a position of trust, he was anxious to get good and reliable names of men who from their past career could not be suspected of having anything to do with a dummy company, this trumpery charge was brought up, and he was charged with being actuated with the same underhand motives which had characterised the Ministry during the past twelve or eighteen months. The stroke of a pen one way or another would make or mar a man in the decision arrived at with respect to the transcontinental railway line, and the country should take immediate steps one way or another to make the Government decide either that there should be no transcontinental railway at all, or that it should be brought before Parliament at once, so that the country might know what was going to be done.

Mr. MILES said he was going to say they might search the whole of the neighbouring colonies, and they would fail to find any Government whose members were connected with Government banks. He felt bound to concur in every word uttered by the hon. the leader of the Opposition to-night. He had had a very disagreeable duty to perform. He was, of course, leader of this side of the House, and it was his duty to find out the delinquencies of the Government. The public looked to him to take steps in this House—at all events, to expose these things if they existed. With reference to the Postmaster-General, it was denied that he had received any commission as agent for that business. All he had to say to that was that, if he did not, the other agents did. He (Mr. Miles) did not desire to mention names, but application was made by one of them to him (Mr. Miles), asking that he would use his influence to send him a portion of the meat and wool for export, as he wanted a share of the commission for shipping the cargo. He concluded that Messrs. Morehead and Company were not likely to ship cargoes without getting some consideration for it. He thought it incompatible with his position that the Postmaster-General should be agent for these mail steamers. The Premier was very jubilant and jocular while addressing the House about proceedings that had recently taken place. It would have been just as well if he had said very little about it. He thought the position the hon. gentleman held was such that the less said about it the better. He (Mr. Miles) had no desire at this stage to commit himself with regard to what had taken place in the Supreme Court; but he could assure the hon. gentleman that before he was done with him he would make him laugh on the other side of his face. He would take him to where he would not be able to get to the ears—well, he would not proceed any further, because he might say something that he ought not to say; but he would allude to the matter at some future time. He thought it would be well if the hon. gentleman would not halloo before he was out of the wood. Before he (Mr. Miles) was done with him he would settle him one way or another.

Mr. NORTON said the hon. member who had just sat down had spoken of the unpleasant duty which the leader of the Opposition had had to perform to-night; but he (Mr. Norton) did not know whether it was an unpleasant duty. It appeared to be rather a congenial task for the hon. member (Mr. Griffith) to cast suspicion on the members of the Government. This was not the first, nor second, nor tenth, nor twelfth time that the hon. member had done that; and nobody but the hon. gentleman's own immediate sup-

porters would consider that he felt it to be an unpleasant duty. The subject which had been occupying the attention of the House was one that was discussed two years ago very fully, and it was settled, so far as the vote then proposed was concerned, adversely to the leader of the Opposition and in favour of the Government. Considered as an abstract question, he did not think it desirable that Ministers of the Crown should be directors of a bank which had a contract with the Government; but, at the same time, he thought it would be admitted that members in this House did not for one moment think that the members of the present Ministry would take advantage, or be led away by the influence they had, to act in a manner disadvantageous to the country simply on account of their connection with the bank. The hon. member for Moreton had almost said so in so many words. He (Mr. Norton) could not say the same of the hon. member for North Brisbane, because he had tried to cast suspicion upon the Government. If that was his object, then he could understand why the hon. gentleman had brought this matter forward. In savage countries a savage, who was never in the slightest degree afraid of his enemies, would shrink back with the greatest fear if the skeleton of one of those enemies was brought before him. He (Mr. Norton) did not know whether the hon. gentleman, in digging up this skeleton which was buried two years ago, thought it would cause any dismay among the Government supporters. Surely anyone would think the hon. member might have had some fresh fault to find against the Government now, instead of going back to the old thing. Did the hon. member intend, as soon as this was disposed of, to go into the steel rails question, and then into every other question which had been brought forward during the last two years? It would be creditable to him if he could introduce something fresh into the House. A very good case had been made out with regard to the Ministry and the bank. It had been shown, at any rate, that there was a foundation of strength in the Ministry, and that the members of the Ministry whenever anything came before them which was affected by their interests, were honest enough to retire at once. He (Mr. Norton) would not have spoken on this question but for the indignation with which the leader of the Opposition resented the Premier's statement, that he had been mixed up in an affair with Mr. Kimber at home, and also with some land at Townsville. The hon. member ought not to feel surprised that when any suspicion attached to him people were ready to accept that suspicion, because during the last two years he had been casting suspicion on the Government. The hon. member should not be surprised at his conduct being regarded with suspicion, and at his statements not being accepted as true. For that the hon. member had only himself to blame.

Question put and passed, and the House went into Committee of Supply.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that £8,878 be voted for the Volunteers.

Mr. GRIFFITH asked what had been done with respect to the defence of the colony?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the fort was going on as rapidly as possible. The guns had just arrived, and were now on the wharf. The foundations for the guns were very heavy, and they would take some time. Some delay had been caused in waiting for men to come from England; but the work was being pushed on as quickly as could be done.

Mr. DICKSON asked if the annual encampment would be held during 1881-2; and, if so, where?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said there would be an encampment at Lytton.

Mr. GRIFFITH asked whether any proposals were to be made to increase the number of volunteers?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it was not intended to increase the number of volunteers at the present time; but a Bill was in preparation to authorise the formation of rifle corps in the interior, the same as in South Australia. If the Bill passed, then rifle companies could be formed, and the Government would only find the arms.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that £4,455 be granted for the Benevolent Asylum, Dunwich. The asylum was assuming very large proportions, and he did not see any way of checking it, though the institution was conducted remarkably well, and with due economy.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that £1,829 be granted for Harbour of Refuge, Thursday Island.

Mr. GRIFFITH asked whether any change had been made, or was intended to be made, with regard to the Police Magistrate, Thursday Island. Did the Imperial Government contribute the same as before to the establishment there?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the Police Magistrate had been absent since the 1st instant. A number of charges were brought against him while in Brisbane, and he (the Colonial Secretary) thought it better that he should remain until inquiry was made. The charges were inquired into by an officer of the Audit Department, and the result was that they were found to be groundless. The Police Magistrate returned yesterday to Thursday Island under his (the Colonial Secretary's) instructions. The Imperial Government still contributed to the establishment on the island, but he did not know how long it would last. South Australia, also, had contributed; but he did not think that would continue either. There was some idea of the Imperial Government forming a coaling station on Thursday Island; and Colonel Scratchley, who was on his way to inspect the batteries here, would go on to Thursday Island to report to the Home Government on its capabilities of defence.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked how long the Police Magistrate had been at Thursday Island?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Some six or seven years at Somerset and Thursday Island.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said it would be a very good plan to remove police magistrates occasionally.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he quite agreed with the hon. member, and he did shift them when possible after they had been for some time in one place.

Mr. DE SATGE said that buildings should be erected, if possible, so as to make the change from place to place less expensive. It was almost cruel to shift a police magistrate without granting him some assistance to form a new home. If the principle he suggested were adopted there would be no difficulty in changing the magistrates about throughout the colony, to the very great benefit of the administration of justice, for it was impossible for a man to live three or four years in a place without his views being tinged to some extent by local influence.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said the sum of £50 was now allowed in lieu of residence, and that was not allowed some time ago; so that it would not be so very cruel to shift magistrates from one place to another. For the reason mentioned by

the hon. member for Mitchell he had always objected to having police magistrates too long in one place.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL agreed with the hon. member for Mitchell as to the hardship of shifting a man on account of the expenses he was put to after he had made a comfortable home. He saw £50 allowed instead of house rent, but did not see anything for other expenses; and £50 would not cover the loss a man would sustain by breaking up his home, and buying new furniture, probably at a high price. If a man did get tinged with a certain amount of bias, he did not do it without cause; for he began to know who were the rogues and who were the honest men, after he had been a certain number of years in a place.

Mr. RUTLEDGE asked whether it was the custom to provide police magistrates, when shifted, with travelling expenses?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that if a police magistrate was shifted on promotion he was not allowed expenses; but if he was shifted for the convenience of the Government he was allowed travelling expenses.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that £1,561 be granted for the schooner "Pearl." There was an increase in the item of "victualing," and this was accounted for by the fact that the white men would not do the work or remain in the service; and eight South Sea Islanders were engaged for the same wages. They did their work efficiently.

In answer to Mr. GRIFFITH,

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the "Pearl" had been cruising about different islands, and had done a great deal of work. She had been at Point Parker; had made a flying survey of the harbour, and would soon be back. He had privately received information that Her Majesty's ship—at present surveying Torres Straits, Prince of Wales Passage, and the entrance of Torres Straits—was likely to be sent to Point Parker next spring to make a survey.

Mr. DE SATGE said this subject might be of more importance than appeared, because persons were making investments in the neighbourhood, and the importance of the Gulf was only beginning to be discovered. Before long the Government should have a pretty large staff of surveyors in the district, with a view to the immediate wants of the people in that direction. A large portion of the Burke district was unsurveyed, and no sketch of the blocks there was to be obtained in the Lands Office. The country was of so excellent a nature that it formed almost a colony of itself; and to find out whether there was a proper harbour on the Gulf was one of the most important works in which the colony could be engaged.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY, in answer to Mr. DICKSON, said he had just stated that eight kanakas were employed on the "Pearl" instead of four white men, because the white men would not remain on the ship or do the work. Four men were not sufficient to man the boat and look after the schooner as well; but with eight men, the boat could be manned by four, while the others with the mate could look after the ship in the event of bad weather.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that £2,540 be granted for the steamer "Kate."

Mr. GRIFFITH said it had been suggested that a new steamer should be got. Had the Government had the matter under consideration?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the matter was under the consideration of the Government, but nothing had been done. The "Kate" was not fit to go to sea at present; in fact, never was a good sea-going vessel, though he had been through Torres Straits in her. The Government considered they should have a sea-going steamer; but he was informed by ship surveyors that the "Kate," with a new bottom and some other repairs, would answer her present purpose for years.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the sum of £31,100 be granted for Charitable Allowances. This was a large sum, but the amount that was voted last year, which was calculated on the receipts for hospitals for the previous year, had proved insufficient. The subscriptions this year to hospitals all over the colony showed very favourably in comparison with previous years, and, of course, an additional endowment was required from the Government, and had to be provided.

Mr. KATES asked whether the Colonial Secretary could give any reason why he had reduced the endowment to the Warwick Hospital? In most of the other cases there was an increase, but it appeared Warwick was to be punished by a reduction of one-half. Last year they received £1,200, and this year it was only £600. At the same time he would like to ask what had become of the £5,000, voted some four years ago on the Loan Estimates, for the erection of a new hospital at Warwick?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the first question was easily explained. The Warwick people would not subscribe to their hospital; and, of course, they were not entitled to the endowment. They were not entitled to the £600, or anything like it. With regard to the £5,000 for a new hospital, that amount was available, and whenever the Warwick people showed that they were inclined to support a hospital, the money would be expended; but not till then.

Mr. H. PALMER (Maryborough) said he would like to know on what ground these advances were made. On what ground was the advance from £500 to £1,400 to Toowoomba made, and in the case of Ipswich, from £700 to £1,000? In one case the advance was £100, in another £300, and in another £900. He would point out that Maryborough had subscribed liberally, and they had got £1,200 from the Government, instead of £800, for years. He did not complain of £800 being put down, but what puzzled him was, that only that sum was put down when they had actually received £1,200 for years. Some years ago he had a promise from Mr. Macalister that that amount would be given.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the explanation was very simple. The subscriptions in Maryborough, for the year 1880-1, were £461 11s. 9d., and the amount of endowment was £923 3s. 6d. A great many of the estimates of this description had come in since these returns were printed; and at the time the Estimates were printed Maryborough was only entitled, under the subscriptions collected, to £800. As the hon. member observed, for years they got more money, but they were not entitled to more at the time these returns were prepared.

Mr. H. PALMER (Maryborough) said that was explained by the fact that the financial year ended in June; their year ended in January, and they were requested by the Government to send in their returns to the end of June. There seemed to be some confusion with regard to the financial year. He knew that they raised the full amount to entitle them to £1,200 a-year, and

they got that amount. How the discrepancy appeared he could not make out.

Mr. HORWITZ called the attention of the Colonial Secretary to the fact that there was only £600 down on the Estimates for the Warwick Hospital, instead of £1,200. Unless the £1,200 was voted, the committee would have to call upon the Colonial Secretary again, as they would be that amount short. He admitted at once what the Colonial Secretary complained of, about the Warwick people not subscribing as liberally as they had done. The people of Warwick were liberal enough when the committee called upon them for subscriptions; but, unfortunately, for the last two years the committee had been rather too late in calling upon the people of the town and district. He could assure the House that the committee at present were doing their best to get as much money as they possibly could.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had already answered the question.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that £3,025 be granted for Medical Officers.

Mr. RUTLEDGE said he should like to ask the Colonial Secretary whether he had given directions to medical officers in view of securing a supply of lymph for vaccination?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There is plenty of lymph in the colony—an abundant supply.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that £1,100 be granted for the Central Board of Health.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he should like some information with respect to two changes in this vote. There was an increase of £50 a year to the secretary. What were the total emoluments of the secretary?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The total emoluments of the Secretary are £100 per year, to be increased to £150 by this vote.

Mr. GRIFFITH: Is he not paid some other emoluments?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There is no other.

Mr. GRIFFITH: Is he not secretary to the Relief Board?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: He has not been so for years.

Mr. GRIFFITH said that in connection with the small-pox hospital, in case of that plague coming here, it would be satisfactory if the Colonial Secretary would tell the House what course he proposed to take. There were terrible complaints made of the conduct of the Government of New South Wales in dealing with the matter. He was sure that it would be very satisfactory to the people here to know that the Government here did not intend to repeat those mistakes. He did not know what sort of hospital had been provided, but it would not be very much for £400. He was sure it would be very satisfactory to know what steps the Government proposed to take. They could not hope to escape the pest long; it seemed to have spread all over Sydney, and it was very doubtful whether they should escape it much longer, being at only forty-eight hours' distance.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that, in the event of our being visited with small-pox, he had had put up a small hospital in the Park, and he had got the hulk in the river which was very well adapted for an hospital also. What

action he should take if small-pox did come amongst us would depend entirely upon the extent of the plague. He had already notified, months ago when the first alarm of small-pox occurred here—an alarm which fortunately came to nothing, as the case was one of swine-pox, or some such thing—that he had no intention of quarantining the medical officers. He believed the great danger in Sydney had been caused by quarantining the medical officers who attended the first cases, and by cooping up healthy persons in places from which small-pox patients had been removed. He believed the best method of dealing with a small-pox case was to remove the patient—but without endangering the person's life in the style adopted in the neighbouring colony—to the small-pox hospital, and then to burn the clothes of those who remained and fumigate them as much as possible; but not to coop them up. He could only give a general idea of what his action would be should small-pox break out, and he believed he would be thoroughly backed up by the medical men of the colony, who would have no fear of being quarantined, or of their health being ruined. The result of the practice in Sydney was that medical men would not attend to the patients, and the great number of small-pox cases which had occurred in Sydney were chiefly owing to the fact that a great number of individuals were kept cooped up in a house from which a small-pox patient had been taken.

Mr. RUTLEDGE would like to ask the Colonial Secretary whether a more suitable place might not be found for the hulk than opposite Toowong, where it was at present. It was not only a very objectionable object to have there, but when the wind blew straight across from it to Toowong there was danger in its being placed there. In many ways it was undesirable to have an institution of that kind in such a position of prominence, and so situated as to be likely to be a source of inconvenience and possible danger to the inhabitants of the immediate neighbourhood. He thought a place of greater privacy might have been chosen, and that the Colonial Secretary would do well to take the hulk a little higher up the river round the point, where there were not so many people living, and thus alleviate what had been considered a grievance by a large number of people at Toowong.

Mr. BEATTIE said he did not at all agree with the hon. member (Mr. Rutledge). He thought, if anything, the Colonial Secretary had brought up the hulk too far. He thought it had been placed where it was for the convenience of transporting the poor creatures who might suffer from it should the malaria arise here. Talking about the place in which the hospital was situated, let them look at the London Hospital; it was placed opposite a very much larger place than Toowong. If they found fault with the Government for this, the people of Toowong ought to be ashamed of themselves.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not think many people in Toowong would back up the hon. member. The reason why the hulk was stationed there was that the people who were first infected in the colony were living in that neighbourhood, and the Government wished to put them to as little inconvenience as possible.

Mr. GRIFFITH said that some harm had resulted in Sydney from taking people long distances, and the Government had now changed their mind, and exercised a discretion as to whether infected persons should be put into quarantine, or treated in their own houses. If the disease should break out here to any serious extent, the proposed hospital in Victoria Park

would not be large enough; and it might be desirable in many cases to treat the patients in their own houses. Many people were anxious to have an assurance that the Government would deal with the matter in a more intelligent way than the authorities in New South Wales did.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he would repeat that the action of the Government would depend upon the extent of the malady. Every precaution against the infection had been taken. All steamers from Sydney were inspected by the Government medical officer before they left, and were inspected here; and he had strong hopes that the colony would escape.

Mr. FRASER asked whether it was true that the gentleman who was down for an increase of £50 had just received an appointment as supernumerary tidewaiter, with leave to be at liberty one day in the week to attend the meetings of the board.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he was informed by the Collector of Customs that no such appointment had been made.

Mr. NORTON asked whether, in the case of small-pox breaking out here and patients being removed to quarantine, the Government would allow relations of the patient living in the same house to go into quarantine also if they chose to do so? If only those infected were allowed to go into quarantine a great many cases of concealment would occur.

Mr. BEATTIE said he should like to know how many times a week the Central Board of Health met?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Once.

Mr. BEATTIE said the secretary in that case got £3 for one day's work, and he believed he had also been employed in the Customs Department. That gentleman, he knew, had been employed in the Registrar-General's Department at a time when he was receiving a salary from the Relieving Board and the Central Board of Health as well. There were many exemplary officers in the Service who received far less salary, and he considered this officer was too highly paid.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had already stated that this officer had not been employed in the Registrar-General's Office for some months. He was employed on the Central Board, and that was the only salary he received. The Collector of Customs assured him that the officer in question had not been employed on the Customs.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said if this officer had £3 for a day's work the Government might well be asked to give him something else to do.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the Central Board only met once a week at present, but the secretary had to attend to all the correspondence of the local boards, and there was no one but himself to do any of the work. The increase had been proposed at the special request of the Board of Health. A man could not live on £2 a week.

Mr. MACDONALD-PATERSON said the payment was at the rate of something like £936 per annum. It might be too bad to ask a man to live upon £100 a year; but the salary might be attached as an honorarium or adjunct to the salary of some other officer, who was not fully employed. As far as he knew, the operations of the Central Board of Health were not of sufficient importance to justify this addition of £50 a year.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that £2,000 be granted for Public Institutions. This was, he said, the vote in aid of schools of art and

mining schools, and the amount was as near as possible what would be required. The total amount expended last year was £1,336 15s. 6d., at the rate of 10s. for every £1 subscribed by the members of the institutions.

Mr. NORTON said that when this matter came before the Committee last year and the reduction in the scale of the subsidy was made, it was proposed at first that the assistance should be discontinued altogether. He thought that even the reduction was a very great hardship—particularly in the case of small townships where there were very few amusements, and the people were entirely dependent upon their own resources in that respect. After patiently and under great difficulties establishing and keeping up their schools of art, they found themselves now placed in a position of greater difficulty than before. In some places the people could hardly carry on at all, and it would be a great injustice if, after having started a library and got some books together, they were compelled by the action of the Government to give them up again. He hoped some arrangement would be come to by which, at least in the case of small places the old subsidy of £1 for £1 would be renewed. A good deal of increase had been made in the expenditure of the country for salaries, and the Committee might consider whether they could not relinquish this reduction.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said that where the people had no other entertainments they would spend very little money, and, therefore, ought to be able to pay for their own amusements, and for maintaining their schools of art. It must be a very miserable place that, under such circumstances, could not keep a school of arts going.

Mr. MACDONALD-PATERSON said it took a good deal of money to form the nucleus of a library for a private individual, and of course considerably more for a library for even a small community like Blackall, Aramac, and such like outside places. He was glad to have the opportunity of expressing his dissatisfaction with the treatment which these institutions had received. He thought the system of giving £1 for £1 should never have been abandoned, and he hoped the Colonial Secretary would give the Committee some assurance that the more liberal scale of assistance previously obtaining would be reverted to. It was just as healthful to encourage the combination of individuals for the purpose of establishing a library as to go on laying unremunerative telegraph lines with borrowed money for the benefit of a few persons. These institutions might be a means of enjoyment in which every member of a village might participate, and they formed a centre for mental culture in every part of the colony. He trusted the Government would make some more liberal provision than that which appeared on the Estimates. Speaking from his own constituency, he could say that they had always been disposed to support a more liberal contribution from the Government than was now given; and, from his own experience in Brisbane, Rockhampton, and elsewhere, he considered that schools of art were one of the soundest fields into which a little dribble of the Government money might be allowed to flow.

Mr. KELLETT had understood, when this reduction was made, that it was only supposed to be temporary, and that this year it would be raised again to £1. Considering that they laid out so much money on education, he thought they could not do better than support these educational institutions well. In other cases money was laid out in a much worse form—not half so conducive to the benefit of the people as this would be. He hoped the Government would see their way clear to raise the subsidy to its former position.

Mr. BAYNES said that last year there was in his own constituency some struggle to keep a school of arts in existence, and he therefore hoped the members of the Government would see their way clear to increase the vote. He thought it was a mistaken economy to reduce the subsidy from £1 to 10s.

Mr. HORWITZ endorsed what had been said in reference to the schools of art. It was better to spend money in their support, where many young men could go in the evening, instead of turning out larrikins. Instead of having a lot of police about the town to keep them in order, it would be a great deal cheaper to have these schools of arts, with books and papers to attract them, instead of letting them lie about the streets. Ten shillings would not maintain these places, and he hoped the Colonial Secretary would take into consideration that this was the case.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said that the hon. member for Rockhampton said that his constituents were in favour of a larger subsidy. That was very natural. All the different places in the colony would probably think the same. He himself presented a petition on the previous day from nearly all the schools of art in the colony—signed by the presidents, vice-presidents, and other officers—all asking for the higher subsidy. If these schools of art were what they were said to be by the hon. member for Stanley, he—speaking as an individual, and not as a member of the Government—would be very willing for them to have the larger subsidy. He denied, however, that they were educational, but simply places where a number of men met together to read newspapers and novels. The term “school of arts” was entirely a misnomer. He did not know how the term came to be applied. It was very much like the calling of small bush public-houses “hotels”—hotels equally with the finest hotels in Paris or London. The real schools of art were educational agencies where the artisans were educated technically in the various branches of their professions, and where lectures were given. Such was not the case here. They were simply for novel and newspaper reading. They were not educational, and he did not think they deserved the larger subsidy.

Mr. NORTON said he agreed that it was a misnomer to call these places schools of art, as they were really circulating libraries and reading-rooms, but he did not agree that their usefulness was therefore limited. In his opinion schools of art were really educational. Many men could not afford to buy more than newspaper—say, the *Queenstander*, and perhaps one or two other newspapers in the week—but not anything like the assortment they could get in these institutions, in some of which they had quite a lot of different periodicals. The Government was spending a great deal of money in education, and what were the pupils of their schools to do in the evenings after they had left school? They could not afford to buy books, and if they could they did not know what to do with them. If they commenced to buy they would soon get an accumulation.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Give them to the school of arts.

Mr. NORTON said that some did give them to the school of arts. He did so himself when he left his station; but it was not people in their position they were talking of at all, but the people who could not afford to provide themselves with books or with other reading matter. He did not think the reduced subsidy should be adhered to.

The PREMIER said nothing stopped the progress of schools of art so much as the attempts to get Government assistance. In other colonies

the best schools of art were started and maintained by voluntary contributions; and the men who gave these voluntary contributions put an interest into the matter—which men who spent the Government money never did. In this colony nothing whatever seemed to be able to be done without the people looking to the Government to do it. The House must not think that all they had to do was to vote in a pleasant way a lot of money they had got together. This money was received from the taxpayer; and why should they vote it to benefit any particular district, for not one in ten actually benefited by these votes. They asked the Government to subsidise, to the extent of 100 per cent., men in their expenditure on newspapers. One hon. gentleman said that the labourer was not able to buy more than one newspaper in a week. He (the Premier) maintained that every working man with health and strength was able to buy as many newspapers as he was able to read in a week. The hon. gentleman had also referred to the loss on telegraphs; but he would remind him of the great loss to the Post Office, which was caused by the Government taking newspapers to any part of the colony free. This was a great contribution to the education of the colony that hon. members forgot altogether, and which they ought to try to think of when they came to a vote of this kind. He thought himself that 10s. for every £1 subscribed was a very handsome contribution. Twenty shillings in the £1 would simply stifle all private effort to benefit these institutions.

Mr. MACDONALD-PATERSON thought if the argument of the Premier meant anything, they ought not to see a single sixpence on the Estimates for this purpose at all. That “school of arts” was a misnomer was granted by every speaker; but it was not an argument to say that, because the postal facilities of this colony were utilised by the Government for the transmission of newspapers free—with which he had never quite agreed—it was no argument at all to speak of this as a reason against the establishment of schools of art and libraries in different parts of the colony. It was a system of drainage on the Postal Service. They sent out pack-horses to the Western border of the colony—to the Gulf of Carpentaria—with every newspaper that any person might choose to send. He thought that ought to be put a stop to. It was a very ungenerous tax on the community, and he would sooner have heard the Premier make some proposal to do away with it than to have heard him speak of taking money from the Railway Reserves Fund to the general revenue. In that way the hon. gentleman would enforce payment by everyone in the colony who received a benefit from it. He agreed that these schools of art were newspaper and novel circulating libraries and reading-rooms. They were that, but they were more. Would anyone deny that works of the highest character were to be found in them also? If anyone read the reports he would see that the greatest discretion and acumen was exercised by committees of schools of art in promoting the reading of the best literature of the day—the very best literature of the time. He knew of some schools of art where it was laid down as a rule that the solid literature should bear a certain proportion to the lighter kind supplied to their libraries. He could speak of this from his own experience. Some years ago he determined to read every book on Australasian exploration that could be found in the colonies, and he found the schools of art of immense assistance to him. He could not afford to buy these works, as some of them were out of print—for example, Leichhardt's journey to Port Essington, with which he was so delighted that he afterwards paid a high price for it in order to have a copy in his library.

He had led many of his friends to read that book, to say nothing of Mackinlay's, Mitchell's, Burke's, Forrest's works, and the works of other Australian explorers. He believed there was not a creek or mountain in the greater part of Queensland that he was not, in consequence, acquainted with. This was his own personal experience, and he could state that he had derived great assistance from the schools of art, and there were many mechanics in this colony who had received the greatest benefit from reading such periodicals as the *Engineer*, *Engineering*, *Iron*, and others of a like nature. The newspapers were read with avidity by the wage-earners of the colony, and no one would assert that they could possibly get the same amount of knowledge and access to the same works unless those grants were continued on a more liberal scale than was now proposed. The Premier had referred them to the voluntary contributions given towards schools of art in the other colonies, but he maintained that we were not to be compared with them at all. There, real schools of art were only to be found in the great centres such as Melbourne, Ballarat, Geelong, Sandhurst, Sydney, Newcastle, and possibly Bathurst, and these places were wealthy compared with towns in this colony. Their populations were more settled, and people there having made money were prepared to make liberal contributions. These votes were justifiable, if on no other ground but this—that they were helping circulating libraries and reading-rooms which might form the germs of schools of art. If they became schools of art fifteen or twenty years hence, the votes were justified. He maintained that they ought to be on a larger scale than the present vote.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he begged to call attention to the fact that all this was irrelevant. They could not increase the vote.

Mr. MACDONALD-PATERSON: I know that.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Then what was the use of wasting time over it? They could not increase the vote, and the discussion could lead to no earthly purpose that he knew of except to waste time. To show how little the Government grant had been taken advantage of, he might say that of the £3,000 voted last year for schools of art and mining schools only about £1,300 was applied for. That showed how great was the desire for these schools. The hon. member for Rockhampton said if the Government carried out their argument there should be no grant at all, and he might see to what extent the amount voted by the House last year was taken advantage of—£3,000 voted and not one-half of it applied for.

Mr. NORTON thought this discussion might do a good deal of good even though they could not increase the amount. If hon. members were willing to press their opinions, the Government might, in time, raise the amount. The schools of art, he was convinced, did much good, and he hoped hon. members would express their opinions to this effect. The Colonial Secretary was, of course, entitled to his opinion, and hon. members were justified in theirs. He had had his experience in the matter, and they had had theirs. The experience that he (Mr. Norton) had had was that in small communities, where people were not able to help themselves, these votes would do a great amount of good. The Colonial Treasurer made a very good speech from a Treasury point of view; but, at the same time, he did not think his argument very good, because he represented that there was not a man in the country who could not afford to pay for as many newspapers as he could read. Of course, single men could afford to spend money in this way,

but men bringing up families of seven or eight children too young to help them could not afford to do it. He hoped the Colonial Secretary would consider the matter before the House met again, and that he would decide to increase the amount.

Mr. REA was understood to say that it appeared from the remarks of the Colonial Secretary that it was of no use to discuss this matter, and therefore that they must not trouble their heads with speaking about it. They were reminded that this amount had to come out of the pockets of the taxpayers, but at page 64 he saw there was an amount of £1,995 to be voted for Pacific Island Immigration, and surely this would come out of the pockets of the taxpayers also. The reason why the vote had not been taken advantage of in previous years was, he believed, because of the limit that no school of arts could have more than £100, but the petition received by the hon. the Minister for Works showed that there was a desire on the part of the people to receive further help.

Mr. KATES said he could tell the Colonial Secretary from his own experience that schools of art in his district had done a good deal of good work. In former years, before schools of art were established, he had observed young men with nothing to do at night spending their time in the public-houses; but of late years he had noticed the public-houses to be empty and the schools of art to be full. With regard to what the Minister for Works had said as to the distribution of novels, he might say that standard works were also circulated, and the schools were sometimes used for the delivery of lectures on agricultural and other subjects. Money spent in that way was not, in his opinion, thrown away. The Colonial Secretary had reduced the amount this year on account of former votes not having been applied for, but probably this year more would be claimed, and would not be granted owing to its not being on the Estimates. He hoped the Colonial Secretary would raise it to the original amount next year.

Mr. DICKSON asked if the amount of £1,361 applied for had been paid at the rate of 10s. for every £1 subscribed?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes.

Mr. DICKSON said the hon. gentleman laid great stress on the public not having encouraged these institutions, and on the fact that the amount applied for during the year just ended did not come up to the vote; but he (Mr. Dickson) would point out that in the preceding year a much larger sum was disbursed by the State at the rate of £1 for each £1 subscribed by the public, and it was evident that if the incentive given by the State was diminished a less amount would be raised by the public. He did not think there was any evidence whatever of a lessening desire on the part of the public to maintain these schools of art; but there would be in case the State ceased to encourage them. In a young colony like this he thought they ought not to restrict the education of the adult population in this direction for some years to come at any rate.

The question—That £2,000 be granted—was then put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the sum of £9,730 be voted for Miscellaneous Services. He explained that the vote for agricultural and horticultural societies had been reduced from £2,000 to £1,000, and that the sum of £2,000 had been put down for repairs to country court-houses and police buildings. If small sums were placed at the disposal of the police they could often carry out repairs without

the delay and trouble of going to the Secretary for Works, and thus considerable expense would be saved.

Mr. KATES regretted exceedingly that the vote for agricultural societies had been reduced. Last year it was reduced from £2,500 to £2,000, and now it was further reduced to £1,000. Agriculture had increased both in the North and South, and he did not see why this vote should be diminished year by year. The hon. gentleman might tell them that the whole amount was not claimed last year, but that was nothing. There might be more claims this year, and if there was no money they would not be met.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said, if the hon. member would take the trouble to look at the foot-note he would see that a subsidy of 10s. would be given for every £1 subscribed.

Mr. MACDONALD-PATERSON said he noticed that no grant was to exceed £100. He thought that ought to be increased to £250. The sum of £100 was very paltry for the purpose of an agricultural society. No one knew better how to make a presentable show than the Colonial Secretary. The siewes of war had made the Brisbane shows a success, and for that success a great deal was due to the Colonial Secretary. He thought they should have some intimation of what the views of the Colonial Secretary were, so that their constituents might know whether agricultural and horticultural societies were to be left entirely to their own resources or to receive this miserable 10s. for every £1 subscribed up to £100, for what was really the most important industry the colony could have. He thought the Brisbane shows reflected great credit on the colony, and had done a great deal of good. Those exhibitions were the means of introducing capital into the colony and of inducing people to settle on the soil. They also brought under the notice of visitors the various industrial interests of the colony. It was like beginning a new business, and they ought to make up their minds for some years to come to spend a certain sum of money for the purpose of assisting exhibitions. He would like to know the Colonial Secretary's views with regard to the limitation of this sum, because he was sure the hon. gentleman had the interests of agriculture at heart.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said his views were very simple; they were stated on the Estimates.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL wished to know the meaning of the £230 for German and Chinese interpreters. What had these interpreters to do, and where were they going to interpret?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the interpreters were required at the various police courts. If the hon. gentleman would look back two years ago he would see that a much larger sum was then put down. He had found that interpreters were getting £80 and £100 a year in places where they were not required more than once in twelve months.

Mr. McLEAN said he noticed that £1,100 was claimed for agricultural and horticultural societies last year, and yet only £1,000 was put down this year. The Government must anticipate fewer claims this year.

Mr. PERSSE regretted that the Colonial Secretary should have seen fit to reduce this sum. He considered that there was nothing more beneficial to the welfare of the colony than these agricultural societies. They had done a great deal of good in the advancement of the colony, and it would be far better to reduce the education vote and increase this one. He considered it a great injustice to reduce this vote.

The subsidy ought to be increased to £1, and the limit of £100 should be done away with. A society might collect £200, and then the Government ought to give another £200. That was his opinion, and he believed it was the opinion of every member of the House. He would like to hear an expression of opinion from members as to whether this vote should be encroached upon in this way, so that it might go before the country whether they were desirous of promoting the welfare of the agricultural districts.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL agreed to a certain extent with the hon. gentleman who had just sat down. He believed that exhibitions were the most useful and practical forms of education that the people could have, better than circulating novels and newspapers. Money spent in this way was better than for the high-falutin' education which was given. He should like to see the education vote cut down, and he would be quite ready to do it. At the same time he thought that those societies flourished best which depended upon their own resources. There were very successful societies at Aramac and Blackall, and they had had very little assistance from the Government. Of course, it would be tickling the ears of the people to increase this vote; but, unless the education vote was cut down, he did not think they were justified in spending any more money upon education of this practical character, however desirable it might be.

Mr. GRIMES agreed with the hon. member for Fassifern that these agricultural societies were worthy of more support than they obtained from the Government, but he did not agree with him that any part of the education vote should be applied to that purpose. He would like to call attention to the marked difference between the way in which agricultural societies were treated in the Southern colonies and in Queensland. They were encouraged in the South; in fact, he believed he was correct in saying that there was a Minister for Agriculture in South Australia. Here there was a Minister for Mines. No doubt mining was a very important industry, but it was not to be compared to the agricultural interest; and instead of a Minister for Mines they ought to have a Minister for Agriculture. With regard to exhibitions, he thought they assisted parties who had any inventive genius, and gave an idea of the new machinery brought into use in other countries. Exhibitions, too, were the only means they had of exhibiting the capabilities of the country and of showing the different improvements in machinery. He might say that there was a good deal of inventive genius among agriculturists in Queensland. They had already several machines equal to any ingenious patent in America—that far-famed country for invention. He thought if a more liberal support was given to these societies they would bring out inventive talent much more than they did now.

Mr. DE SATGE thought that societies that were not assisted became self-supporting sooner than any other. He instanced the societies at Springsure and Aramac, which had spent about £300 for new yards, and were making good progress generally. They could already afford to give gold medals and silver medals, and the start of £100 which they received from the Government they would be able to refund in a year or two. These societies, in common with others, should not be always looking to the public purse for assistance. It was the boast of such societies in the pastoral districts that they could do without Government support. While he fully concurred in the opinion that agricultural societies were very useful, he would rather see the money applied to some charitable purpose which would benefit the poorer class.

Mr. LOW confirmed the views expressed by the hon. member for Fassifern.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said that, as a taxpayer, he objected to the vote being raised any higher. He agreed that these shows might benefit farmers and breeders of fat stock; but as a consumer he objected to the increase, and those gentlemen should pay for the shows themselves. What interest had the miner in stock-raising or agriculture? Was not the farmer already supported by a direct tax on butter, hay, and corn; and had not he (Mr. O'Sullivan), as a consumer, to pay his share of the tax? Why should people come to the public purse for these things? He believed the farming interest was very great; but if they wanted shows they should pay for them—just as he had to pay for the things they produced.

Mr. REA noticed in the Auditor-General's report £100 each for the Warwick, Toowoomba, Marathon, and Peak Downs Societies, while there was only £57 down for Rockhampton. Were they all on the same footing?

Mr. MACFARLANE was surprised at the speech of the member for Stanley (Mr. O'Sullivan). It was the very same speech that he (Mr. Macfarlane) delivered on the Marsupials Bill. The hon. member did not object to being taxed for the destruction of marsupials, but now he objected to be taxed for the support of agricultural societies.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: And schools of art.

Mr. MACFARLANE said they were very useful institutions, and had done a great amount of good; and the money given to them had not been badly spent. Ultimately they might be the means of lowering the prices of consumable commodities; because, if agriculturists were encouraged by the introduction of proper machinery, the cost of production would be reduced, and consequently the cost to the consumer would also be reduced. He hoped that not only schools of art, but agricultural societies, would be supported by Government grants. The marsupial plague had been called a national calamity; but ignorance also was a national calamity, and if they could reduce the amount of ignorance by voting a little money they would not only be benefiting individuals, but the whole nation.

Mr. FOOTE said he could not fall in with the views of the last speaker. His experience showed that there were too many shows. Every tradesman knew that even after the Brisbane Exhibition people had very little money to spare for some time, not only on account of the money they subscribed, but also on account of the money it cost to attend the exhibition. If shows were held once in three years they would be more successful. No doubt it was to the interest of the Government that they should be held every year; because the takings on the railway more than reimbursed what they paid to the society. He had attended several shows, and had come to the conclusion that they had not come up to the mark for some years past. The amount set down was a very liberal sum, and he should support the vote as it stood.

Mr. FRASER said he was not an agriculturist, or a producer, but a consumer. His opinion was that a thing of this kind, if done at all, should be done well; and he maintained that to realise any satisfactory result a fair sum should be granted. A grant of 10s. for every £1 subscribed up to £100 was only playing with the matter. It could not be denied that these societies were productive of good, though he would not deny that shows might take place too frequently. That, however, was no argument against their support. It was well known that many things were being produced in Queensland

about which at one period there was much scepticism, and the change was caused by the societies having shown what could be produced. For those reasons he hoped the Government would reconsider the question with a view to making a more liberal grant. This case was not at all analogous to the preceding vote respecting schools of art, to which objection might be taken in some instances on account of the money not being properly expended.

Mr. DE POIX-TYREL said he was sorry to see the vote reduced, and could not agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Stanley. The miners in his electorate took great interest in the agricultural society, for they were able to get their produce much cheaper than before the existence of the society. Not only agricultural societies, but mining societies, could get this vote by offering prizes for the discovery of minerals; so that the hon. member (Mr. O'Sullivan) was wrong in saying that miners were not benefited by this vote. He should like to see another footnote to the effect that £1 for £1 would be granted on sums not less than £100, and not greater than £500.

Mr. REA asked whether the Warwick, Marathon, Toowoomba, and Peak Downs Societies had subscribed £200 each in order to get the grant of £100 each.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that only two societies had subscribed the full amount. The Queensland National Association had subscribed a great deal more, and so had the Charters Towers Mining Association. He did not know about the Auditor-General.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he concurred with the hon. member for Fassifern in thinking that these societies should be encouraged; and if this reduction was made two years ago on account of the depressed state of the colony, it was quite time they returned to the wise policy adopted before.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said no doubt the remarks of the leader of the Opposition would have a great deal of influence with the Government in forming their Estimates next year.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he should like to ask a question with reference to the compilation of the Statutes. He did not know whether it came in the Colonial Secretary's Department, or in the Crown Law Offices. If it came in the Colonial Secretary's Department he would ask for some information respecting the matter. What department was it in?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said there was no item down for the compilation of the Statutes. It would be time enough to discuss that when the estimate came before the Committee.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he asked what department it was in. There was no reference to it in the item for miscellaneous services.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It will be in the Supplementary Estimates. It is not included in this.

Mr. GRIFFITH: Where is it included?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is not in these Estimates.

Mr. GRIFFITH: Is it in the Colonial Secretary's Estimates at all?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It will be in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he was entitled to a civil answer. He should like to know how the compilation of the Statutes was progressing,

and what was the fee that was paid for the work. He had asked a question and should like a proper answer.

Question put.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he had asked a question, and was entitled to an answer—whether the compilation of the Statutes was completed, and, if not, what condition was it in; and what was to be paid for them?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had already informed the hon. gentleman. When the Supplementary Estimates came forward he would answer the question. He could not do so before; he did not know. The Statutes were progressing as fast as the Printing Office could get on with them.

Mr. GRIFFITH said that the hon. Colonial Secretary had said he did not know. Did any member of the Government know? Was there any member of the Government who knew anything about it? If the Colonial Secretary did not know, who did know? It was information the House was entitled to get. He asked the Colonial Secretary, who said he would not tell, and then said he did not know. If he did not know, of course he could not tell. Some member of the Government surely knew. They were entitled to the information, and it was a matter that was particularly in the Colonial Secretary's Department, or used to be. When the last compilation was done, it was done by the Colonial Secretary's Department. Had not the Colonial Secretary been there long enough to know that he had to answer proper questions?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the hon. member had a right to ask any question on the Estimates, but he had not a right to ask a question that was not on the Estimates without previous notice. The hon. member knew that as well as he did.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he wanted to know how this matter was getting on. It was a matter certainly in the Colonial Secretary's Department—and one of very great importance. The work would cost a great deal of money in the way of printing at the Government Printing Office; and if all they heard was true it had cost a great deal already. How was it going on? He hoped hon. members would insist on knowing.

Mr. RUTLEDGE said he did not think this was an unnecessary question. If it was a matter within the cognisance of the Colonial Secretary, he did not think the fact that it did not appear on these Estimates was sufficient shelter for the Colonial Secretary to enable him to say that, as it was not on the Estimates, an answer could not be expected. He (Mr. Rutledge) knew very well, from his reading of the debates that took place in previous Parliaments, that the present Colonial Secretary was about the last man who would take an answer of the kind given. He was the very gentleman who would have insisted upon an answer, and would have said that he would not allow another item to be passed until he got the information. This was not fair treatment for the Opposition, who had allowed these Estimates to go through with unexampled celerity; and it would appear that the more concessions allowed by the Opposition the more the Government seemed to think they had a right to assume a tyrannical attitude. The Opposition had been very forbearing. He, for one, had refrained from making any remarks on any item except he felt called upon for the very best reasons to ask for information; and he confidently appealed to the Committee whether the Opposition had not helped the Government through with these Estimates. The Colonial Secretary's tone was not the kind

of treatment they had a right to expect, and not the kind they were disposed to put up with. It would be too late, as the Colonial Secretary knew, to take exception to any act of the Government with regard to the matter when the Supplementary Estimates were brought forward. The mischief, if there was any, would then be done. There might or might not be mischief connected with it; but whatever the Colonial Secretary knew they had a right to know, and he submitted that this information was reasonably desired, and might, in the most frank manner, be given.

Mr. DICKSON said now that the Premier had returned he hoped wiser counsels would prevail, and that he would call his more choleric colleague to order.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: You had better call yourself to order.

Mr. DICKSON said he must claim the Chairman's protection from the insolent remarks of the hon. member, who had characterised himself pre-eminently in that Chamber by his insolence, which distinguished him from a true gentleman.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: You are a rattling good judge of a gentleman.

Mr. DICKSON said he would not ask the Colonial Secretary's opinion as to whether he was a gentleman. He regarded the hon. gentleman's remarks with very great contempt indeed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Ditto.

Mr. DICKSON said he hoped the Premier would see the desirability of giving the information which his hon. friend had asked for so moderately—namely, the condition the compilation of these revised Statutes was in at the present time, when they would be ready, and what would be the probable cost. The question had also been asked to what department that expenditure would be charged. It might not be within the power of the Government to state what the exact cost would be; but the Opposition did not desire to ask for information upon matters of detail, which it might, perhaps, be impossible to furnish. He contended, however, that the general question might be reasonably answered as to when the Statutes would be issued from the Printing Office, and to which department the expense would be charged. It had been rumoured that the compilation and issue of these Statutes had to a great extent interfered in the press of the Printing Office with other matters awaiting printing. That might or might not be the case; but the question asked by his hon. friend was entitled to some answer, and they should get at least some information as to when the Statutes would probably be issued, and to what part of the Colonial Secretary's vote their compilation was to be charged.

The PREMIER said that as to what department of the Government Service this work was to be charged was really a matter of very little importance, and had not had the consideration of the Government for one minute. When they had paid for the vote it would appear on the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. GRIFFITH said it was supposed this would be a heavy item.

The PREMIER said that at all events the item would be proposed for the approval of the House, and they would have every opportunity of opposing it. As to when the Statutes would be ready, the hon. gentleman had himself suggested some of the difficulties in the way. However, they were in fair progress now, and when they were ready the House would be informed of it. There was not the slightest wish on the part of Ministers to withhold any information respecting them.

Mr. GRIFFITH asked what further payments had been made on account of the work. He asked the question because the Treasurer said that when the money was paid the House would be asked to sanction it. That was rather inverting the proper order of things, as the House should first be asked to sanction the payment before it was paid. He would like to know what amount was to be paid for this service in addition to the sum of £200 which they had been informed had been already paid.

The PREMIER: There has been an additional payment of £300.

Mr. GRIFFITH said that if that was the case the hon. member for Cook, Mr. Cooper, was receiving a very good salary for his services as a member of that House.

The PREMIER: Have you seen the work?

Mr. GRIFFITH said he had not, but he said the hon. member was receiving a very good salary for his services.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is not a salary at all.

Mr. GRIFFITH said it looked something very like it. There was £200 now, and £300 then, and they found that the work was still progressing, and no doubt the hon. member would get more as it progressed. Was there ever such a thing heard of before? Here was a member of the House actually a paid servant of the Government. He wondered how much more it would be. He had a pretty good idea of what the compilation of the Statutes was worth. He knew that the gentleman whom the Government had intended to employ for this work first, and who would have made a good job of it, would not have got anything like that, because he was not a member of Parliament. Still, he was quite as competent as the gentleman who was doing the work now.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the hon. gentleman knew nothing whatever about what the Government contemplated giving the gentleman who was to do this work at first, but whose eyes had failed him. No definite arrangements were made with that gentleman, except that he would be paid according to the value of his work; and he did not know how the hon. gentleman had arrived at his conclusions.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he arrived at his conclusions from what he had been told by the gentleman himself, and he also knew what the last compilation cost, and he thought that was overpaid. That was how he got his information, and he thought he ought to know what the work was worth now. The gentleman in this case had not got even a fixed sum and did not even know what he was going to get. He was kept on at the will and pleasure of the Government. Here was a gentleman actually hanging on at their will and pleasure for his daily bread and for what he was to get. Could anything be more degrading to the position of a Government or of a member of Parliament?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said that in this matter the hon. member (Mr. Cooper) had not been so highly privileged as the hon. gentleman himself, who had drawn far larger sums from the Government than any other member of the House had. The hon. member for Cook was receiving payment for the work of compiling the Statutes, whereas the hon. gentleman (Mr. Griffith) had drawn larger sums of money over and above his official salary.

Mr. NORTON said he objected to lawyers being paid at all, but he saw no difference in principle between one lawyer being paid for compiling the Statutes, and another paying himself for conducting Crown cases. The difference

was not in the principle, but only in the individual receiving the money.

Mr. GRIFFITH said hon. members were going back to old matters which had been discussed very fully six years ago. When hon. members had a bad case which was utterly indefensible, they thought it was sufficient to get up and throw mud at the leader of the Opposition. That matter had been fully discussed and settled six years ago.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Not satisfactorily.

Mr. GRIFFITH said if the hon. member wanted to know anything about that matter he could read what had been said.

Mr. NORTON: I have read it.

Mr. GRIFFITH said the hon. member would have seen, then, that what had been stated this session about the matter was entirely untrue. His action as a member of the Government had been taken after the fullest consideration, and after consulting the conduct of his predecessors—particularly that of Mr. Bramston—who, upon adopting a similar course, took advice from the most eminent members of the profession in England and in the neighbouring colonies. He was referring now to the position of the Government with regard to a member who was simply in their paid employment at the present time, and the answer he got was about what he had done six years ago. Supposing he had committed suicide, or forgery, or any other crime then—what had that to do with hon. members now? The question was whether the conduct of the Government was proper, and hon. members should deal with the particular case on its own merits. They did not improve their position by flinging mud at him.

Mr. ARCHER said he agreed with the hon. member for Port Curtis that, if the Government were to be allowed to employ lawyers to appear for them in the courts, they must be allowed to employ them to condense and codify the Statutes. There was not the slightest difference in principle; it was quite as important to make the Statutes clear and easy for reference as to obtain legal assistance in the law courts. Lawyers appeared to be a specially exempted class, and different from all other hon. members. They could go on circuit for the Government and be engaged to defend in civil cases, and he wanted to know why they should not be allowed to perform work for the public in another way. If there was any distinction of principle, it was so fine as to be imperceptible to ordinary laymen.

Mr. SIMPSON said there was a very great difference in the two cases. In the case now under consideration money was being paid for work done; in the other case the leader of the Opposition himself, when a Minister of the Crown, received very high fees for doing the work for which he was receiving a salary.

Mr. REA said the point was that the present Government side of the House had passed a resolution affirming that payments of money to any member of Parliament should be illegal. In all the colonies hitherto the employment of barristers in their professional capacity had been recognised; but no country had recognised the right of a Government to maintain a voter and retain his vote by inventing work for him. When similar work was required to be done under a former Administration it was given to a professional gentleman outside the House.

Mr. GRIFFITH said that the hon. member for Dalby was unfortunately wrong in all his facts. Up to the time to which the hon. member referred it had been recognised both here and elsewhere that the salary of the Attorney-

General did not cover the civil work of the Crown. That was a recognised rule in Great Britain at the present time, where the Attorney-General got a higher salary than any other Minister of the Crown except the Lord Chancellor, and special fees with all briefs. That principle was never disputed until within the last year or two. As to the difference between giving a lawyer briefs to go into court and keeping a member subsidised by paying him from month to month, it was as great as the difference between going into a shop to buy a walking-stick and taking a contract to supply goods on Government account.

Mr. NORTON said the hon. member did not like those questions about the prosecution of land cases brought up, because he said they had been fully discussed six years ago. That was all very well, but might not the same objection have been raised about the question brought up by the hon. gentleman this afternoon? Was not that question fully discussed two years ago? The hon. gentleman could see a thing very well from one side, but he could not see both sides, or would not. To his (Mr. Norton's) mind, the principle was exactly the same, whether a lawyer received fees for prosecuting a case in court, or earned a payment for work performed. He objected to payments to members of the House whether lawyers or not. If the lawyers were entitled to receive payment so were other members—the lawyers should not by right be more highly privileged than other hon. members.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he had given his adhesion to the same principle, being compelled to do so by the conduct of the Government; but supposing that he had not done so, was it any answer, when the conduct of the Government was criticised, to call across the House "You're another"?

Mr. RUTLEDGE said there was a very great difference between a case like this and the one which happened years ago, quite irrespective of the consideration whether the Government in the past had been well served by the conduct of these prosecutions. The House came to a resolution after a long discussion last year, that the system of paying members was undesirable, and the hon. member was, therefore, receiving money in violation of the authority of the House. When the late Attorney-General was brought to book about receiving a brief to prosecute at Maryborough, a motion was brought forward to declare his seat vacant; but he (Mr. Rutledge) voted against it on the ground that, the House having endorsed such practices, the hon. gentleman should not be made a victim, and the resolution came to nothing. Subsequently, when the House came to a unanimous resolution on the subject—

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It did not.

Mr. RUTLEDGE said the only two hon. members who voted against it were the Minister for Lands and the Attorney-General; and the Minister for Lands, to prevent a division, went out of the House.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Why did you not give a correct account at first?

Mr. RUTLEDGE said there was no division, and consequently the vote was unanimous. In the face of that vote, he could not help thinking that the Government, in acting as they did, were violating the expressed wish of Parliament. The Government had one trait of character which some people regarded as being very admirable—unquestionably they were true to their friends. They strained every power to the utmost to assist those who helped them; and it would

have been a very good thing if the previous Government had indulged in a little of that kind of virtue. He trusted that the lesson taught them would not be lost sight of when their time came again, as it would come; and future Governments would be much to blame if they did not display a similar amount of pertinacity in looking after their friends both inside and outside the House.

Question put and passed.

The CHAIRMAN reported progress, and obtained leave to sit again next day.

The House adjourned at a quarter to 11 o'clock until the usual hour next day.