

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**THURSDAY, 17 AUGUST 1882**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

*Thursday, 17 August, 1882.*

Petitions.—Questions.—Fortitude Valley Post Office.—  
Experimental Farm at Clermont.—Roads in Her-  
berton District.—Triennial Parliaments.—Payment  
of Members.—Adjournment.

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

## PETITIONS.

Mr. H. W. PALMER presented a petition  
from certain residents of Ravenswood, Charters  
Towers, and Townsville, praying for the construc-  
tion of a Branch Railway from Ravenswood to  
Cunningham's Waterhole.

Petition read and received.

Mr. HAMILTON presented a petition from  
the residents of Gympie, urging the construction  
of a railway between Gympie and the metropolis.  
Petition read and received.

Mr. BLACK presented a petition signed by  
three or four hundred inhabitants of the Pioneer  
district, asking for the benefit of Railway com-  
munication in that district.

Petition read and received.

Mr. DE POIX-TYREL presented a petition  
from the Miners' Association of Stanthorpe,  
having reference to a grant for mining purposes.  
He was afraid the petition was not in accordance  
with the Standing Orders; but he had been  
asked to present it and he did so, leaving it to the  
Speaker to say whether it could be received or  
not.

The SPEAKER said that as the petition asked  
the House to grant a sum of money it was con-  
trary to the Standing Order and could not be  
received.

## QUESTIONS.

The Hon. G. THORN asked the Minister for  
Works—

1. Do the Government intend to cause a Survey of a  
Railway to be made from Roma or Yulebar, or from some  
other point on the Southern and Western line, to St.  
George; and if so, when?

2. When will the Government call for Tenders for the  
extension of the line from Harrisville to Fassifern?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Mr.  
Macrossan), in answer to the first question, said  
that arrangements had been made to start a  
survey from Roma to St. George. With regard  
to the second question, the hon. member knew  
that no permanent survey had yet been made,  
and that no tenders could be called for till that  
had been done.

Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for  
Works—

1. Has any decision been arrived at in connection  
with the inquiry into the complaint of A. Norton of  
improper conduct at Ipswich Railway Station on 30th  
March last?

2. If so, has the Minister any objection to inform the  
House what that decision is?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS, in answer  
to both questions, said that from inquiries which  
had been made it was considered unnecessary to  
take any further action in the matter.

## FORTITUDE VALLEY POST OFFICE.

Mr. BEATTIE, in moving—

That the House will, at the next sitting, resolve itself  
into a Committee of the Whole to consider of an Address  
to the Governor, praying that His Excellency will please  
to cause to be placed on the Supplementary Estimates  
for this year the sum of £3,500, in addition to the £1,500  
already on the Loan Estimates, for the construction of  
a Post Office in Fortitude Valley—

said he hoped there would be no opposition made  
by the Government to the small request contained

in the motion, though he expected it would be opposed. As some hon. members were aware, there was already on the Loan Estimate £1,500 for the purpose for which he asked an additional £3,500. The importance of the district was increasing, and it was necessary that some addition should be made to the accommodation of the people in the locality. The present accommodation no doubt answered its purpose, but it would be advisable, knowing that the Government had no land in the locality applicable to the purpose, to secure a piece of land now on which to construct a central post office for the neighbourhood. The want of such a convenience was very much felt. The present building was leased, and he believed the rent paid would cover the interest on the amount of money asked for to erect permanent buildings. He was not going to say where the post office should be, because he did not wish to bind the Government to any particular locality; but it should be placed in the most central situation for the convenience of the people of Fortitude Valley and the neighbourhood. He need not say much more. The Government could not accuse him of coming down and asking them for large sums of money for his electorate, and he believed the sum asked for, if granted, would be the first money given by them for public purposes to Fortitude Valley. Seeing that the whole locality was becoming so densely populated, and considering what would be required before long, more convenience should be given in the way of erecting buildings of a permanent character instead of using leasehold property.

The PREMIER (Mr. McIlwraith) said he was sure the hon. member would not be astonished that the Government intended to oppose the motion; and their reason was that in making such a motion the member for the district was taking out of the hands of the Government their legitimate function of providing for the public works. If the hon. member had come forward and said that the Ministry had neglected to provide a proper post office, that they had failed in providing that accommodation which was necessary for the receiving and distribution of letters in the district, he would have understood him; but he did not think it was part of the duty of a member to look forward for a year and say the present was a good time to buy land and why not buy it now. But the Government as a Government must resist raids on the Treasury of that kind. And as to the question itself, of course the Government would provide the best accommodation they possibly could for Fortitude Valley. They had leasehold premises at the present time, but they were perfectly sufficient for the purpose. No doubt a better post office would require to be erected there some time, but the £1,500 asked for was quite insufficient for the purpose, and so would £5,000 be insufficient for a site such as the hon. member proposed. There was plenty of time to consider the matter, and Fortitude Valley should be allowed to develop a little more before a site was actually chosen. Of course the Government would oppose all motions of the kind.

Mr. BEATTIE, in reply, said he was not at all astonished, because he anticipated that the matter would be opposed, and of course he did not feel at all annoyed. He had taken some trouble a year or two ago, and consulted some of the members of the Ministry, and from their expressions of opinion he thought then that he would not get the grant; but he promised himself he would try during the present session. He did not feel at all astonished at the opposition of the Premier; but if a locality consisting of 9,000 people did not deserve something better than a

wooden shanty for a post office it was rather surprising. He was certainly surprised at the Premier saying that motions of that description ought not to be brought forward, when they knew very well that it was done every session. He had heard hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House over and over again introduce motions with reference to post and telegraph offices, and police offices, and he did not know that they had received such opposition as he had that afternoon received. In reference to Fortitude Valley, he did not say that the present building did not answer—

The PREMIER: It does answer.

Mr. BEATTIE: At the same time he thought that Fortitude Valley, with its 9,000 people, deserved something better than the small building at present used, more particularly seeing that during twenty years not £2,000 of Government money had been spent in that district. Therefore he thought the people of the locality as taxpayers had some claim to at least one respectable Government building in their midst for their accommodation. He should certainly not again introduce a motion of that description, because, having brought the matter under the notice of the Government, he hoped they would see that justice was done. The year before last, when he spoke on the matter, he was satisfied that the £1,500 on the Loan Estimate was insufficient for the construction of such buildings as were necessary; but as for not being able to get a site for £5,000—he wished he had the job of supplying a site for that sum—he was satisfied he could get it for much less. When he consulted the Postmaster-General two years ago that gentleman said he would be very happy to give the matter his consideration if he (Mr. Beattie) could find a site. He had taken some trouble in the matter, and must acknowledge that on making inquiries for a suitable piece of land people began to open their mouths very wide. But he at once told them that he was not going to be the medium by which they could take advantage of the Government when the Government wanted to buy land. He hoped, though unsuccessful in getting the motion carried, the Government would give the matter their consideration, and that they would see the necessity of giving some little attention to a locality that had never before asked for anything from that House.

Question put, and the House divided:

AYES, 13.

Messrs. Griffith, McLean, Miles, Garrick, Brookes, Francis, Buckland, Beattie, Aland, Thorn, De Poix-Tyrel, Isambert, and Macfarlane.

NOES, 25.

Messrs. Archer, Pez, Macrossan, McIlwraith, Pope, Cooper, Perkins, O'Sullivan, Jessop, F. A. Cooper, Lalor, McWhannell, Weld-Blundell, Stevenson, H. W. Palmer, Kellett, Low, H. Palmer, Ferguson, Allan, Govett, Scott, Kingsford, Black, Norton, and Hamilton.

Question resolved in the negative.

#### EXPERIMENTAL FARM AT CLERMONT.

Mr. WELD-BLUNDELL said he had moved the motion standing in his name for the establishment of a Government experimental farm at Clermont, or in a suitable locality upon the Peak Downs, before he distinctly understood that a sum would be placed on the Estimates for that purpose. Finding, however, that there was a sum of £2,000 on the Estimates for the purpose, he thought it unnecessary to take up the time of the House by discussing the question, as it would be fully discussed when the vote of £2,000 was under consideration. It was, therefore, not his intention to move the motion.

## ROADS IN HERBERTON DISTRICT.

Mr. F. A. COOPER moved, pursuant to notice—

That this House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of an Address to the Governor, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be placed on the Estimates for this year the sum of £20,000 for the purpose of constructing trafficable dray roads between Cairns and Herberton, Port Douglas and Herberton, and also between Herberton and the surrounding tinfields in the Herberton district.

He said it would be in the recollection of hon. members that at the time of the passing of the Divisional Boards Act of 1879 the main roads of the colony were exempted from its operation, and that exemption operated in no small measure to the successful passing of that Act. However, there were so many claims made for exemption by the different divisional boards that it was deemed necessary by the Premier to come down with a United Municipalities Bill, having, amongst other things, for its object the amalgamation of municipalities and divisional boards to enable two or more of them to keep in order and maintain the main roads passing through them. But he submitted that neither the Divisional Boards Act nor the Municipalities Act were at all applicable to the district he had the honour to represent, and that it never was intended that they should operate at places such as Cairns, Port Douglas, and Herberton. At Cairns, at the present time, there was but a handful of people, or ratepayers—so few indeed that he found the endowment for last year amounted to only £226 6s., and the rate of endowment being £2 for every £1 raised by rates, showed that they had assessed themselves to the extent of £113 3s. But although that was the present position of Cairns, he believed a very great future awaited it. He believed that with the single exception of Port Jackson there was not a harbour on the whole of the Eastern coast of Australia that possessed the same advantages, and that with the assistance of one of the large dredges now in use in the colony—the distance to dredge being only something like half-a-mile—ships of the greatest possible tonnage could be floated into its harbour; and not only that, but there was sufficient water at the wharves to admit ships of the largest tonnage now afloat lying there. And independent of that Cairns was surrounded by very rich sugar lands, and on the tableland between it and Herberton there was to be found possibly the richest agricultural land in the world. Those lands were very magnificently timbered; several hon. members had seen them as well as himself, and could endorse what he had said. An immense revenue would accrue to the Cairns Divisional Board when those lands were thrown open to selection. Cairns from Herberton was only distant some thirty-seven miles as the crow flew, but it had been considered necessary to extend the line of road a distance of fifty-three miles, the object of that extension being to go as near as possible to the Goldborough Gold Field. There was now no necessity for that, and he believed that the road might now be constructed between the two places at a distance of something like forty-five miles, and that would at the same time obviate the necessity which at present existed of having to cross the Mulgrave River twice, the crossings being highly dangerous and causing in the wet season a total stoppage of traffic. Speaking of the nature of the country through which the road passed and the large revenue that would be received from it, he might say that it was rich volcanic soil, thickly studded with the very best cedar and kauri pine, and one of the finest timbers the world had ever known—timber quite equal in durability to ironbark—he referred to the red

beech. Men who had used it said they preferred it to almost any other timber, being more easily handled than ironbark and quite as durable. To give hon. members who had not had an opportunity of visiting Cairns some idea of the extreme richness of the soil, he might state that although it had only been as it were run over by a few timber-getters, there were, he was informed, at the present time no less than 18,000,000 feet of cedar fell—the kauri pine and red beech having been scarcely touched—and that there were lands far richer than any yet thrown open to be thrown open to selection; yet these magnificent lands did not return one single shilling to Cairns or Herberton by way of revenue, being still in the hands of the Crown, though capable of supporting a large population. At Herberton, again, the property upon which rates were levied was only about a quarter of a mile square, but the people there were so exceedingly anxious to clear their streets of stumps and trees that they did not even wait for the Divisional Boards Act to operate properly in the district, or for requisite notices to be given, but they at once assessed themselves at the highest possible amount—1s. in the £1; this, notwithstanding the whole of the rates collected, amounted to only £194 10s. He thought the House would very easily conclude that if there was only a handful of people at Herberton, who although they assessed themselves at the highest possible rate the amount of rates collected was only £194 10s., while at Cairns the amount was only £113, the endowment of £2 for every £1 collected was quite inadequate for the construction of a road fifty-three miles in extent. He submitted that this was altogether an exceptional case. The leader of the Opposition paid a visit to Herberton some little time ago in company with the hon. member for Darling Downs, and they both expressed themselves to the effect that the circumstances were special, and that a sum of money ought to be expended upon that particular line of road. He thought that all hon. members would agree with him that if the vast mineral resources of Herberton were to be developed it could only be by making good roads, and it was utterly impossible for the ratepayers to make them, the rates being so small that they must come down to the House for assistance. The rate of carriage ruling between Herberton and the coast was £20 per ton, and that rate, high as it was, was of no benefit to the packers or teamsters, owing to their loss in horseflesh and destruction of their pack-saddles and teams, while it was utterly ruinous to the tin-mining interest. The road to Cairns ought to be cleared a chain wide through the scrub, and a road at least 16 feet wide properly made through it. There was every facility for the purpose, there being an immense quantity of loose basaltic boulders lying about which could easily be broken up; in fact, one of the finest roads in Australia could be made through that scrub. At present there was simply a cutting twelve feet wide, and as the trees on either side were exceedingly high the sun rarely reached it, and as it was continually raining there the track was always in a sloppy condition, and at times utterly impassable for packers or pedestrians. The amount of rates obtained at Port Douglas was £185, which, with those obtained at Cairns and Herberton, amounted in all to £492. The Government endowment brought up the entire sum to £1,474. Was it possible, he would ask the House, to form and maintain 153 miles of road on so small a sum? It must be borne in mind that the road had yet to be formed. It was at present simply a bush track, and in places it was almost impossible to traverse without a considerable expenditure in clearing the scrub.

Large sums of money had at different times been expended on what was called the Port Douglas and Hodgkinson track, and as far as Gaines' it did not require much repair; but there the road branched off to Herberton and passed over a low-lying swamp, which made the track impassable for six months in the year. It would be necessary to drain the road properly on either side. On passing Borghero's the greatest difficulties began, and he need not tell hon. members who had travelled from Port Douglas to Herberton that the difficulties then met with were very great, and continued so to Granite Creek. Very few had the moral courage to go through the scrub on horseback; the usual way was to dismount and scramble through as best one could. After that succeeded a boggy country as far as Herberton. Those were the places that required a large expenditure of money. Some hon. members might possibly think the sum he asked for was in excess of the amount required; but it was nothing of the kind, for the whole of it would be absorbed. Economical and competent a manager as Mr. Charles Macdonald was, he could not make bricks without straw, and if he had not the money he could not make the road. With regard to the state of the road, there was a letter from the special correspondent of the *Herberton Advertiser* which appeared in that paper on the 22nd of last month, written from Port Douglas, which fully endorsed what he had said. He would trespass on the indulgence of the House by reading a portion of that letter, which was as follows:—

"The progress of Port Douglas is steady, substantial, and unmistakable"—

That, in other words, meant the progress of the whole colony—

"and every day's experience appears to render the bond of union between this port and the Herberton tinfields more close and inseparable.

"The fact that no less than five large steamers from Sydney, Brisbane, and other southern ports have discharged cargo here, amounting in the aggregate to something like 350 tons, within the last seven days, and that nearly 300 tons of this is consigned to the Herberton tin district, speaks volumes for both the port and the vast importance of the industry in course of development scarcely eighty miles distant from it. The wharves, and the vicinity of the wharves, are literally blocked with engines, fly-wheels, stampers, and stamper-boxes, boilers intact, and boilers in sections for convenience of carriage, cans and discs, and weigh-bridges, roofing iron, and the various indescribable impediments that belong to crushing and sawing machinery, automatic tin-dressing machinery, and the buildings and workshops belonging thereto. Standing conspicuous is a fine powerful portable engine from Clayton and Shuttleworth's works, England, for the Bischoff Herberton Company, Great Western, waiting removal, besides an immense quantity of castings and wrought-iron work from the Launceston Foundry, Tasmania, for the same concern. There is a battery and a lot of machine appliances for the Monarch Co.; tons upon tons of machinery and material for conversion into machinery for the Great Western Tin Mining Co.; a couple of engines for the new saw-mill of Messrs. Williams and Co., to be erected at Nigger Creek; another boiler for another saw-mill (presumably Mr. Hurrey's); besides accumulations of general goods in bales and cases and crates, that cry aloud, as it were, for teams, or tramways, or railways for their removal, to make room for the large consignments pouring in almost every day, and to forward which to the mines before the commencement of the wet season (about Christmas), will tax the energies of the Port Douglas merchants and forwarding agents, and of every available teamster and packer to the very utmost."

He (Mr. Cooper) was well informed of the existing state of things along that road, and what he had just read was a sample of scores of letters that he had received on the subject. Notwithstanding the money recently expended there by the Minister for Works, it would in no wise enable the traffic to be continued during the wet season.

In the surplus revenue list placed in the hands of hon. members yesterday, he noticed an item of £13,000 for Northern goldfields' roads, and he was beginning to congratulate himself and the Herberton district on the fact that his motion had been anticipated; but on inquiring from the Minister for Works he found that that money was in course of expenditure, and had in fact been nearly all expended. If even now the road was in the condition described he was perfectly warranted in proceeding with his application. But what was to become of the Cairns road? Was no money to be spent on that road? The distance between the two places was only thirty-seven miles as the crow flew, and a road could be made in forty-five miles. If the £13,000 was nearly all spent, what was there left for that road and for the road between Herberton and Port Douglas? The latest papers to hand described very accurately the state of the work going on, and it appeared that notwithstanding the large expenditure there were only two road parties at work. If that was the case it was utterly impossible for them to construct the road in such a way as to make it trafficable by the wet season. If it taxed to the utmost, as it would do, the efforts of all the teamsters and packers to convey the machinery he had referred to from Port Douglas to Herberton—and without machinery there was no use employing men on account of the high rates of carriage for the ore raised—what was to become of the supplies for 4,000 people? When he was last there in the wet season supplies sometimes ran short, even when the carriers were not so busily employed as they were likely to be now in conveying machinery. The case was indeed a very pressing one and demanded the earnest consideration of the House. There were no tin-mines in the world so rich as those at Herberton. The ore ranged from 5 to 65 per cent., and there were some tin lodes 14 feet wide. He had seen a lode that width, and the assay of tin in it was 60 per cent.—indeed, he had some of the pieces now in his possession. There were many claims as rich as that; and the field was only just being opened up. The tin-mines of Cornwall had, according to history, been working for nearly 2,000 years, and it was even now found profitable to work them at a considerable depth, though the tin ore only averaged 2½ per cent. of clean tin ore. In the Dolcoath Mine the lode was only three inches wide. There was not a miner at Herberton who would work on a lode that did not average 20 per cent. If all the mountains around Herberton were composed of loose boulders, none of them exceeding 100 pounds in weight, and averaging 25 per cent. of tin, they could not be removed to the port of shipment under existing high rates of carriage except at a considerable loss. He had in his possession a copy of a sale-note handed to him when at Herberton by Mr. William Jack, one of the most popular store-keepers there, and a thoroughly reliable man—perhaps none more so. It was an account sale for thirty-four bags containing 30 cwt. of tin. Seven of the bags assayed up to 64 per cent., and twenty-seven bags 46 per cent., and the amount realised for it in Sydney was £60 14s. 2d. The actual expenditure upon it was £30 9s. 5d., or a little over 60 per cent. The expenses were as follows:—Carriage, £23 6s. 6d.; lighterage, 15s.; assays, £2 2s.; A.S.N. Company's freight, £1 15s.; and commission, stamps, and Customs charges, £2 11s. 5d. If such was the case with very rich ore, what must happen to the unfortunate man who sent down ores of a lesser percentage? There was one charge to which he would make special reference, and that was the charge for lighterage. The miners were sufficiently handicapped without having to pay lighterage, and that might have been

avoided if the wishes of the people of Port Douglas had been consulted in the matter. If the wishes of the people of Port Douglas had been consulted a jetty would have been constructed there and the expense of lighterage saved. Mr. Nisbet, however, expressed an adverse opinion, though he believed no one would be found—certainly no one in the North—to agree in that opinion.

The PREMIER (Hon. T. McIlwraith): I do myself.

Mr. F. A. COOPER said hon. members could see for themselves what success had followed Mr. Nisbet's works. Had the work at Mackay been a success? or the Townsville jetty, which had cost £60,000, and in the opinion of some authorities would cost £300,000 more to complete? How about the Pitroy River improvements? He ventured to say that if a wharf were constructed only a distance of 200 yards from the shore it would be sufficient to meet the requirements of Port Douglas, and if constructed in a north-easterly direction the prevailing south-east winds would not affect it, and the people would cease to be mulcted of lighterage charges, and that, in his opinion, ought to be done now. He had now placed before the House the principal features in connection with the application, and had supported it to the best of his ability. He had not asked a single hon. member to support it because he desired that every hon. member should be free to vote as he thought fit. Having pointed out the difficulties under which the people of Herberton laboured with regard to dray roads, he invited the House to consider the necessity of treating this as a special case of hardship, and would leave the matter in the hands of the House, hoping they would deal with it in a strictly impartial spirit.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said it was a rather difficult matter to answer the hon. member on account of his having gone into so many subjects besides that of roads and bridges. He was surprised at the modesty of the hon. member. Why did not the hon. member ask for £50,000 or £100,000 instead of £20,000? To make a metalled road a chain wide, partly through scrub, from Cairns to Herberton, would cost more than a railway from the coast to the top of the range. A railway might be carried from the top of the range to Port Douglas or Cairns for perhaps half what it would cost to make the road asked for. Let hon. members look at the facts of the case as stated by the hon. member. In support of the motion the hon. member quoted certain figures purporting to show the amount of rates raised in Cairns, Port Douglas, and Herberton under the Divisional Boards Act, and he declared that the endowment was insufficient to keep the roads in repair. It was admitted, of course, that the amount quoted would not go any distance in making such roads; but where had the money raised in those places been spent? The whole of it had been spent in Cairns, Port Douglas, and Herberton, and the roads had been made by the Government. Before leaving the subject of rates he would remind the House that a great change had taken place in the prosperity of that portion of the country since the rates were first struck. The hon. member quoted £192 as the amount raised in Herberton; but he (Mr. Macrossan) was perfectly confident that if a rate were struck now the revenue would be £500 or £600 in consequence of the increased value of property, and, with the endowment, it would amount to over £1,000. He might also remind the House that the amending Divisional Boards Bill now before the House contained several clauses strictly applicable to places such as

those represented by the hon. member. If that measure passed—as he hoped it would—those people in the Cook district would be able not only to maintain the roads, but also to make them themselves independently of the Government. One clause empowered the Government to give an endowment of eight to one in districts where the ratable property was only one-quarter of the whole area of the district, and also provided for the district boards mentioned by the hon. member. The fact concerning the expenditure upon those roads was that £13,000 on the surplus revenue estimate was appropriated and was being expended, and the whole of that amount had been appropriated to the roads mentioned by the hon. member, with the exception of the road from Cooktown to Maytown, since April last. Seeing that no Government money was being spent upon roads in any other part of the country, he would ask hon. members whether the expenditure of £13,000 upon those roads since April was not a very fair thing? Nearly the whole of the £20,000 voted specially for main roads had also been expended in that district. That was to say, £33,000 had been appropriated or spent on those roads in three years, or at the rate of £11,000 a year; and yet the hon. member very moderately asked for the further expenditure of £20,000 in making a dray road. The worst part of the road asked for was, as some hon. members knew, the portion which went through the scrub about ten or twelve miles from Herberton. A road there was being cut at the present time, and as it was almost impassable at any time after rain, it was being gravelled at a cost of over £1,000 per mile. The road from Scrubby Creek to Herberton itself was being put in first-rate order, and the remaining portion of the road from the scrub to Port Douglas required very little improvement. As to spending money on a dray road from Scrubby Creek or from the Ten-mile to Cairns, he would never be a party to such a scheme. Such an expenditure would be simply throwing money away—it would be easier and cheaper to make a railway. A sum of money was even now on the Loan Estimates for the purpose of making a railway from Herberton to some portion of the coast, wherever found most practicable. The hon. member might surely have been satisfied now that £360,000 was put on the Loan Estimates for his district. The hon. member also told the House that if the wishes of the people of Port Douglas in the matter of constructing a jetty had been carried out it would have been better for the district and the colony generally, and that Mr. Nisbet was wrong because he did not agree to that proposal. He (Mr. Macrossan) believed that Mr. Nisbet was altogether right, and he was thoroughly convinced from conversations with that gentleman, and also with sea captains, that if Mr. Nisbet had attempted to carry out the wishes of the people of Port Douglas the same results would have followed as followed in the case of a somewhat similar attempt at Mackay. They had already had one jetty which had been washed away, and if another were constructed it would probably suffer a similar fate. In his opinion the Government had been extremely liberal, and he had been blamed for his extreme liberality in regard to that matter. He had acted, however, from a belief that the people of Herberton required some better means of access to the coast. Before the £13,000 already voted was exhausted the roads spoken of would be in first-rate order, with the exception of a dray road to Cairns. The hon. member also said that not a penny had been spent on Cairns; but what was the fact? Money was being spent on the Cairns road now—a bridge was being built over the Barron River, between Cairns and Herberton; a new

track was being formed which avoided the necessity of crossing the Mulgrave twice, as had previously been done; and the old track from the top of the range to Herberton was being improved for pack traffic only. More than that no reasonable man could attempt. It was no use telling hon. members about the richness of Herberton, and that the ores yielded 55 per cent., because if the ores were ten times as rich as they were that would have no effect upon a motion like the present. If the ores were so rich the people should be rich also, and there was the greater probability of their being able to raise rates to make their own roads, as the people of other districts had to do. They would no doubt be happy to do so, and the amending Divisional Boards Act would provide them with the necessary machinery. He was obliged to oppose the motion.

Mr. McLEAN said he did not know whether the Government were going to make this a party question, as they did the motion of the hon. member for Fortitude Valley. He had a little knowledge of the localities indicated by the hon. member for Cook, and he, like the Minister for Works, was surprised at the modesty of the hon. member. The House would, however, bear in mind that the hon. member had asked for an amount to be placed on the Supplementary Estimates and not on the Loan Estimates, and, therefore, if the whole of the sum were not required the balance could lapse. The Minister for Works wished the House distinctly to understand that the whole of the £13,000 mentioned had been spent on the road indicated by the hon. member for Cook, but at the same time he told hon. members that a portion was being spent between Cooktown and Maytown. The Minister for Works had told them that it would be cheaper to make railways than to make roads from Port Douglas to Herberton, and from Herberton to Cairns.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: From the top of the range.

Mr. McLEAN said he had no doubt it would; but what was to be done in the meantime? That was a very urgent question, and one that must be attended to at once. He had had letters from friends at Port Douglas which gave him an idea of the state of the roads, and he knew from his own experience that the scrub was a very bad place and required money spent upon it; but there were other portions of the roads, such as that from Valley Creek to the scrub, which were almost impassable in wet weather. He knew that a large sum of money had already been spent in the district; something like £15,000 had been expended between Hodgkinson and Gaines'. But that expenditure was no earthly use whatever. He believed that something like £200,000 instead of £20,000 would require to be expended to make anything like a good road between those places. It was not a question of a railway just now, but an urgent question of roads; and if all the money asked for was not required to be spent by the Government the rest of the vote could lapse. He should support the hon. member's motion as a matter of justice to the district. He knew perfectly well that in consequence of divisional boards being established it might be urged that if that vote was given other districts might make similar applications. But it must be remembered that whilst the Divisional Boards Act was applicable to certain portions of the colony, it was not at all applicable to the northern portions. The Minister for Works stated that all the money raised from rates in Cairns, Port Douglas, and Herberton had been spent in those places. And justly so, too, because it was only in those places where rates had been raised, and the people

who paid them had a right to expect that the money would be spent there. It was just as necessary that there should be something like passable roads in townships as between townships; and therefore he was not at all surprised that the money had been spent where it had been raised. He was convinced that the Divisional Boards Act had to a certain extent been a success in some of the settled districts, but it would be years before the principles of that Act would be applicable to the northern parts of the colony; and he had no doubt whatever that there were certain districts which would periodically come to that House and ask for votes for the making of roads. He thought the House should take into consideration the sparse population in the North, and should deal out strict justice wherever required. Upon the ground of justice to the district, and in view of the urgency of the case and the necessities of the people, he had much pleasure in supporting the motion.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. P. Perkins) said it was very refreshing to see some members of the Opposition transferring their interest to the North; it was evident that they were not going to keep to Queen street any longer. He was glad to hear the hon. member for Logan take such an interest in the North. He was not attributing motives to the hon. gentleman; but it was well known what took him there and why he left. He was on an electioneering campaign at the time, and took no interest in the miners whatever. The hon. member for Cook had given them a picture of the kind of roads there were going to Herberton, and the not very pleasant state of things that existed there. Certainly, during his (Mr. Perkins') experience he never remembered the rates of carriage being so high as they were now, notwithstanding the facilities that existed. The reason was plain enough. The obstacles were not those that nature sometimes imposed; but carriers shunned the place and went somewhere else, and there was evidently something wrong. Carriers were now getting £18 to £19 per ton from Port Douglas to Herberton, and the same amount back. In other parts of the colony where the difficulties were far greater they were very glad to get much less in one direction and go back without pay. He must say that when he went over the roads in the district he never saw country so well watered and so well grassed. He thought the hon. member for Cook had drawn an over-coloured picture of the trade in timber and other produce. He admitted that the timber trade was very good, but he should like to know what benefit the colony got from it; to him it seemed almost nil. Even the rations of many of the timber-getters were smuggled in. He might mention that the other day, in some correspondence received in the Lands Department, he was surprised and vexed at discovering that one man who had in a short time got 4,000,000 feet of timber had got it all cut down by kanakas. If those were the people who were to get the timber the sooner they left the better. He did not think the hon. member for Cook would maintain that there was much benefit from such timber-getters. The proposed new state of things would no doubt, however, prevent the wholesale destruction of timber which was going on at the present time, and more benefit would accrue from the industry than had been received hitherto. He could not agree with the hon. member in the request he had made to the House. Let them look at what was going on at the present time at Herberton. It was a notorious fact that a few persons had secured all the rich mines; and, if the representations of miners and other persons of a reliable character were true, they were trying

to strangle others and get the whole field in their own hands. In one place they found twenty-three men's ground monopolised by one party—they were doing no work and putting up no machinery. They valued their property at something fabulous—hundreds of thousands of pounds—and therefore they ought to come forward and help to make the roads. They were all very silent while the discoveries were going on. The miners who bore the hardships and the privations had had to part with their interests for a very small amount. There were miles of ground now in the hands of syndicates in Sydney and Melbourne; and if they had secured property worth half-a-million, as the hon. member for Cook said, he thought it was time a levy should be made upon them for the making of roads. His great objection to the motion was that there had been a very liberal expenditure in the district compared with the expenditure in other parts of the colony. He was quite sure the Minister for Works, if he erred at all, would err in the direction of being too lenient to the miners. He thought an extreme state of things existed in the Herberton district, and that it required an extraordinary remedy. Seeing that there was something like £200,000 on the Loan Estimates for that district, he regretted that he must record his vote against the hon. member.

Mr. MILES said he knew the portion of country the hon. member's motion applied to, and he had no hesitation in saying that he had never seen anything worse than the roads between Port Douglas and Herberton, and between Herberton and Cairns. At the same time he was doubtful whether the sum of money asked for would be much benefit. The hon. member for Cook did not often bring grievances of his constituents before the House—in fact, he did not recollect that the hon. member had ever done so before; on the other hand, the hon. member had been strongly abused by his constituents for not doing it. Now that he had brought forward a grievance he was told that this and that provision had been made. He (Mr. Miles) was perfectly satisfied that no road would ever be made between Cairns and Herberton; it was impossible, and therefore he thought the Government should push on as rapidly as possible a railway to Herberton, either from Port Douglas or Cairns. There was a large population, and unless some provision was made in the meantime for repairing the road, how were the residents to get supplies? He had no doubt a large sum of money had been expended on the ranges between Port Douglas and Herberton. He had himself seen a dray going between those two places with thirty-six horses drawing it, and even then it was very difficult to get the load along, and they had to take their way along the beach in one part and make a main road of it. He thought that something should be done by the Government in the way of endeavouring to give the people facilities for getting their supplies up. The Minister for Lands had made some reference to certain parties who had done nothing to develop their property on the field, and who had erected no machinery. The hon. gentleman ought to know the great difficulty which was experienced in getting machinery to the place on account of the state of the roads and the high rates of carriage. With reference to the divisional boards, he knew for a fact that no rates could be collected between Port Douglas and Herberton because the intervening country was not occupied. How, then, was it possible that the trifling sum obtained in the townships could suffice for the wants of the district? and there was no one else to tax. How was it possible to make the roads

from the income of the divisional boards? The Act, in fact, could not possibly be worked where the population was so exceedingly small, though it might answer very well where the people were close together. In the North it was utterly unworkable. Let them take the district between Cooktown and the Palmer. There was nobody to tax there, so how could it be possible to make the roads without Government assistance? The Government were bound to do something to assist in making the main roads, more especially as before the Divisional Boards Act came into operation the southern portion of the colony had its roads and bridges made for it—and not only roads and bridges, but railways, which acted as main roads. It was not so in the North, and therefore he would most willingly support the motion of the hon. member for Cook, if it was carried to a division.

Mr. STEVENSON said that he quite agreed with the hon. member for Logan in the surprise which he expressed at the modesty of the hon. member for Cook. Considering the way in which that hon. member had been able to get money from the Government, it was no wonder that he should come to them heavily now and again for a new supply. He would advise the Government to buy the hon. gentleman out altogether; that would be the best thing for them to do, and then they would have some peace. The hon. member for Cook had not made out a very good case. He had talked a good deal about charges for lighterage and other things, but he had not shown the House why it should take those things out of the hands of the board, or why the people were not in a position to raise money for the construction of their roads; and he thought that the Minister for Lands had shown very clearly, from information given to him by the hon. member for Cook himself, that companies had bought for £10,000 property which was now worth £500,000, and that there was therefore no reason why those companies should not be in a position to make and maintain their own roads. The Minister for Works had shown that the £13,000 which was being expended in that district was sufficient to put the road in fair repair, and he did not see why another £20,000 should be appropriated at the present time. In regard to the statement of the Minister for Works that the sum of £1,000 per mile was being expended for gravel on those roads, he thought the expenditure was a waste of money, and that if it took that sum to make roads it would be better to make a railway at once. He did not think that such a large sum of money should be spent on an ordinary road in that way. The arguments of the hon. member for Logan in favour of the motion really seemed to indicate that the principal reason why the House should agree to it was that the hon. gentleman had friends and acquaintances there; but that was a very poor argument, and he did not see why on that account there was any necessity that £20,000 should be expended there. Perhaps the hon. gentleman had some other interests there besides those friends and acquaintances. At any rate, he gathered that such was the case from what had fallen from the Minister for Lands. He did not think that any case was made out why that district should be so exceptionally treated. There were plenty of other places in the colony where there were bad roads and where the people themselves had to raise money to keep them in repair. Why should not the people in the Cook district do the same thing? He would be glad to see the district well off in the matter of roads. He had interests there himself; but why money should be raised in the way proposed to assist the district he could not see, and therefore he should not support the vote.



Mr. FEEZ said that at the first blush he had been very much disposed to give his support to the motion of the hon. member for Cook; but after hearing the explanation of the Minister for Works he must confess that he had altered his opinion. Hearing constantly so much about the vast resources which lay buried in the Herberton mountains and of the glorious consequences which must follow their speedy development, he was naturally inclined to support any expenditure in the district which would be likely to bring that about. As the hon. gentleman had talked about bad roads, he (Mr. Feez) would give him some idea of the state of the roads in the Central district, and in one of the most populous parts of the colony. The hon. gentleman had spoken of the carriage of goods for sixty miles being £25 a ton, but between Emerald and Clermont, a distance of less than sixty miles, they had to pay from £16 to £18 per ton. The roads, indeed, were so bad that the mayor and corporation of Clermont had asked for permission to use the track of the railway which was under construction, so that they might obtain the necessities of life, as the people were actually starving. It appeared from the statement of the Minister for Works that a very large sum of money had been expended in the Herberton district contrary to the regulations and rules laid down under the Divisional Boards Act. In his opinion the people, having accumulated such wealth as they had done, ought certainly to put their shoulders to the wheel to assist the Government in every possible way in making their highways as good as possible. If the wealth of the district was as great as it was stated to be, the assessment of the owners of it for road construction ought, he thought, to be in proportion to it. He had begun to think that the Herberton district was getting more than other parts of the colony, and that it would be an injustice to other people if they were to be too sanguine as to the necessity for giving any further facilities to it at present. One thing that appeared to him most striking on the question was that they heard only about Herberton and Port Douglas, and nothing about Herberton and Cairns. He thought that he had a right to mention the fact, as he was continually getting letters from the district on the point. He was particularly anxious to give expression to the opinions of the people in the House. Port Douglas was a far greater distance from Herberton than Cairns, and yet the former seemed to have been chosen for the harbour. That he gathered from the expressions made use of in the debate, though the people in the district did not know it, and he thought the sooner they did so the better—they ought not to be kept in the dark. They stated that Cairns had a far better harbour, and the sooner the Government let them know that it was not to be chosen the better it would be for them. He was sorry he could not support the motion.

Mr. FOOTE said that he had seen the motion now before the House on the order-paper with some little surprise, for he had thought that motions of such a character had long since been set aside. He had understood that one of the great objects of the Divisional Boards Act was to save hon. gentlemen the trouble of coming to the House with such motions. He remembered also, however, that when the Divisional Boards Act was passing through the House it was understood that the Government would make the main roads of the colony, and that the other roads would be left under the supervision of the divisional boards to construct and keep in order. He believed that the Government had in a measure broken faith in that respect. It had turned out that all the roads in the colony were main roads, or, at any rate, there was a difficulty in

defining what were main roads and what were not. That was the reason, he presumed, why the Government thought fit not to undertake any of that class of work, as otherwise they would have found themselves in the same predicament which they were in before the passing of the Act. He should support the motion of the hon. member for Cook because it affected people from whom the Government were receiving a considerable amount of revenue, and it was quite proper, therefore, that they should have roads to travel upon. Especially where they had to carry their goods in drays was it necessary to have the roads in something like proper order, if it was possible to make them so. He would support the motion also on other grounds. Although the Divisional Boards Act had been spoken of as a success, he failed to see that it was so. There were no roads that he knew of that were now in good order, or in anything like as good order as when they were in the hands of the Government. He maintained that the Divisional Boards Act as it stood was an utter failure, and they ought to avail themselves of every fair means whereby they could override that Act. That, he took it, was the intention of the hon. member for Cook, and he was perfectly justified in bringing in the motion. There were two or three roads in his (Mr. Foote's) district which he considered main roads, and which sadly required improvements; and he should probably come down to the House, if the hon. member succeeded in carrying his motion, and ask for a sum of money, although a moderate one—say £4,000 or £5,000. He saw the necessity that must exist for good roads in the country represented by the member for Cook. The country was bad in every way for road-making, and the heavy rainfall made it still worse for travelling over. He did not wish to take up the time of the House. He had wished, however, to give his reasons for supporting the motion, and he hoped that hon. members would consider the question well. He had no doubt that almost every member there knew that the district he represented might some time or other suffer from a similar want; and if hon. members would only put their heads together they might get what they required. If hon. members would but sympathise with one another they could soon get over all difficulties with reference to roads.

Mr. LOW said there were about 600 miles of road in the district he represented, and the public and divisional boards were perfectly well satisfied with the present excellent arrangements. He thought it a bad principle to disturb the working of the Divisional Boards Act.

The PREMIER said the hon. member for Bundamba had caused him to get up, as he should not have spoken on the motion at all had not the hon. member spoken of going back to the old state of things—the log-rolling system. The hon. member for Logan had implored the Government not to make this a party question, as they had done the last—namely, the proposed vote for a new post office in Fortitude Valley. Now, the same thing had struck him when he was sitting on the other side of the House during the division—that there was not a single member of the Opposition voting with them, and he made the remark to one of his colleagues. Who but the Opposition made it a party question? He would put the matter very clearly in a few words. The hon. member appealed to him not to make the motion a party question. It was a party question most essentially, because if motions of the sort were carried the Government would retire. They would never submit to the humiliating position that some Ministries had been put in by seeing motions carried for the expenditure of public money when the Government said it was not wanted,

and that they would not spend it if it was voted. The Ministry had far more respect for themselves than to accept such a position, and if motions of the sort were carried they would simply go out. The hon. member for Bundamba had avowed his intention to vote for the motion; not, however, because he believed that the money was wanted—not because he had any sympathy with the North. The hon. member—he did not say it offensively—had such a strong affection for Ipswich and its surroundings that his ideas seldom got beyond that place. He was the last man who he (the Premier) would expect to support such a motion as the present. And what was his object? Why, to destroy one of the best Acts that was adopted by the Parliament! He (the Premier) intended to uphold that Act by every means in his power, and he was only sorry that circumstances had forced the Government to spend so much money on the roads as they had done, but they were roads that could not be dealt with by the Divisional Boards Act. He hoped, however, they would find a remedy for that state of things without going back to the old system of log-rolling. He hoped the hon. member would not be backed by members who desired to see the Divisional Boards Act work properly; he was sure they would not back him. The Opposition, he was sure, believed just as much in the principles of that Act as the Government did, and they were trying all they could to make it work well. It had worked well in the past, and there was every prospect of it working still better in the future. After the hon. Minister for Lands' explanation, the House could not but be astonished at the liberality with which the Cook district had been treated; £200,000 had been put down on the Loan Estimates for a railway from Herberton to the coast. The hon. member for Rockhampton need not look at him in an inquiring way for the purpose of finding out to what part of the coast that line was to go. Whenever the Government found the proper place it would be divulged at once. He could not admire the logic of the hon. member for Cook. He admitted that the road would cost as much as the railway, but still he wanted a road in the meantime. The road would take longer than the railway to construct, and it was certainly most impracticable advice that the hon. member had given the Government. He believed the hon. member's speech was just a little quiet piece of electioneering, but he would remind him that the general election did not come off for eighteen months yet.

The Hon. S. W. GRIFFITH said he agreed with the Premier that, as a general rule, it was not desirable the Government should be dictated to as to the way money should be expended; but he had always maintained there were parts of the colony to which the provisions of the Divisional Boards Act were inapplicable. He had maintained that from the first and everywhere he had gone; but if there was one place where the Act was less applicable than another, it was the particular place now under discussion. It was ridiculous to suppose that the divisional boards at the ends of the roads could make these roads with the money at their disposal. It was not proposed to make a macadamised road, but at the same time the road might be very much improved. Now the answer the Government had made was—"We are going to make a railway." But first they had to find out where it was to go; then the surveys had to be prepared, and they could not be made in much less than twelve months from the present time. Then the sanction of Parliament had to be obtained, and he did not suppose the line would be finished under three or four years. What was to happen

to the roads in the meantime? That certainly appeared to him a case that could not be dealt with under the Act. The district would increase in population and become much more wealthy in the course of three or four years, if means of communication were provided, but means of communication were absolutely necessary. There were no means of making that communication under the Divisional Boards Act, and the only other way was for the Government to do it. He thought the present an exceptional case—like as the making of the road to the Hodgkinson was a few years ago. For the reasons he had stated he thought he ought to support the motion.

The Hon. G. THORN said he did not see his way to support the motion, but would advise the hon. member to introduce an amendment in the Divisional Boards Act, so that mining districts might contribute to the funds of the boards in the same way as farmers contributed. He was quite sure that when they got back to seasons such as those which preceded the passing of the Divisional Boards Act, there would be a hue-and-cry for its repeal. If they looked at the Supplementary Estimates they would find that the Premier was the first to infringe the Act. There was a sum down there for the repair of a bridge. When they found the framer of the Act the first to infringe it, it was high time hon. members followed his lead. He was satisfied the Act would be infringed over and over again; and he would assist any Government in power to infringe it because it did not work satisfactorily. Miners and pastoral lessees were exempted from taxation, and he would tell the Government that the proposal of theirs under that new Divisional Boards Act would not cure that. It would only increase the animosity of farmers and other freeholders against them. He should have more to say upon the Divisional Boards Bill at the proper time, as he was drifting away from the subject in speaking upon it now. He could not see his way to support the motion of the hon. member for Cook; but if the hon. member would come down with amendments upon the Divisional Boards Act such as he had suggested, he would support him, as he thought mining property should be assessed the same as other property.

Mr. F. A. COOPER said he wished to say one or two words in reply. He might state at the outset that there was no doubt that the electorate of Cook had been remarkably well taken care of by the present Government, and more especially the Herberton portion of it. There had been no request that he had ever made to the Government which was founded in reason that had not been acquiesced in by them; so that he had nothing to complain of on that score. What he wanted to explain in the present matter was this: that although he was by no means opposed to the Divisional Boards Act, still he maintained that it was altogether inapplicable to the requirements of such places as Cairns, Port Douglas, and the Herberton. It was utterly impossible for the small handful of people congregated in those places to construct the roads he referred to without some assistance from the Government. He failed to see the difference between passing the sum of £20,000 for making roads to tinfields and putting £13,000 on the Estimates for the roads to goldfields. This was the only colony where such an absurdity obtained. Mining should all be put under the same head, as it was in the mother colony and in the other colonies, and where the system seemed to work remarkably well. The tinfields were dealt with by the same Minister who dealt with the goldfields in those colonies, and a difference should not be made here. In the face of the passing of the Divisional Boards Act they had the Government

placing the sum of £13,000 on the Estimates for making roads to the Hodgkinson; and surely the same necessity existed for the making of the roads to the Herberton as to the Hodgkinson and Palmer. Hon. members, in dealing with the question, did not take into consideration the immense revenue derived from those places. They knew that something like four millions sterling worth of gold had been obtained from the Palmer; and was the paltry sum of £20,000 too much to ask the Government to expend for such an enormous return as that? They knew that the Customs revenue of Cooktown for some years amounted to £80,000 a year, and it was now £50,000, and was likely soon to be largely increased in consequence of the works going on there. Were they to be told that they were not to get £20,000 for the purpose of assisting in the development and progress of those places? And who was it who would be benefited by the expenditure? Hon. members should bear in mind that the whole colony benefited by it. A large sum of money had been expended upon the sugar lands in that part of the North within the last two or three years. There were no less than 140,000 acres of land taken up at Cairns and Port Douglas, and there was now a large sum of money bursting in the pockets of the people of Port Douglas and other places who were ready to take up those lands. He might mention the case of one man who came down to the Lands Office and was willing to pay down 20,000 sovereigns for 20,000 acres of that land. In the face of all that they were told that they would get no assistance from the Government in developing those places when it was clearly impossible for the people there to make those roads by themselves, as the money to be raised there under the Divisional Boards Act was in the aggregate only some £500. The hon. Minister for Works said that the amendment to be proposed in the Divisional Boards Act—that of giving £8 for £1 raised under the Act—would remedy the defect; but the hon. member had to run the gauntlet of that House with that amendment, and the House might object to such a proposition. He thought a bird in the hand was worth two in the bush, and consequently he would rather take the vote of the Committee of the House upon his motion than wait until the amendment upon the Divisional Boards Act was agreed to. He had wished that every member should deal with the question in accordance with his own light and assert his own independence in connection with the matter. He had no idea that it would be made a party question, or that the Government would recognise it as such for one moment. He considered it showed gross inconsistency on their part to regard it as a party question when hon. members found that out of the surplus revenue there was £13,000 set down for a similar purpose. He simply asked the Government to increase the sum to £20,000. Would not hon. members far rather see £20,000 expended for the conservation of water, or for the purpose he suggested, than see £60,000 expended in the purchase of two gun-boats? He considered his was a very pressing case, and if it were not at once attended to he had already pointed out that starvation might arise on that field from the want of proper means for supplying the people there. Before sitting down he would address himself to one remark made by the Minister for Lands, who was rather severe in his strictures upon the timber-getters.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I said trades.

Mr. F. A. COOPER said the people in the North were immensely indebted to the timber-getters. They were very useful men, and it was they who made the roads there—they were, in fact, the explorers of the Herberton,

and had opened up the roads to get their timber to the river—and by doing so had afforded the only facilities for the people to get between the coast and Herberton. He submitted that more leniency ought to be shown to those men, and they should be granted the extension of time they had applied for to get their timber away. He thought they were entitled to that consideration when the large sums of money they had expended in felling the timber were taken into account, amounting up to the present time to about £20,000. They were only to be allowed twelve months to remove their timber—which was of great value—and the time had almost elapsed. It was not the timber-getters' fault that it was not removed.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It is.

Mr. F. A. COOPER said the Minister for Lands interjected that it was their fault, but he (Mr. Cooper) could tell the hon. gentleman very plainly that the timber had in most cases been brought to the river, but the floods had not been sufficiently high by thirteen feet to admit of their floating it down to the coast; so it was the act of Providence which had intervened in that case, and prevented the timber-getters from getting their timber down to the coast, and the delay was not caused through any fault on their part.

Question put, and the House divided:—

AYES, 16.

Messrs. Griffith, McLean, Dickson, Brookes, Rutledge, Miles, Foote, Bailey, F. A. Cooper, Isambert, Buckland, De Poix-Tyrel, Horwitz, Macfarlane, Hamilton, and Beattie.

NOES, 24.

Messrs. Archer, Macrossan, Mellwraith, Weld-Blundell Perkins, F. A. Cooper, Pez, Jessop, Black, Scott, Kellett, Allan, McWhannell, Ferguson, H. Palmer, Lalor, Baynes, Stevenson, Kingsford, H. W. Palmer, Low, Govett, Norton, and O'Sullivan.

Question resolved in the negative.

### TRIENNIAL PARLIAMENTS.

Mr. GRIFFITH, in moving "for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Constitution Act of 1867," said that the object of the motion was to reduce the length of future Parliaments from five years to three years.

Question put and passed.

The Bill was read a first time, and the second reading made an Order of the Day for Thursday next.

### PAYMENT OF MEMBERS.

Mr. GRIFFITH said it was some time since the question of payment of members had been considered in that House, and he thought it was rather a misfortune that it had been delayed so long. At one time it was taken almost as an axiom of the House that payment of members was desirable, and he thought the principle should be carried into effect as soon as possible. In four successive years since he had been a member of the House the question had been brought before it, and on each occasion it had, by a large majority, affirmed the principle. In 1872, the session in which he first had the honour of being a member of that House, it was introduced by Mr. Lilley, the present Chief Justice, and was supported by a considerable majority; and a Bill was brought in by the Government of which Mr. Palmer was the head. The Bill was sent to the Legislative Council, where it was thrown out. In 1873 the matter was introduced by Mr. C. J. Graham, member for Clermont, and a Bill was brought in by the Government. It passed through Committee in that House, but did not go any further in consequence of the shortness of the session. In 1874 it was introduced by the Government, and the second reading was carried by a majority of

twenty-nine to seven. The Bill passed through the Assembly and was sent to the Legislative Council, where it was again rejected, but by a smaller majority. In the following year the Bill was again introduced by the Government; he did not think there was even a division upon it—it was passed without a division, if he recollected aright, and was sent to the Legislative Council, where it was amended so as to make it a Bill to provide only for the payment of the travelling expenses of members, and of course the Assembly declined to accept it. In 1876 it was again introduced, but he did not think it went from that House; he forgot whether it went to the Upper House or not—he thought not. From that time to the present the matter had not been brought before that House, and he very much regretted it. He thought it was the one thing most to be regretted that the last Parliament did not insist upon carrying that measure into law. Considering the principle had been so often affirmed by the House, and the principle discussed at great length on previous occasions, he did not think it desirable or necessary to do so now. He had never been a great admirer of the doctrine of payment of members in the abstract; but he had been convinced for a long time—certainly from the time he first voted on the subject—that it was desirable in this colony, and not only desirable, but necessary for the proper representation of the people. The principle was certainly established by example; and in almost all the British dominions where there was representative government the principle of payment of members was recognised. In Canada the system of payment of members had been established for a very long period. Although even in some of the Australian colonies the principle had not been established, he did not think that was any great argument against it. It might be said it was not in force in New South Wales, but it would be better for New South Wales if it was in force there. He did not think that the Parliament of New South Wales need be held up as a model of what a Parliament should be. The difficulty existed in that colony the same as in Queensland of getting suitable representatives for the different districts. The electors were so restricted in their choice that they were compelled to have almost any man who offered. There was no doubt that in Queensland the electors had been very much restricted in their choice of representatives simply by the fact that the colony was so large, and the expense and loss entailed by attending Parliament in Brisbane was so great, that suitable persons could not come forward. The electors had, therefore, to choose from those few persons who might have sufficient wealth to offer themselves, or who might think it worth their while on other grounds to become members of Parliament—men who thought the pecuniary loss they sustained would be more than compensated in other ways. It was desirable that the electors should have a larger choice. That the present system restricted the choice very much he did not think would be disputed. One of the best arguments he had ever heard in favour of the principle was delivered by the gentleman who at present occupied the position of Minister for Works when the matter was introduced in 1874. That gentleman called attention to the many constituencies which were, in fact, not represented at all, simply from the absence of that system which was in force in so many other countries—he referred to the British colonies, not to Great Britain itself, although it used to be in force there too when the circumstances of that country were not what they were at present—now that there were many people of different opinions, with money, who could afford to give

their time to represent constituencies in Parliament. There were men of so many opinions able to go into Parliament at present that, never mind what an elector's views were, he could find a man qualified to represent them without payment. In nearly all countries where representative interests prevailed, except England, the practice of payment of members was adopted. In most Continental legislative assemblies it was adopted, except Italy; he believed that was the only exception. In America of course it was adopted, and always had been. In fact, it might almost be said to be generally recognised all over the world as an essential part of democratic government, although there were a few places where it was not enforced. One objection had often been brought forward to the payment of members, which was, that it would give rise to professional politicians. He did not think that it would lead to such a result. He should be very sorry to offer such remuneration as would make it worth while for men to become members of Parliament who were not able to do anything else or to get a living honestly. He thought members of Parliament might fairly be compensated to a great extent for their loss of time, particularly the country members. He had always had a very strong repugnance towards receiving any remuneration, but he thought members who lived in the metropolis might consider those who came long distances; but that was merely a matter of detail—not the essence of the thing. That was his private opinion, and being his own private opinion he had prepared the resolutions so as to give effect to that view. The principle was that members should be remunerated for their attendance at Parliament, and members who voted for going into Committee to consider the matter need not commit themselves to any particular detail. They might prefer the scheme which was, he believed, embodied in one of the Bills brought before that House, and provided that all members of the Assembly should receive the sum of £200 per annum. That was a simple and intelligible way of dealing with the subject. For himself, however, he thought it would be better to pay members an allowance, as they would pay to witnesses or officers of the Government, who were compelled to absent themselves from their usual places of residence on public business—put them on the same footing as Ministers or officers of the Government—give them an allowance of two guineas a day. That was what would be done with other persons, and members of Parliament should be placed in the same position; and he did not believe people would go into politics as a trade for the sake of such remuneration as that. He thought it would materially enlarge and extend the choice of constituents. Members of Parliament would then represent better than they did some of the more important constituencies of the colony. He would not attempt to anticipate the objections that would be made to the motion. They would probably amount to a Conservative party not approving of payment of members, and he thought that might be taken for granted. As he said just now, payment of members had really become a part of the programme of democracy all the world over. It was sometimes said that Victoria was a shocking example of the principle of payment of members; but he did not think so. He believed that the Victorian Parliament, since payment of members was instituted, had been better than before—in the sense that it was more truly representative of the people of the colony; and he thought that, as a legislative assembly, they ought to represent their constituents; and if payment of members would bring about that result, then it was a good thing. He had no desire to travel over the whole ground, as he said before. There

was a great deal to be said about the matter, and there were a great many authorities on the subject, going back to Aristotle, who was referred to in the first debate on the subject, in 1872, by the then Minister for Works, Mr. Walsh. That gentleman said that all the authorities on political economy, from Aristotle to the present time, agreed in condemning the principle. He (Mr. Griffith) had never heard Aristotle cited on the subject before, but being cited by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Walsh), he referred to Aristotle, and quoted to the House a passage from his writings decidedly in favour of payment of members of legislative assemblies; and showed that from that time to the present all the best authorities had been in favour of the principle. Mill was in favour of it—

The PREMIER: Not in favour of payment of members.

Mr. GRIFFITH: He thought so. The hon. gentleman said he was wrong; but he was only speaking from recollection of the debates of long ago when Mill was cited in the House. He might be wrong; but turning to more modern times, two of the most eloquent champions of the principle in that House had been two hon. members sitting opposite—the present Premier and the present Minister for Works; and although the Minister for Lands was not in the House on any of those occasions, he remembered that in 1877 that hon. gentleman was the member who spurred the Government on, thinking they were not sufficiently in earnest about the question of payment of members. At that time the Premier did not call himself the leader of the Conservative party—a title which he had since assumed with a considerable degree of pride—but he hoped that hon. gentleman had not altered his opinions on the question. He (Mr. Griffith) had before him the division list of 1874, and he was sorry to see that of the majority who then voted for the resolution affirming the principle of payment of members only his hon. friend the member for Darling Downs, Mr. Miles, and himself were still in the House; and of those who voted against it the member for Leichhardt, Mr. Scott, was the only member now in the House. In 1876, of the majority of twenty-nine who voted in favour of the payment of members the only members at present in the House were the Premier, the member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. Beattie, himself, the Minister for Works, the member for South Brisbane, Mr. Fraser, the member for Bundamba, Mr. Foote, and the member for Toowoomba, Mr. Groom; and the only members now present who voted against it were the member for Leichhardt, Mr. Scott, and the member for Enoggera, Mr. Dickson. He hoped that the opinions of those hon. members had not been changed by the fact that some members who were then eloquent champions of payment of members were now opposing it. He hoped for their support—that they would be consistent in the matter. It was certainly not a party question. He knew members on the Opposition side of the House who did not approve of payment of members, and he knew that there were members on the other side who did; and he hoped that when a division took place it would be entirely without reference to what side of the House members sat on. He should certainly expect the support of a majority of the present Ministry. Just one word as to the form in which the resolutions were drawn. As he said before, he preferred that the payment should be on the principle on which Government officers and other persons were remunerated when they were necessarily absent from their place of residence; but that was entirely a matter of detail. He had no objection in the least, if they got into

Committee and a majority of the House thought it should be a fixed rate for every member of Parliament, irrespective of where he lived, to adopt that principle. He proposed that the resolution should only take effect after the present Parliament. That was certainly in itself a desirable proposal, and he proposed it in that form; but at the same time he wished it to be distinctly understood that if the present Parliament did not assent to it he should feel himself at perfect liberty in a future Parliament to propose the payment of members and to make it applicable to that Parliament, and should be prepared to do so if he had an opportunity. The principle having been affirmed so often by the House, if by any accident it was not carried during the present Parliament the future Parliament should be perfectly free to do so. He regarded the matter as of very great importance, and, much as he would regret the necessity of having recourse to such a proposal, he should be quite prepared if necessary to adopt the principle which had been adopted in some other colonies and place a sum on the Estimates for that purpose. He hoped they should never see here the difficulties that had arisen in Victoria, or the same conflict between the two Houses; but, regarding the question as he did as one essentially for the proper representation of the different parts of the colony, if it were not adopted now, and a majority of a future Parliament believed in it, he maintained they would be perfectly justified in voting it even to themselves, although it would be far preferable to vote it in advance and make it applicable to succeeding Parliaments. He would not further trespass on the time of the House, as no doubt a good deal would be said on the subject, but would conclude by moving—

That this House will, on Thursday next, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:—

1. That Members of the Legislative Assembly ought to receive payment out of the Consolidated Revenue for their expenses necessarily incurred in attending Parliament.
2. That such payment should be at the rate of £2 2s. per day for every day for which a member is necessarily absent from his usual place of residence for the purpose of such attendance, together with his actual travelling expenses, but not exceeding in all £200 per annum.
3. That the foregoing Resolutions should take effect from and after the dissolution of this present Parliament.
4. That it is desirable to introduce a Bill to give effect to the foregoing Resolutions.
5. That an Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to recommend the necessary appropriation for that purpose.

The PREMIER said the hon. gentleman, in introducing the motion, gave as a reason for not entering more at length into the arguments why payment to members should be enforced in this colony, the fact that the principle had been affirmed in so many previous Parliaments. The hon. gentleman was quite correct as to the fact that Parliaments in 1872-3-4-5 did affirm the principle, but he (the Premier) did not consider that affirmation made by previous Parliaments at all a sound argument why very strong reasons should not be given for introducing payment to members into the colony now. The circumstances of the colony had altered very considerably since then, and he was quite sure that, not only among members of that House, but among the constituencies of the colony, a very great change in public opinion had taken place. He was quite satisfied that that was not the real reason why the hon. member declined to go at length into the argument why payment of members should become the law of the land here. From the half-hearted way in

which the hon. member advocated it, and from the ability with which they all knew he could advocate anything he believed in and brought before the House, he was quite sure that his heart was not in the matter. He thought that must be patent to every member of the House, and that he had taken the question up simply because some persons who called themselves the "Liberal Party" had put it forth as part of their programme. As the hon. member said, there was a time in that House when it was taken almost as an axiom that payment of members was right; in fact, they hardly cared about discussing it, because it was looked upon as the right thing. The hon. member had no reason to fear that it would be opposed now simply because the Conservative members of the House were opposed to it, because if he looked at the division lists in previous years he would find that payment of members was supported by Liberals and Conservatives alike. It was supported by the present President of the Upper House; it was strongly supported by himself and as strongly by the Minister for Works, and it was supported by a great majority of members at that time. If the hon. member had not confined his history of the Bill to the time when it was dropped in that House in 1876, but had told them the reason why it was dropped, he thought considerable light would have been thrown upon the matter. He was, as he had said, a strong supporter of the measure on theoretical grounds, and he did not know of any measure that could be better supported by argument on theoretical grounds. He held, however, that there were stronger grounds to be found for legislation than mere theory; and he appealed to the history of payment of members in any country or colony wherever it had been introduced for the course he intended to pursue, not only that night, but until he changed his mind again in strongly condemning the system. He felt no shame in confessing that he had changed his mind thoroughly on the matter; and that confession might save hon. members the trouble of quoting his speeches in which he advocated it. Before 1876 he thoroughly believed in the system, and he now as thoroughly disbelieved in it. It was the duty of a member, when he had changed his mind on some important point of politics to which he had committed his constituency, to inform his constituents that he no longer represented them on that point. In 1876, after he had seen strong reasons for changing his mind on that particular subject, he called his constituents together, told them of the fact, and gave his reasons for it, and offered to place his resignation in their hands. But he carried his constituency with him; they would not accept his resignation, and afterwards he represented them on the other side. What were the reasons which influenced him and his constituents, and so many others, to change their minds on that important subject, but simply those evil effects that were seen in another colony where payment of members had been introduced? It was about the year 1876 that those evils commenced to develop themselves. Before that time it was looked upon as a sound and conservative institution, an institution which could be advocated on the broad principle that every labourer was worthy of his hire, and that there was no more reason why that principle should not be introduced into politics than into any other class of labour. The experience of Victoria contradicted that in the plainest way, by demonstrating that it put the Parliament at the mercy of the Ministry, and that that Ministry would actually exercise their power. And what had taken place? Sir James McCulloch, in whose time payment of members was introduced, held together the Parliament which, in the opinion even of the newspapers that sup-

ported him, did most unconstitutional things. They all remembered the "iron-hand" resolution that he carried through the House, and the deadlock that ensued, and the determined way in which he carried out his resolutions in the legislation of that session. The point which he (Mr. McIlwraith) wished to bring out was that the Conservative leader managed to succeed in keeping Parliament together for a couple of years when that Parliament was, in the opinion of all the newspapers, as clearly as possible against the opinion of the country. The members supported him simply on account of the payment they received. That Parliament expired by effluxion of time, and when Sir James McCulloch appealed to the country he returned with a miserable minority. It was plain that those members were actuated in their votes, not in order to support the measures of Sir James McCulloch, but in order to retain their seats so long as they could possibly draw their salaries. All Governments would make use of that power, if they had it, to coerce members of Parliament. There was no more frequent subject of complaint came before the House than that the Government arrogated to themselves too much power when framing Acts of Parliament; but that was nothing to the power which the system of payment of members gave to a Ministry. After Sir James McCulloch came Mr. Graham Berry, who did exactly the same thing. When the country was quite opposed to him he carried on until a dissolution by effluxion of time forced him to appeal to the country; and the result of that appeal was that he was put out of office. There could be no better proof than that, that the proper working of parliamentary government was unduly influenced by the payment of members. Those facts wrought a complete revulsion of feeling in the opinion of all the thinking people of the colony with regard to payment of members. The consequence was that the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member had not the courage to bring the resolutions before the House again. He believed that those resolutions would have been carried even then, because members did not like to acknowledge in the House that they had changed their opinions. They liked if possible to keep on in the same groove in order to say that they had been consistent. At the same time there was every reason to believe that such expressions with regard to the resolutions would have been used as would have justified the Upper House in rejecting the motion. The hon. gentleman said that he himself was not an admirer of the principle in the abstract, that he himself would not like to receive payment for his services in Parliament, and that he had framed the resolutions so as to exclude himself. He (Mr. McIlwraith) thoroughly believed the hon. gentleman, and did not think he could be placed in a worse position than that of feeling that he was being paid remuneration by the Government for the services he performed in the House. He had no hesitation in acknowledging the great services of the hon. gentleman in that House, and he knew perfectly well that the hon. gentleman would feel degraded to think that he was paid for those services which he chose to perform on behalf of his country. The hon. gentleman had too much professional pride not to know that his services were worth far more to the country than any Government could afford to pay for them; and the lukewarm speech he had just delivered proved that he did not believe in his own resolutions, and would feel degraded by accepting remuneration in that shape. The hon. gentleman said that all great thinkers of the present day were in favour of payment of members.

Mr. GRIFFITH: I do not think I said that.

The PREMIER said the remark was rather that all the political economists of the present day were in favour of payment of members. The hon. gentleman did not give them an opportunity of knowing whom he considered to be the great political economists of the day, but quoted three—first the late John Stuart Mill, next himself (Mr. McLlwraith), and then the Minister for Works (Mr. Macrossan). He would first see what John Stuart Mill had to say about the matter, and read his remarks with regard to payment of members:—

"We heartily join in Mr. Hare's condemnation of the proposal for payment of members of Parliament. The constant meddling of a body of men paid for making laws, and acting under the notion that they are bound to do something for their salaries, would in this country be intolerable (p. 122). Moreover, as Mr. Lorrimer remarks (p. 169), by creating a pecuniary inducement to persons of the lowest class to devote themselves to public affairs, the calling of the demagogue would be formally inaugurated. Nothing is more to be deprecated than making it the private interest of a number of active persons to urge the form of government in the direction of its natural perversion. The indications which either a multitude or an individual can give, when merely left to their own weaknesses, afford but a faint idea of what those weaknesses would become when played upon by a thousand flatterers. If there were 658 places of certain, however moderate, emolument to be gained by persuading the multitude that ignorance is as good as knowledge, and better, it is terrible odds that they would believe and act upon the lesson. The objection, however, to the payment of members, as Mr. Hare remarks, is chiefly applicable to payment from the public purse. If a person who cannot give his time to Parliament without losing his means of subsistence is thought so highly qualified for it by his supporters as to be provided by them with the necessary income at their own expense, this sort of payment of a member of Parliament may be equally useful and honourable; and of this resource it is open even to the working classes to avail themselves. They are perfectly capable of supporting their parliamentary representatives, as they already do the managers of their trade societies."

That was common sense, and it was the opinion of one of the greatest philosophers of the day. To payment of members in that shape no man could have any objection. The hon. gentleman gave no reasons for the position he had taken up, but relied on the fact that a similar motion had been carried before. The present Chief Justice (Sir Charles Lillie), however, when supporting a motion of a somewhat similar character, gave his reasons for so doing. The first reason was that it was a grand old principle taken from the mother-country, and in that respect he (Mr. McLlwraith) would agree with him entirely. At that time, when a knight was sent to represent the shire the sheriff assessed the country for the maintenance of the knight while in Parliament. That was a correct principle. If a constituency desired to be represented by a certain gentleman, surely it was right that such member should be sent down at the expense of the constituency. They could do so, probably, at the expense of a few hundreds, as the man whom they would wish to be represented by would be one whose wants did not exceed a sufficient sum to keep him while attending Parliament. That kind of payment of members he believed in, and he would support the principle to that extent. Of course the principle was voluntary; but if once inaugurated, and the constituencies had a real desire to obtain the services of men who would not attend without payment, then the principle of payment would be generally adopted. The next argument used by Sir Charles Lillie was that of the labourer being worthy of his hire. That was also the ground upon which he (Mr. McLlwraith) had always defended the principle, believing that every man, whether barrister or bricklayer, should be paid for work performed. But there was something different in the question of payment to members of Parliament, because the

House had to look to the results of a bad choice on the part of electors. The great bulk of the men who aspired to the position of members of Parliament at the present time were men actuated by the worthy motive of acquiring the honour which that position reflected upon them. In every constituency there were men to whom the constituents looked as being worthy of honour, and those men, whether rich or poor, always regarded the position of a representative as one of high honour. But what a change it would be if their places were taken by a lot of hungry aspirants for the £200 or £300 a year which might follow their election as members of the House. There would be the professional politicians, who would put before the constituents arguments which, though of very little effect now, would be made stronger when enforced by the enthusiasm consequent upon the fact that the speaker's living depended upon their acceptance. The duty of representing the constituencies would be relegated to a class of men who, he was glad to say, had not up to the present time got into the House. The next argument was one which had also been used by the hon. member (Mr. Griffith). The hon. gentleman said he did not believe in the principle in the abstract, but that there were peculiar circumstances in the case of this colony that made payment necessary. What were those peculiar circumstances? The hon. gentleman did not instance any one case in which a different man would have been returned if payment of members had existed. Sir Charles Lillie put the matter before the House in an entirely different manner and used the argument in a plain, sensible way. He pointed out that in a small community as Queensland was then there were not thirty gentlemen living in Brisbane who were able and willing to give their services; and he advocated not the payment of those only who came from a distance, but payment of all members alike. The circumstances of the colony in that respect were very much improved, and every day the class of men was increasing who could give their leisure to political matters and were willing to spend their time in the service of their country. The hon. gentleman passed very quickly and glibly over the fact that payment of members was a recognised part of all democratic institutions at the present day. Upon what did the hon. gentleman base that argument? Surely not on the example of the United States! Much as all must admire the progress that country had made, no hon. member would degrade the members of that House by comparing them with members of the House of Representatives at Washington. Every impartial writer upon the political affairs of America attributed the greatest of the legislative disasters in the United States to the fact that members were paid, and paid insufficiently. The emolument was just sufficient to tempt such men to come to Washington, and they formed there that class of lobbyists with whom every one who read the magazines was so well acquainted. Surely the hon. gentleman did not wish to degrade members of that House to the position of members of the House of Representatives! No one who read the accounts of the way in which political affairs had been conducted in the United States of late years would say that payment of members had not helped very materially to degrade political institutions. In England members were not paid. Payment there, except by the constituencies, was perfectly impossible, because the cost of election was so great that only rich men could bear it. No political institution that democracy could invent was able to put in a man except at a large expense, and the constituency would have to pay the member afterwards. He believed in that kind



of payment of members. Let the constituency who desired to return a man who could not support himself take measures to find the means of supporting him. The hon. gentleman in his arguments quoted the Parliaments of France, Germany, Italy, and Austria. In Italy, however, he would point out, members were not paid; and that was, in his opinion, the freest of the four Parliaments mentioned by the hon. gentleman. France, it was true, had payment of members, but the amount paid was so small that no argument of any weight could be based on that instance. To quote Germany as an instance of the success of payment of members was, to his mind, a most frightful absurdity. According to the latest telegrams, a most important piece of legislation, involving the policy of the session, had been rejected by a majority of 276 against 43; and what was the result? The Chancellor simply declared to the House that he should remain in power nevertheless and have his own way in spite of the opposition. There was nothing in that Parliament which hon. members would wish to copy, and to attempt to draw an argument from it was simply absurd. The Parliament of Queensland was a free institution; the Parliament of Germany was anything but that, and hon. members had no desire to copy any of its institutions. Coming to the resolution itself, he thought it was very cleverly worded, and it meant a great deal that the hon. member had tried to explain. They would see by the division, he believed, that the members who voted for the resolution would be those who would not be able to accept it; that members who lived close to Parliament, and who would not come within the effect of the resolution, would vote for it. Did they suppose that there was a real intention on the part of those members to advocate payment? Those members knew perfectly well that that was not the conclusion they wished to arrive at. Why should members living in town not get paid while others were paid? Why should some members get paid when others were not paid? The fact was that it was simply the thin end of the wedge to enforce payment for all members. He had not the slightest doubt that if a Bill were brought in, whatever resolution was carried, it would extend payment to all members. Hon. members had not the courage to face the Council; but if the members of the Council gave their time to the same duties as members of the Assembly, why should they not be paid? Hon. members opposite knew perfectly well that must be faced. If they wished to follow the example of Victoria they must face that part of the question. Members of the Council were paid in Victoria—

Mr. THORN: No!

The PREMIER said he believed they were paid in Victoria, but would hon. members opposite not acknowledge that that would be absurd here? The Upper House might be enlarged and members might get a pension of £300 a year, but he did not believe the country would stand that for a moment. He noticed, in comparing the present resolution with the one he previously moved, that the hon. member had divided one of the paragraphs into two—making them 4 and 5. The object of the hon. member was to have the means of enforcing his pretended views at any moment by putting the vote on the Estimates at some future time. If the motion were carried in the way it now stood it would be competent for any hon. member, when a message came down from the Governor recommending the necessary appropriation for the payment of members, to move that the vote be put on the Estimates. That was allowed by the Constitution. The consequence would be that the vote would go as part of the Estimates to the Upper

House, and, therefore, that that House would not be able to consider the question by itself, and would refer the Estimates back to the Lower House. He hoped the hon. member was not courting a battle with the Upper House on that ground. He would have liked the question debated at greater length, if the hon. member meant to use all his influence to carry it through. He did not think the hon. member had done justice to the subject. He ought to have given all the authorities on the subject. He ought to have investigated the results of payment of members in countries where it had been in force, and especially in the neighbouring colonies. He ought to have explained away, what was patent to hon. members of that House and the whole country, the palpable failure of the system in Victoria. He ought to have been prepared to deny that the Parliament in that colony was worse than previously, and to have given reasons why that Parliament was more degraded than it had been. There was not the slightest doubt that Ministers there at the present time had a hold upon the House, and kept men who did not represent the constituencies. The hon. member (Mr. Griffith) had often blamed the present Government in Queensland for keeping a House together that did not represent the constituencies; but what a handle payment of members would give them to do that! The power of taking away £200 or £300 a year from each member would give them great influence, not only with members of their own party, but also, he was afraid, with members of the Opposition. He had thought it wise to speak on the motion at almost as great a length as the mover, and he believed he had adverted to almost every argument the hon. member had used. He was quite satisfied that the hon. member would have to bring forward much stronger arguments before he got his motion into committee. He hoped hon. members would express their opinions, as he should like the matter thoroughly debated, and he should rejoice if he found that a majority of the members acknowledged the evils of the system in other colonies, and decided not to introduce it here until at least they had greater experience to guide them.

Mr. PRICE said that of course hon. members would naturally believe that he would like payment of members; but he knew the results of the system in other colonies, and he was of opinion that no man who thought anything of himself would go down to that House and receive £200 a year. He believed in independence of purpose on the part of those who represented the people. He had always gone against payment of members; and if he could not pay his own travelling expenses down to the House he thought it was far better that he should stop at home. Many a man would ask a constituency to let him represent them if they would give him two guineas a day, and then he could come down to Brisbane and enjoy himself like any other man. In his (Mr. Price's) opinion no man who could not afford to give up his time ought to represent a constituency, and he believed the leader of the Opposition in his conscience thought so too. If he (Mr. Price) did not think he was worth more than two guineas a day as a member of Parliament, he would never have come to the House. If he could not make more for his little place out of the Ministry than that he would not ask them for anything at all, and he was sure the hon. leader of the Opposition would never have come into the House for that sum. He had never agreed with payment of members. He had seen it in Victoria, and he should vote against the motion.

The HON. G. THORN said that he should not have uttered a word on the subject had it not



been for an observation of the Premier's as to the payment of the members of the Legislative Council in Victoria. He was sorry to find that the hon. gentleman was so ignorant, for he could assure him that for some considerable time the members of the Victorian Legislative Council had not been paid for their services. They had not been paid for the last two Parliaments, though he was aware that they were paid up to that time. When the last Parliament brought in a Bill for payment of members, the members of the Council threatened to refuse to sanction any payment unless the provision for themselves was dropped out. The measure was dropped, and the Council then passed a Bill providing for the payment of members of the Assembly. Those were the facts of the case, and he hoped the Premier would either on the next or following day acknowledge that he was in error when he had contradicted him. On the question whether he could give his assent to payment of members he was inclined to support the resolution brought forward, because he thought it only right that the Government should provide for members coming from a distance. There were many good reasons why they should do so. Members living in Brisbane occupied a different position altogether. It was different also in Victoria and New South Wales. Victoria was a small colony, and the capital was in the centre of it, and members could radiate from their homes to Melbourne in a very short time. So in New South Wales—the capital was central, and the Government had, by their extensive railway ramifications, connected all parts with it. He hoped the Premier of Queensland would connect all parts of the colony with the capital in the same way. Another reason—and a very great one—why they should have payment of members was that they had already got it. Only that session the hon. member for Cooktown had been paid for his services in the House. Why should a distinction be drawn between him and other hon. members? Why should lawyers be treated differently to other hon. members, as if they had prescriptive rights? Why should they be treated differently to cobblers, or any other tradesmen? The hon. member for Cook, too, had been paid in the teeth of a resolution passed almost unanimously in the House. He should support the proposal, though he should not traverse the whole of the ground which was gone over year after year. In his opinion, the proposals of the leader of the Opposition were unobjectionable, and he should give them his support.

Mr. MACFARLANE said that he had always been in favour of payment of members, and he was glad to have the opportunity of stating publicly in the House his opinions on the matter. Before he entered the House he had advocated payment of members. The Premier told them that he had changed his mind on the matter; but they were all at liberty to do that, and he had no doubt that members on the Opposition side of the House who had formerly been against payment of members were now in favour of it, and had changed therefore in the opposite way to the hon. gentleman. He had never changed his mind on the subject. He had always looked upon it in the light that it was the right and duty of the State to support the members who were sent to represent the constituencies in Parliament. The Premier had referred to the fact that the Premiers in Victoria, Sir James McCulloch and Mr. Berry, were able to maintain their position in the Legislative Assembly of that colony by a kind of fear that members had that they would lose their pay if they turned them out. It struck him that in Victoria the Parliaments were shorter in duration than in any of the other colonies, and if that were so, payment of members appeared to have no

force in making longer Parliaments. The Premier had referred to the opinions of Hare on the subject. He (Mr. Macfarlane) did not object to that gentleman's system of payment of members—it was the same which was applied in reference to presidents of societies in the colonies. Was it not a fact that in most of their societies—insurance, benevolent, and other kinds—and even the boards of management also, were paid for the work they performed? The mayors of most of the municipalities, and even the chairmen of the divisional boards, were also paid; and surely it would not be said that their duties were more onerous than the duties which members of Parliament had to perform! As had been observed by the hon. member (Mr. Thorn), it would be more honourable to be paid by the State than to be paid by the Ministry. The House had almost had an admission from the junior member for Wide Bay that he got more than two guineas a day for attending to his duties in the House. He (Mr. Macfarlane) always had and always should support payment of members. They might haggle about it as much as they chose, and try to make black appear white, and white black, but the facts still remained with regard to the difficulty which was found all over the colony in getting men to represent the various constituencies in Parliament. It was only men of independence who were able to come to that House. He knew, and other members knew, men who were well qualified to represent constituencies—some of them working men—who were prohibited through want of means. Through that cause alone the country was deprived of the benefit of their knowledge and experience. The Premier had said he would like to see the question fully discussed before it got into committee, and he (Mr. Macfarlane) would like to see the same. He maintained that until payment of members was established they would not have as good representation as if members were paid. He should therefore support the resolutions.

Mr. NORTON said he was as much interested in the payment of members as any member of the House, because, although he had not been living out of Brisbane, he had come to live there because he was a member, and his whole time was devoted to his duties. On that ground, in speaking to the resolutions, he might say he had a right to expect that his opinions should be received with a certain amount of consideration. He was opposed to the system of payment of members. He did not care whether the payment was made by the Treasury or by a man's constituents; in either case, in his opinion, it was degrading. If a man was paid by his constituents he was nothing more than a delegate, and it would certainly be a great misfortune if that House became a House of delegates instead of a House of representatives. The principle that should guide a constituency in electing a member was to see that they chose a man whose opinions the majority of the constituents believed in, and he should be a man who could be trusted to carry out those opinions whatever might be the consequences. He admitted that it was difficult to know how to choose, and that mistakes would happen in spite of everything; but he did not think payment of members would obviate those mistakes. The hon. member who introduced the resolutions had told them that at one time a large majority of the House was favourable to the payment of members, and that when it was brought forward and put to a division on one occasion it was carried by a large majority, and in one case without division. Well, he (Mr. Norton) thought that the country was to be congratulated that a change of opinion had come over the House. The remarks

of the hon. Premier were very forcible, and had direct application to the subject before the House. The example they had from Victoria, even if no other example had been forthcoming—the example of that colony alone had been such as to force the House to consider very seriously what they were doing before agreeing to resolutions of the kind before them. The circumstances of the colony had greatly changed and were altering continually. Some years ago the House thought it desirable that members should be paid, because in large and scattered districts it was difficult to get men to represent those constituencies. At that time there were very few men in a position to come forward and give up their time and business and remain away from home for months together. They were quite justified in their opinion at that time, but the colony was altering for the better every day. Constituencies were becoming more populous; in every department of labour men were becoming richer, and no constituency had any difficulty in finding an independent man to represent it. Amongst the sugar-growers large fortunes had been made, and amongst the miners and squatters there were numbers of men who had become independent within the last ten years; so that there was no justification for the remark that there was a difficulty in finding men who were in a position to come forward and represent any constituency whatever; and not only was that not the case, but every day the difficulty in finding men was decreasing. The country was in a prosperous state, and there was every reason to hope that a fair share of that prosperity would continue, and the number of men who would be able to come forward would be greater and greater every day. For his own part, he thoroughly disbelieved in the principle; he always had done so, and hoped he always should disbelieve in it. Under the circumstances, it was almost unnecessary to say he should oppose the resolutions.

Mr. DICKSON said that, when payment of members was introduced into the first Parliament of which he had the honour to be a member, he opposed the measure, and he had on every subsequent occasion expressed his disapproval of it; but he was free to confess that he had changed his mind, and he supposed the same consideration would be allowed him in his change of opinion as had been allowed to the Premier. His (Mr. Dickson's) opinions had been modified by a close observation of the representative system, not only of this colony, but of the other colonies; and whilst he must confess that he should prefer to see a House composed of representatives entirely independent of any pecuniary payment from the State, he maintained that in the present circumstances of the colony payment of members was not only desirable but was an absolute necessity. He believed it to be an absolute necessity unless they consented to vest in one particular class the whole representation of the colony. He was fully convinced of that, and he was sure the constitution of the present and preceding Assemblies of Queensland corroborated his statement—that unless payment of members was introduced the representation of constituencies—the less populous constituencies—would remain chiefly centralised in one class—the wealthy class of the community. There would not be the same extent of choice given to the constituencies that would be afforded if they enabled men not possessed of the same amount of wealth to come down and represent their interests in that Chamber—men who possibly might be more closely connected and identified, and having a more intimate knowledge of their requirements than wealthier gentlemen—who, in consequence of their want of means, were unable to give any considerable time from their professions or

business to attend to the duties of that Chamber. It was in that belief that he gave his accordance to the resolutions introduced by his hon. friend. He believed the experiment was well worth trying. He saw nothing to be alarmed at in the direction indicated by the hon. gentleman who had just spoken. If they were not altogether correct in their view of the benefits which would accrue from the adoption of the system, there was nothing to prevent them from abrogating the system at a future time, supposing its effects were not as satisfactory as they expected they would be. Whilst he said that he could not for one moment accept the statement invariably ventilated whenever the question came under discussion—namely, the horrible example of Victoria—he maintained there was no such horrible example in Victoria. He was very well acquainted with Victoria, and he was astonished to hear hon. members who were themselves old Victorians express their astonishment and horror and regret at the present constitution of the Legislature of that colony. He only wished that in some respects the Parliament of Queensland could vie with the progressive spirit at times displayed in the Victorian Assembly. He did not know that it was at all seemly in them to consider themselves so far superior to the Legislative Assembly of Victoria either in ability or patriotism. He was sure that any attentive observer of the progress of legislation in Victoria—possibly apart from their fiscal policy—would not be found to condemn, in the wholesale manner that had been done by the Premier, the legislation of Victoria in regard to the constitution of its Parliament. The present Government seemed very much afraid to introduce payment of members, and yet at the same time they were making great progress in that direction in a more indirect manner than that suggested by his hon. friend. Every member of the House was paid to a certain extent in having free passes upon the railways. It was but a session ago since the hon. member for Stanley introduced and carried his motion to grant free passes to the Northern ports. He thought that now they ought to go further and allow members of Parliament representing remote constituencies the benefit of having their expenses paid, and also of having a reasonable amount of remuneration for the time they were withdrawn from their business. He was very glad his hon. friend had framed the resolutions in such a way that members residing in the metropolis should not come within its scope. For that reason he could advocate it more warmly than if it affected himself. He did not think there would be any degradation in receiving the honorarium such hon. members would have. If a member did not want it himself he could dispose of it in many ways. There would be plenty of objects within his own constituency or in the colony to which he could apply it; or, as had been done in Victoria, he need not draw it at all. Instances were not wanting in the colony of Victoria where the remuneration had not been drawn.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Very few.

Mr. DICKSON said he did not think the hon. Premier was very fortunate in his historical statements in connection with the question. He led them to infer that all action in connection with the matter in this colony was delayed in consequence of what took place in Victoria in 1876 when Sir James McCulloch was in power. The hon. gentleman led them to understand that the matter was delayed here for fear of a repetition of such an example in this colony. But he (Mr. Dickson) maintained that the cause of Sir James McCulloch's defeat was the unpopularity he incurred through the introduction of the "iron hand;" and it was in consequence

of that that he was banished from power in the next Parliament after the imposition of that arbitrary measure. But the payment of members question came on in Victoria before the time referred to by the hon. Premier. He did not think that any warning was to be derived from that. The fact was the Victorian Ministries shared the fate of all Ministries too long in power, whether in Victoria or Queensland. In 1873 the Palmer Administration succumbed; in 1878 the Douglas Administration succumbed; and it was quite possible that the hon. gentleman himself might also furnish an example of the reward Ministers obtained for remaining in power too long, and that, too, without the payment of members being added to the catalogue of their crimes. He had stated why he should support the resolution. He believed, and still held, that if they had such a large and wealthy community amongst them that they could obtain representative men from all classes he should prefer seeing them come to the House as they came now. But he was convinced that if they wished to see that branch of Parliament composed of representatives of the people—and in that capacity alone he respected it—the system now proposed ought to be introduced. They should not have the sole representation handed over to one class of the community, and to avoid that they should support such a motion as had been introduced that evening by his hon. friend the member for North Brisbane.

Mr. STEVENSON said the hon. member for Enoggera had not been very happy in his arguments. He commenced by telling them that payment of members was necessary for those members who represented the outside districts in this colony. He supposed that by "wealthy class" the hon. gentleman meant that the squatters in that House who represented the outside districts were too numerous, and that there were many Brisbane people who would like to represent some outside districts. But what were the facts of the case? Who had represented the outside districts for many years past? Had they not been represented by Brisbane lawyers? The hon. member for Stanley (Mr. O'Sullivan) represented one of the largest squatting districts in the colony for some years, and he was not one of the wealthy outside squatters. They had had all sorts of men representing outside districts, and why squatters should be prohibited from representing the squatting industry he was at a loss to know. He thought that there was a very large proportion of lawyers in that House representing outside districts, and they were a pretty mixed crowd; and thus little could be said about one particular class representing outside districts. The hon. gentleman also advocated the payment of members in another shape—that was, by their being allowed free railway passes. Not much could be said against that, because he did not see why they should not travel free on Government railways. With regard to members having passes on board steamers, he agreed with what had been said by the leader of the Opposition. It was a thing he opposed strongly at the time; and he had always been so consistent in his disapproval of it that he had never availed himself of his pass, which was a great deal more than many hon. members could say. He found that a good many Southern members, since the tin-mines had been opened up north, had taken advantage of their passes very considerably, although they were supposed to be only used by members when travelling on purely political business. With regard to the subject which was touched upon by the hon. member for Northern Downs and the hon. member for Enoggera concerning the payment of members in another shape, he quite agreed with them. He objected

to the payment of members in every shape and form, and thought it was very reprehensible on the part of members of the Ministry to pay members in any way. There certainly was no reason for them to pay any members, because they had a good large majority. The Ministry had no right to have treated with utter contempt a resolution which was passed some time ago by Mr. Morehead, who was at present one of the Ministry, and they were very much to blame in that respect. That resolution was passed in a tolerably full House, and ought not to have been treated with contempt. Of course they would say that the resolution was only intended to apply to that session; still there was a fair number of members in the House when the resolution was passed, and it ought to have been respected. He thought that when a member accepted any remuneration of that sort he sacrificed his independence in that House. He did not care whether it was for services performed or whether by way of getting his electioneering expenses paid—when a member accepted any remuneration he sacrificed his independence and ought to give up his seat in the House. For himself, he agreed with the leader of the Opposition in having a strong repugnance to accept any remuneration whatever for his services, and when he could not afford to live in Brisbane and represent his constituency he would cease to be a member of that House, and he hoped every hon. member would act in the same way. The hon. member for Ipswich gave as one of his arguments that if the payment of members became law the working man might go to that House. He should be very glad to see a good common-sense working man in that House to represent a working man's constituency. He could quite understand a working man's constituency paying a common-sense man to represent them in the House, but he did not see why the Government should pay him. But supposing the payment of members was passed, it would not be the working man who would get into that House. It would be the stump-orator, who would go and talk to working men who were not perhaps so clever as himself, and had not the "gift of the gab." That would be the man who would get into the House if the resolution were passed. The hon. leader of the Opposition made a great point of paying a regular salary of £200. He (Mr. Stevenson) did not see that that had anything to do with it. The Premier had pointed out that when once the principle was established there would be an end of it, and he also pointed out very clearly that the experience of the system in Victoria had not been a very satisfactory one. He hoped hon. members would not look upon it as a party question, but would consider the matter upon its merits.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said he wanted to say a few words to sustain the vote he intended to give on the question. He believed he was the first to introduce anything in the shape of a resolution for the payment of members, and he had been in that line pretty consistent since he had been in the colony. He had always been in favour of the payment of members. So had the Premier been in favour of it until very lately, and he was very much disappointed with the reason given for that gentleman's conversion. To him (Mr. O'Sullivan) that reason was a very extraordinary one; in fact, in his reasoning he did not sustain well the points he took up. He gave as his reason that he had changed his mind in consequence of his experience of Victoria, of the "iron hand," of the deadlock, and of the length of time that Sir James McCulloch kept his men together in opposition to the opinion of the country; and he inferred from that that the payment of members was the cause of it. They had seen in that House the very thing that the hon. member

spoke of—without the payment of members. They saw a Ministry keep their place for four or five years, and when they came in they came in with a most miserable minority—as miserable a minority as ever took place in Victoria. The “iron hand” and the deadlock in Victoria was not at all caused by the payment of members. The existence of the Constitution was gone when the Upper House in Victoria was made elective, and if they had had a nominee Upper House in Victoria as they had in Queensland there would have been no deadlock. In fact, he (Mr. O’Sullivan) was not aware that the hon. the Premier said anything that was likely to induce him to alter the view he had always taken of that matter. There was nothing new in the payment of members, and every time the question had come before the House it had been carried by a large majority. It was untrue that payment of members had done harm in Victoria. It broke up the higher class that had governed the State for many years, and since the colony had been fairly represented it had become immensely rich. That was the state of things there, but Queensland had always been governed by factions. From the date of Separation it had been governed by a higher class; in fact, there had always been class legislation in the colony. But there was a cure for that sort of legislation, suggested by the extraordinary speech of the hon. member for Port Curtis, who said that a constituency should send in men who were perfectly able to represent them. That was exactly the reason why they wanted payment of members. By the hon. member’s statement it would appear that wealth and ignorance was to represent the colony in that House; it did not matter how intelligent a man was, if he was poor he had no business there. But did not the hon. member know that wealth and intelligence did not always go hand-in-hand? Was it not as clear as daylight that many who were wretchedly poor were also very intelligent and very able men? Were they dishonest or corrupt because they were poor? He did not think so. A great authority had said that a man should always be rich if he could; but they knew how some of the riches in the colony had been acquired, and that great wealth was not always a sign of honesty and intelligence. The impression he had always been under in that House was that all classes of the community should be properly represented, but all classes could never be properly represented without payment of members. And what repugnance could there be to payment of members? The thing already existed; they saw it with their eyes and heard it with their ears; members were paid corruptly and had been so paid since Separation. He had no experience of payment of members of the Upper House; but he had seen gentlemen fighting on the floor of that House, one telling the other that he had got a bigger bone from the Ministry than the other. He was an eye-witness to that scene, and made the attempt to propose that they should be expelled. Of course, when a direct payment was made the State lost the money; but if it was a loss might not the State as well lose it with its eyes open, knowing what became of it? Was it not as well that it should be made law that a member should be paid as to have it done indirectly and corruptly? The Premier was afraid that the House, by carrying the motion, would have to fight a battle with the Upper House. And why not fight it if it had to be fought? If they passed a resolution in favour of payment of members, and the Upper House rejected it, why not fight it out with that House? What terror should the Upper House have for them? They did not want to quarrel with the Upper House, but if that House wanted to quarrel it could not be

helped. Really there was nothing in the hon. gentleman’s arguments when they came to be examined. It had been stated that no poor man could get into Parliament; but what did they see in Victoria? Why, before England got so wealthy the members were always paid! The Premier said it would be degrading to hon. members to take payment; but how was it that the hon. member did not think it degrading to take £1,000 a year for his services? How was it that a surveyor, or a judge, or anyone in the service of the colony did not consider it degrading to take the two guineas a day allowed for travelling expenses? For his own part he had done very well since Separation without payment. He had not very far to travel to and from the House, and if the motion were carried it would not have the slightest effect on him. His work in that House was drawing to a close. He was the oldest member in the House, and the only one who was a member of the first Parliament.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Mr. Groom.

Mr. O’SULLIVAN said he was in the House two years before Mr. Groom. So that personally he had no interest at stake in the motion, and it was not of the value of 3d. to him whether members were paid or not; but, as a principle, he thought they ought to have payment of members. He was perfectly sure that for the time and labour, together with the absence from his own business, which he had given in that House for the last twenty-two years he was entitled to something; and he could say openly that he had never yet spent one day in Parliament which did not cost him something, more or less, out of his own pocket. But as much as a box of matches, a pot of blacking, or a pipe of tobacco he had never yet got for his services as a member of Parliament, and he could stand up in that House with as clean hands as any man. Though he was not speaking for anything personally, at the same time were he to receive something for his services he should not consider it by any means degrading. As was stated by the hon. member for Enoggera (Mr. Dickson), the principle of payment of members had been established a long time in Queensland. He himself (Mr. O’Sullivan) carried resolutions a year or two back for passes to the North; and he thought he only half did the thing, for if a member went to New South Wales or Victoria, or any other part of the colonies on political business, the State ought to pay his way. He had no business of his own in the other colonies, and if he went there it would be to gain some little experience he might bring to bear on the legislation of the colony so far as his capacity went. He did not presume to say that the State would be much the better for it; but it was possible that on such a visit he might see something that might turn to the use of the State. A member should not be expected to pay money out of his own pocket for the benefit of the State. The State had been having his labour and money for the last twenty-two years, and he should support the motion.

Mr. H. PALMER (Maryborough) said he was very sorry to hear that the father of the House did not intend to keep up the dignity of the House. He believed if such a motion as that proposed were carried there would be a perceptible change in that House before long—

HONOURABLE MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. PALMER: For the worse. That was his opinion. He had never previously had the opportunity of voting on the subject, not having been in the House when it was discussed; but outside he had always given his voice against payment of members, and should continue

to do so to the end of the chapter. He believed it was for the benefit of members on his (Mr. Palmer's) side of the House—chiefly country members—that the present alms-giving motion, as he might call it, was proposed. The town members—who were chiefly on the other side of the House—were, he learned from the hon. member for Enoggera, not to participate in the honorarium, as it was intended for those who came from a distance and were detained in town. As for himself, he scorned the idea of any such thing as getting money from the Crown to which he gave little or no service. His time and half the time of members from the country was not occupied in parliamentary duties—not three afternoons in the week—and he should consider it a fraud on the public to take money from the Treasury for time for which he gave no services. He had never heard since he had been in the House such weak arguments in support of a motion as came from the leader of the Opposition on the present occasion, showing that he had gone into the thing in a half-hearted way—such milk-and-water arguments he (Mr. Palmer) had never heard. One of the strongest arguments the hon. member used was that if the payment of members were passed the electorates would have a greater choice of members to choose from, and that was quite right as far as it went; but he doubted whether that choice would be an improvement. He admitted candidly that there was not an electorate in the colony where probably they would not have half-a-dozen or a dozen members to choose from; but he questioned very much whether the selection would be an improvement on the House as it had existed from its earliest days. The Parliament of Queensland during his experience in the colony, which was as long as that of any member present, had always obtained and held high celebrity for its character, demeanour, ability, and orderly procedure in every way as compared with the other colonies, and he hoped that character would always be maintained. In arguing the question he thought they should be guided by the experience of the colonies of New South Wales and Victoria. He did not think it was necessary to go further than there for a guide, and he meant to say that Victoria as compared with New South Wales was very much behind so far as legislation was concerned. He maintained that the progress of New South Wales was immensely in advance of that of Victoria, and that the difference had arisen from the ill-advised legislation which had prevailed in the latter colony. It had been admitted even by prominent members—leaders of the House—that payment of members had had a great deal to do with the degeneration that had set in in that colony. Looking at the other colony, what did they find? Steady advancement throughout—no payment of members there; it had been proposed over and over again and always rejected, and he hoped that the House would unmistakably reject the motion that night. He was sure it would do so, and he believed that it would be for the benefit of the country and of the House itself that it should be thrown out. He only felt sorry that since he had been a member of the House he had accepted a small gift—a ticket or something of that kind—and if he had thought that things were coming to the present pass he would never have accepted it. But beyond that he should never accept any gift from the Crown. He had lived so long in the colony without dirtying his fingers with Crown money that he thought he could very well keep clear of it for the remainder of his days. He could not help feeling amused when he heard the hon. member for Enoggera talking of the high character and integrity of the Victorian Parliament, where

payment of members existed. Why, it was only the other day he read of a member of the Parliament of that colony who had been imprisoned for twelve months for some defalcation in connection with his creditors, and after he came out of gaol he claimed a sum of money for his services in Parliament, and his creditors came forward and protested against it. That was a nice example of the result of payment of members. That was a notorious case, and others might be cited were he conversant with them; but no such example, he was happy to say, was ever likely to arise here. Having given expression to his feelings on the question he should not detain the House longer, but he should certainly and unmistakably vote against the motion; and he hoped that every member coming from a distance in the country would scorn to take two guineas a day for services not rendered in some cases, and at the best for only a few days in the week, but stand upon their dignity and refuse what he must consider in the light of a sop.

Mr. RUTLEDGE said the present was the first time the question of payment of members had come before the House since he had had the honour of a seat in it, and he should, therefore, avail himself of the opportunity thus afforded of giving expression to the views which he had been led to entertain as the result of study of the question from practical observation. The arguments that seemed to have been chiefly prevalent amongst those who were opposed to the proposition of his hon. friend the leader of the Opposition were—first, that it would introduce a class of professional politicians; and, in the next place, that as the country was increasing in wealth there was a larger proportion of persons who had the requisite facilities, financially, for maintaining themselves in the metropolis for the purpose of attending Parliament, and that therefore it was superfluous to legislate for the purpose of enabling those who desired to represent the outer districts of the colony to do so without being put to very serious loss as the result of their desire to serve the public. That argument had been very well met by the hon. member for Stanley. It had been assumed both by the Premier and by the hon. member for Port Curtis, who had given special prominence to that part of the argument, that if they had men who had the requisite amount of wealth, they had also the men who had the requisite amount of qualifications for the position of members of that House. Now, England had been cited as a country where, because there was a large number of wealthy men, there was no necessity for giving members of Parliament any gratuity or anything in the shape of remuneration for their services. Yet what did they find there? That notwithstanding that there were thousands—perhaps hundreds of thousands—of very wealthy men who were burning with ambition to occupy seats in the House of Commons, there were several constituencies who preferred to pass over the numerous wealthy candidates for the honour of representing them, and to send in men who did not possess the sole qualification of wealth. There were several members of the House of Commons who were really working men's representatives, and whose election expenses were paid by those who believed that brains had as much right to find a place in Parliament as wealth. He did not mean to say, because a man was wealthy, that therefore he had no brains, because they knew that very often brains had a great deal to do with the obtaining of wealth. But even in England—than which they could not find a more excellent example for the purposes of the arguments advanced by the opponents of the measure—it was found necessary to pass over rich men and select poor men as representatives of the people;

and the argument applied surely with very much greater force to a colony like Queensland.

MR. KINGSFORD: Name one!

MR. RUTLEDGE said the names of Mr. Macdonald and Mr. Burt occurred to him, and there were others. Those men were simply artisans, and commended themselves to the bulk of their fellow-electors by force of character and brilliancy of intellect, and they were selected in preference to men of wealth. Nearly all the Home Rulers, he was told, were in the same category. The whole of those men were not Fenians; some were men of the highest character and ability, and were an ornament to the House of Commons. There were many able men in the colony capable of representing constituencies in Parliament who had not the means to enable them to live while in attendance upon Parliament. In an old settled country like England there were multitudes of persons with assured incomes ready to come forward regularly and systematically and contribute money in cases of that kind; but here such a system would not work. On the gold-fields, for instance, there might be men of the requisite character and intellectual qualifications who, if they were required to undertake the expense alone, could not manage it. They would be dependent on the generous contributions of those whom they represented, and very often they would go short of the amount promised them for that purpose. Men soon got tired of that kind of contribution. If men were to depend, as had been the case in New South Wales and other places, on the contributions of admirers they would very soon find out that admirers quickly tired of giving that expression of their admiration. In that colony one or two cases had occurred where men who originally entered Parliament as working men's representatives, supported by voluntary contributions, had had to give the thing up in disgust. There was so much grumbling, so many excuses were made for not contributing, that they had to make themselves independent of those whose paid representatives they formerly were. That would apply in this colony to a much greater extent than in New South Wales. The shocking example of Victoria had been harped upon by the Premier and other hon. members. It had been taken for granted that Victoria was a colony that had been reduced to the very lowest extreme of degradation by reason of the system of payment of members. He did not know how that idea had become so prevalent. It seemed that because the *Argus*—the organ of a wealthy oligarchy in Victoria, whose interest it was to cry down democracy in every shape and form, and to cry up the virtues of capital—a bitter opponent of Mr. Berry and everything in the shape of Berryism;—because the *Argus* had said so, therefore persons who read nothing but the *Argus* had come to the conclusion that Victoria was a shocking example of the condition of things that resulted from payment of members. As far as he had been able to judge of the condition of things in Victoria, the very opposite conclusion had forced itself upon him. Victoria was never really emancipated from a most degrading thralldom until they obtained payment of members, by means of which a larger selection was gained to the constituencies, and the power of the oligarchy was broken up. When vested interests were hurt, it was well known how loudly they cried out; and no vested interest could cry out more loudly than the vested interest which was represented by capital in one or other of its various phases. He did not see why Victoria was to be regarded as a shocking example. There were many men in the Parliament of Victoria who, as regarded

their personal character and fitness for the position of a member of Parliament, were quite on a par with those who had so much to say against them. A comparison had been instituted between Victoria and New South Wales, to the disadvantage of Victoria; and the hon. member for Maryborough asked why they should not follow in the footsteps of the mother colony, and not follow the baneful example of Victoria. He (Mr. Rutledge) hoped that the House would long be preserved from the shameful example which had been lately offered by the Parliament of New South Wales. They had not payment of members there, and yet there was a class of professional politicians—men with an object in view, and who were determined to make politics pay. What were those disclosures which had recently horrified the whole of Australia, of the absolute corruption that had prevailed in the Parliament of that colony, if not an example of the baneful results of professional politicians who had “axes to grind” and their own ends to serve—who got into Parliament and made something far more handsome than the £200 or £300 a year they were talking about? There were the Milburn Creek disclosures, the Darling Harbour scandals, and the disclosures in the late free selection cases—and a number of other things were talked about which would be brought to light but for fear of the Libel Act—of the way in which members of Parliament had allowed themselves to be corrupted, and had disgraced their positions as members of Parliament in seeking to further their own financial interests. In the case of a paid Assembly, a very effectual safeguard against anything like corruption was found in the necessary corollary of triennial Parliaments. The Premier had spoken about the way in which a corrupt Government could hold over the heads of paid members of Parliament a threat of dissolution because those members would not want to lose the opportunity of drawing their salaries, and would thereby be forced to support the Government in power, no matter how much opposed that Government was to the wishes of the people at large. Surely the same argument applied whether members were paid or not. Ministers were almost always more anxious—he did not mean the members of the present Government particularly, but all Ministers—to preserve their own emoluments than private members would be who were receiving so much less. They were more ready to truckle to this and that constituency, and to this and that member, and make their own bargains for their own purposes, than were members to make bargains with the Government to foster their own private aims and objects. The Government that wished to keep in power had other ways of attaining that end besides threatening a dissolution. If the Ministry in the case of a remunerated Parliament threatened a dissolution, the institution of triennial Parliaments was a very certain remedy. Members having before their eyes a wholesome dread of facing their constituents within a short period would be more influenced by the desire to keep peace with those constituents than by the fear of losing a paltry £200 or £300 a year, and they would not allow themselves to be used as tools by the party in power. There would be nothing at all degrading in the fact of members of Parliament receiving some remuneration for their services. No hon. member would regard such remuneration in the light of an equivalent for his services. By this motion it was only proposed now to recoup certain hon. members for absolute losses. It was well known that a man could not get into the House unless he expended a considerable sum of money. The Premier had spoken of the difficulty of getting into the

House of Commons on account of the great expense entailed; but the expense was not relatively more enormous there than it was here, considering the resources of the men who became candidates. Men there in receipt of £15,000, £20,000, or £100,000 a year had to spend, say, £10,000; but that was not a greater tax upon them than the expenditure of £100 was to men here whose income was only £1,000 or £500 a year. Where a member living in town attended the House and sat in his place all night, after a day of hard work and strain of body and mind at his own business, it was no great compliment to compensate him to some extent for his actual work even if it were considered in that light, and no hon. member need consider himself degraded by accepting such partial compensation. The hon. member for Stanley, who had not far to come, had pointed out that he had always been out of pocket; and how much greater must be the loss in the case of hon. members living at a greater distance. The hon. member for Maryborough spoke of the motion as a proposal to pay hon. members from day to day for attending three days in the week; but the hon. member must admit that he had to be in town all the week round, and his expense was as great whether he was sitting in the House taking part in the debates or at home in his own lodgings. If an hon. member faithfully attended to his legislative duties it was perfectly clear that £200 or £300 a year did not go a long way towards reimbursing him his expenses. A member of Parliament was being perpetually applied to by all sorts of persons to subscribe to every mortal thing going in his own electorate, and being a public man he was also expected to subscribe to matters in other electorates and to national movements generally. A member of Parliament was, in fact, considered to be fair game, and his position entailed a large amount of outlay to which other men were not subjected. This paltry £200 or £300 could not be considered as a salary or as a recompense for services rendered. Again, there were many estimable people belonging to what was called the working class, who would be for ever debarred from showing the country what they were able to do, what stuff they were made of, and what capacity they possessed of assisting in good legislation, unless they were enabled to come forward by some such measure as that now proposed. The hon. member for Normanby said that the distant electorates were sometimes represented by Brisbane lawyers and others. That was because local men of a desirable kind were not willing to be at the enormous expense of leaving their occupations and paying for lodgings and other necessities while attending Parliament. If the outside constituencies were to have an opportunity of sending local representatives, it must be by enabling the constituents to tell an intended representative that if he went to Brisbane to represent them he should not sustain any actual loss. Surely it could not be contended that outside constituencies were properly represented by men who, perhaps, had never visited the district except for the purpose of being elected! He would not take up the time of the House further than to say that all his observations had forced him to the conclusion that, unless some system were adopted whereby members might be to a certain extent prevented from suffering very serious loss through becoming members of Parliament, hon. members would see a state of things perpetuated in Queensland which would not tend to the good government of the colony.

Mr. KINGSFORD said if the leader of the Opposition would amend his resolution he should be disposed to vote for it, at all events to the extent of the amendment. The hon. member

who had just sat down had made charity the special object of the motion. If any speech made that evening had been mercenary, it was that of the hon. member. The hon. member had thoroughly advocated payment of himself for his services to the country, and it would be an act of charity on the part of the country to remunerate the hon. member. It appeared to him (Mr. Kingsford) that some of the remarks made during the evening had been very wide of the subject. It was not the business of hon. members to criticise each other's motives in expressing opinions on the question before the House or in voting upon it. A great many strictures had been passed on the speeches and supposed motives of hon. members, and many unkind remarks had been made. Hon. members had now nothing to do with what passed in Victoria or New South Wales, and there was no advantage in raking up instances of dereliction of duty on the part of members of Parliament in either colony. It was not safe to take any other country as a guide, unless the circumstances of the two countries were entirely parallel. The hon. member had followed other hon. members in trying to show to those who opposed the resolution, and those who intended to oppose it, that there was a contradiction between the working men and those who did not come under that class. The hon. member made some such remark as this—that brains were only the property of wealth, and that they only belonged to wealthy persons.

Mr. RUTLEDGE: No; quite the reverse.

Mr. KINGSFORD was sorry if he had misunderstood the hon. member. An attempt had been made to show that it was necessary that wealthy men should be in that House. Now, he repudiated such an idea. He no more believed that a wealthy man had more brains than a poor man than he believed that the moon was made of green cheese. But that was not the question. They wanted brains and they wanted wealth; and he objected to any idea of opposing the admission of a working man into Parliament simply because he was a working man. It appeared to him that a working man who had, by reason of his brains and energy, accumulated wealth, was no less fitted to take a seat in Parliament than any other man. Had not nineteen out of twenty men in that House been working men? He knew some of them twenty-five and thirty years ago, and he could point to some who had not a penny to bless themselves with even now; but he thought they deserved great credit for attaining the position they held. All hon. members were working men, and although some of them had more wealth than men who had to work from morning till night, they were no better for it. He thought that if a constituency wanted a working man—using that term in the ordinary sense—to represent them, they should not send him into the House unless he was paid. But was there any outcry in the country for payment of members? If so, he had not heard of it. The newspapers had been silent on the question. For years it had scarcely ever been mentioned. He had not heard of any constituency which had introduced the question.

Mr. STUBLEY: Yes; mine.

Mr. KINGSFORD said there must, he thought, be some unworthy motives for introducing the question at almost the close of the Parliament. He could not find in the arguments that had been used in favour of the system any that would justify him for a moment in favourably entertaining it. When the question was brought before the House previously he opposed it, and therefore he was consistent in opposing it now. He thought it was uncalled for. A great many



arguments had been used, but none of them showed him that the system was necessary. If he could only find any reasonable argument in favour of the system; if any good purpose could be gained by it; if the *personnel* of the House would be improved, its legislation made perfect, and greater integrity, uprightness, patriotism, and loyalty introduced into the Legislature, he would vote for it. But he could not see in what way legislation would be benefited. On the other hand, he thought the system would result in some instances in men being thrust into the House who had better stay out. Until, therefore, some better arguments were advanced than those he had heard, he must vote against the motion.

Mr. BROOKES said that he should like to express his opinion on such a very important subject temperately, and without the slightest wish to be personal towards any of the preceding speakers. It was not a new question to anyone who had taken a general interest in the subject of politics. It was a very old question, which had never been lost sight of. In the time of the Chartist, thirty or forty years ago, an attempt was made to revive it; and it had always been a moot point with philosophers and thinkers whether payment of members of Parliament was or was not desirable, just in the same way as they discussed the duration of Parliaments. If he had to form his opinion for the first time from what he had heard in the House that evening, he would scarcely know how to decide in any other way than in favour of the motion. He did not wish to say, although it was common to do so in debate, that no good arguments had been advanced on the other side. On the contrary, he would say that the Premier had made a very clever speech—a singularly clever speech—which showed him to be adroit in debate and keen in catching up the points of a question. The hon. gentleman, nevertheless, could not help falling into pitfalls such as other speakers were constantly falling into. For instance, in alluding to the Legislature of Victoria, and to Messrs. McCulloch and Berry, the hon. gentleman did so in such a manner as to leave the impression on his (Mr. Brookes') mind that those gentlemen balanced one another. The incidents did not tell either for or against the hon. gentleman's arguments. He should have wished that the Premier would have avoided saying that the very concise way in which the leader of the Opposition introduced the question to the House was a proof of his insincerity and lukewarmness—the latter word having been used several times during the evening. That was not a fair way of putting it. In introducing the question, the leader of the Opposition very naturally supposed that it was a worn-out one for the Legislative Assembly of Queensland. It had been before the House five or six times, and the hon. gentleman supposed that other hon. members knew as much about it as he did. He (Mr. Brookes) did not regard his manner as a proof of insincerity, but simply as a wish to save the time of the House; and if the hon. gentleman was wrong he did not think the fault ought to be visited on him heavily. The hon. gentleman stated the question very briefly and very temperately. In the course of the debate some hon. member—he did not know which one it was—had alluded to the United States, and not in terms of flattery; and there had been a tendency throughout on the part of hon. members rather to elevate themselves at the expense of the United States. The House had been told of the corruption at Washington; but all that was beside the mark, because it was just to the United States that he would go if he wanted to show them a country which should be a proof to them that payment of members was a wise course to adopt.

No Government in the world had stood the wear and tear of temptation that the Government of the United States, which had been in existence for about 100 years, had done, and yet it was more creditable than that of England.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. BROOKES asked if hon. members had not read of a person standing at the door of the House of Commons and giving to every retiring member a £500 bank-note? Whatever might have been the little corruption in the United States Government it was only chargeable and traceable from the time when the United States became a somewhat rich and wealthy nation. If hon. members wanted to learn what was their duty here in Queensland—small and insignificant a colony as it was—if they wanted to know how payment of members worked in the United States, they ought to go back to their infancy. He thought they ought in fairness to recognise that Washington was only the seat of the Federal Government, and that every State had its own Legislature, and the members of them all were paid. He remembered very well, some time since, a senator speaking to him about the State of Wisconsin, and describing to him the mode in which they paid the members of their Legislature, and the mode seemed to him a very great improvement on any he had ever seen in this or any other of the Australian colonies. Every member was paid, but he was only paid a certain amount, whether the session lasted for thirty or ninety days. Hon. members would hardly believe how the session was got through in thirty days. They worked day and night to get the work done, and it was done faithfully and efficiently in that time. He had heard Victoria alluded to a great many times during the evening, and it only showed him what a variety of opinions could be taken concerning the same set of circumstances, and how they might be regarded from entirely opposite points of view. He would tell them what he thought of Victoria. He did not say he would challenge contradiction, for that would only be vanity. He did not wish to challenge anything; but he threw out his opinions because he thought they were as well worth listening to as anybody else's. There was a time when the political fortunes of Victoria were in very great danger from the great squatters, and from the land-sharks. The land was threatened to be entirely absorbed, and the political chambers were threatened to be entirely occupied by one class, and that class was the rich, the greedy, and the selfish. And what saved Victoria was the adoption of the system of payment of members, and nothing else, and it did that simply by enabling the labouring classes, the intelligent artisan classes, and the trading classes to combine to take steps to have themselves fairly represented in the Legislative Assembly. Now, one great danger to which the Victorian Legislative Assembly was exposed was that those rich and greedy men put their candidates in and paid all their expenses—guaranteed their seats in the House without a shilling of expense. That danger had to be met, and let him say here that it was to the lasting honour of the artisan class of Victoria that they so combined as to checkmate such scheming as that. That class put men into the House who could not otherwise have afforded to be there, and those men infused into the Victorian Legislature that spirit of enterprise and fairness which characterised it above all other Legislatures of Australia. Somebody had said in connection with professional politicians that payment of members would cause to spring up a tribe of professional politicians, but he would express his opinion from what he had seen and read of Victoria. Nothing had done more to



repress and clear out the tribe of professional politicians than payment of members. The selection of candidates was an important one; there might be two candidates, but the electors could generally tell the impostor from the real man. The public verdict was generally right when it came to a matter of that kind. What did they find in New South Wales, where they did not have the system of payment of members? On one occasion he happened to be passing through Tenterfield and he asked who represented that constituency in the Sydney Assembly. "Oh," they said "our member is a Sydney lawyer." He then asked if there was no local man whom they could send to represent them; and the answer was that they had plenty of competent men, but they could not afford to go. Let anybody look into the New South Wales Legislative Assembly and see how many of the country constituencies were represented by people who lived in Sydney. Here in Queensland, where the distances were so great, he was quite satisfied—and he said this without any disrespect to any gentleman whom his remarks might seem to touch—he was convinced that did the system of payment of members exist there were many gentlemen who represented squatting constituencies whose faces that House would see no more. The only reason they were there was that they were the only persons who could afford to come. That was not a right state of things, and here they came to the real politics of the question. What constituted the value of that House unless it represented the mind and will of the people in a direct degree? When it ceased to possess that qualification it ceased to be an Assembly worthy of respect. There had been one ruling class in Queensland ever since its separation, and they had possessed themselves of the balance of power in that Assembly. He said it was now time that that balance was rudely shaken, and nothing would shake it more than the introduction of the system of payment of members. He was not going to ask whether it was degrading to receive public money or not. He saw people every day in the streets whose breeches pockets bulged out with Government money, and he had not yet decided upon the way it got into their pockets. It was very odd that the most seductive bribe that could be offered by the Government to anybody was that of which they certainly had the most—namely, land. Let nobody imagine that they or the public knew the three-card or thimble tricks that were played with the public lands. He meant to say this—and he might as well say it if he thought it, which was better than thinking it and not saying it—that the present Government was by no means the first Government that had secured its majority in consequence of having power at the Lands Office. How were they to face that powerful oligarchy? and they were threatened with a second. He did not know what would become of them then. It would be hard to live between the sugar industry and the squatting industry, as between the jaws of a vice. He was there more particularly to speak for the people of every constituency in the colony, and not for Brisbane alone. So that in recommending the adoption of the principle of payment of members he did so in his heart believing that if they were to be saved from oligarchies of every kind; if that House of Assembly was to be a fair reflection of the intelligence and wealth and morality of the community, they would never arrive at a consummation so devoutly to be wished until they had established the system of payment of members.

Mr. FEZ said that after the very exhaustive speeches they had heard from hon. gentlemen upon the question he might, perhaps, fail to impress that House with more than the fact that he intended to vote against the payment of

members. He should do so for a very practical reason. He saw the House constituted in a manner which he believed the introduction of payment of members would not alter one iota. They had in the House representatives of all classes of the community—squatters, merchants, legal representatives, general—as he would term those whose occupation he did not know—miners, sugar-planters, editors, and farmers. He should like to know whether any system of payment of members could give them a fairer representation than that. He did not think any such system would introduce a more general representation of the wants of the people than they had at present. He could not, therefore, see that any alteration in the present system was necessary. As the hon. gentleman who introduced the motion was so unselfish as to exclude himself from participating in the benefit of the system, he (Mr. Fez) could tell him that the members on the Government side of the House who did not live in the metropolis were perfectly willing to forfeit the benefit which the payment of a few pounds a year would afford them. They were perfectly happy to give it up, and he thought they ought to be consulted in the matter. There might be among them gentlemen sufficiently well off to devote their time to their parliamentary duties without any payment; but they were not well enough off to afford to sacrifice their business. They came there simply because they considered the position a sufficiently honourable one to make a small sacrifice for it. If he thought that by payment of members the tone, utility, and action of the House would be improved he would vote for it, because personally it would be a benefit to him, as it would be far better for him that his expenses in attending to his duties as a member of the House should be paid for him than that he should have to pay them himself. He was not going to say that payment of members had corrupted the House in Victoria, or that the absence of that system had made the New South Wales House any better. Both Houses had their faults. He knew of very good men in the Victoria House under the system, and also knew of very inferior men being returned to the Assembly in New South Wales by the force of the great bulk of the people. Those who were to benefit by the hon. member's motion were satisfied with the present state of things, and therefore he did not see the necessity for taxing the country to establish the new system. They were moving on fast enough for a colony of 220,000 people, and he did not see there was sufficient necessity for imposing such a tax. Reference had been made to the motion introduced by the hon. member for Stanley last session, but he (Mr. Fez) could not place that in the same category with the motion of the hon. member for North Brisbane. Hon. members on the Opposition side of the House had benefited by the hon. member for Stanley's motion as much as anybody else, and he was very glad to see that it was so. In consequence of that motion many hon. members had been enabled to go north and see the country who would have been prevented from doing so by the heavy expenses attached to such a trip; and, as he said, he was very glad to see hon. members on the other side taking advantage of that motion to travel about and see the wants of various portions of the colony. As by the motion before them payment of members was intended for those gentlemen who did not live in Brisbane, he could simply say that, while the unselfishness of the hon. leader of the Opposition in bringing forward his motion in such a form was very gratifying to him, still many hon. members to whom the motion would apply were quite as unselfish, and were quite willing to go there at their

own expense. It gave them more pleasure to serve the country at their own expense than if their expenses were paid for them. He should vote against the motion.

Mr. STUBLEY said he had a few remarks to make upon the question. In the first place he would say that if those gentlemen who spoke against the motion would only argue logically it would be more to the purpose. One hon. gentleman had argued that members should be paid for travelling, and then that members should not be paid; and, putting that with the fact that the members of the Ministry received £1,000 a year for sitting on the Government benches, he could not see any logic in the argument. If the members of the Ministry did more for the £1,000 a year they were paid, other members who came from just the same distance spent just as much time; and if they were worth £1,000 a year, other members ought to be worth enough to keep them—their ordinary expenses at any rate. His constituency was anxious that he should advocate payment of members, but although he disapproved of it in Victoria, he maintained that payment of members was absolutely necessary in a new country. They might get a few members to spend their time in attending the House, and they were either political robbers or they came there, as hon. members had said, from patriotism to the country. They could not afford to do so unless they were capitalists. It was well known that there were several gentlemen on the Government benches who had been absolutely kept there by the present Government who never could make a living outside of that House, and if they did so it was a very mean one.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS on the Government side: Name, name!

Mr. STUBLEY said it was a well-known fact that those men had been kept by the Government, and it was well known that their solid phalanx of strength had been gained by their financial power in the colony. It was well known, also, that there were gentlemen on the other side of the House who had been maintained there by the Queensland National Bank and by the Government money put through that bank. The Government might talk against the payment of members, but they had not produced a single argument against it. The Premier wanted to show that Victoria had been damned on account of the payment of members. He (Mr. Stubbley) said that Victoria was as good now as ever it was, and the men who were in office were as good a set of men as ever Sir James McCulloch took into office when he first instituted the payment of members and protection. There was one hon. member—the hon. member for Maryborough, he thought—who compared Victoria with New South Wales with regard to prosperity. There was no line at all to be drawn between them. New South Wales had immense resources and an immense amount of country in comparison with Victoria, but the latter had a far greater population. Queensland was a prosperous colony—one of the most prosperous in Australia from its own buoyancy and natural resources. There were very few independent members in the House—he might pull out about one out of four or five who were really so; and he did not think that if they were paid £300 a year the position would be at all improved. He did not think the House required improving; he was quite satisfied with it as it was. At any rate, their House of Parliament had a standing equal to any House in the colonies; but at the same time no reason had been shown by the members on the opposite side why members should not be paid for their loss of time, travelling expenses, and living in Bris-

bane when they ought to be at their own places of business. If the Government were to employ an engineer to go and construct a locomotive, if the work were not properly done he would not be paid; but when they employed a member on the Government side to revise the Statutes, which were made worse than they were before he started, they paid him £1,000. That was bribery and corruption forty times worse than any payment of members would be, and made that man a great deal more dependent than any member would become by taking £300 a year. If people who represented the colony had no right to remuneration for their services, why should they employ men as they did in the Government service to give them immense salaries for doing work that was already done and paid for, such as the Auditor-General? That officer had to look after and superintend work that had been already done, but still if he satisfied the colony he was paid an immense salary. The Government wished to show how they had made the colony a great nation by their energy and ability and knowledge. He failed to see where they had done anything towards that. As he had already stated in that House, it was the natural buoyancy of the country and its gold and minerals which had been twice its salvation. He did not know, and did not wish to know, why the Government objected to the payment of members, but he had thoroughly made up his mind for it, although he should never receive anything himself as it was his intention to resign within the next few days, and he would leave the "subsection" to do a little blowing at somebody else and not at him. As to a remark made by him in the House the other night, which was considered unfit to be made in the House by a gentleman who was once a member of that House, and then a member of the Legislative Council, but at present a common reporter or editor of the *Courier*—

The SPEAKER: I do not think that has anything to do with the payment of members.

Mr. STUBLEY said he could show that it had something to do with the question. If that gentleman had received a salary of £300 a year he would not have been editing that paper. That gentleman made a remark with reference to something that had been said in that House which was more derogatory to the Speaker than it was to him (Mr. Stubbley). He referred to what appeared in that gentleman's paper, the *Courier*—the Government organ. If he (Mr. Stubbley) made use of any improper expression in that House it was the duty of the Government or the Speaker to interfere; but for a common man in his common paper to say that language which had been allowed to pass by the Speaker was not proper, was degrading to that House. That was one of the gentlemen who, if he had had £300 a year, would have been in the House now. No doubt in writing he was a very clever fellow.

Mr. PERSSE: Name!

Mr. STUBLEY said he was always prepared to name and to certify anything he said if he had the Speaker's permission, either inside or outside the House. The objection he had to the motion was that the amount allowed was not to exceed £200 a year; and if it went into committee he should move to have it amended, and make it the same as in Victoria, where members received £300 a year. Some members on the other side who had spoken that night had declared that it was perfectly right for a man to have a railway pass or a steamboat pass; and some of them said they had never used the steamboat pass, but had stood on their dignity. Those hon. members appreciated the pass and said it was perfectly correct, but at

the same time they did not consider that a man had any right whatever to receive any remuneration for five or six months' services in that House. The hon. Premier wanted to show what a debauched state Victoria had come to by payment of members, that Victoria had become demoralised, that there was no such thing as honesty and no such thing as legislation there; but he could tell the House that very nearly two-thirds of Queensland was held by Victorian capital at the present day, and by Victorian men. In Victoria some of the richest men went into Parliament and received their £300 a year; and that place, that little bit of an insignificant spot, scarcely as big as the district he represented, which was not the largest in Queensland—that little place owned two-thirds of Queensland. And men from that colony were landing in Brisbane every day; he met three or four of them as often as the steamers arrived—surveyors, engineers, and scientific men of various descriptions—withstanding the complaint of the Minister for Works, the Postmaster-General, and other members of the Government about not being able to get skilled labour. Those men came to the colony and made application for work and could not get it, and in some cases they were told they would be given a chance at the first opportunity. He was prepared to vote for payment of members, although when he was returned he told his constituents he would not do so under any circumstances. He had seen since that in that very House—without going further—men backed up and supported in various ways by the Government; and it was necessary that payment of members should follow. If the Opposition were to take possession of the Treasury benches to-morrow he dared say it would be a great deal worse, because there would be more fighting for office—there was no unity amongst them, he admitted. Things were bad enough now, but they would be worse if they changed sides; and for that reason he should like to make every member independent so far that he could pay his expenses whilst attending to his parliamentary duties.

Mr. HAMILTON said that at one of his election meetings he was asked whether he was in favour of payment of members, and he replied that he was; since then, however, he had carefully considered the question and had arrived at a different opinion from the hastily expressed one given on the impulse of the moment in answer to a question. He had changed that opinion, and he intended to give effect to the change by voting against the motion. Had he made a promise to his constituents he would have visited them and asked them to absolve him from that promise; but having only expressed an opinion he felt at liberty to act in conformity with that change. The fact that in voting against the motion he deprived himself of the sum it proposed to give—namely, £200 a year, provided he was again returned to the House—and he did not think he could be accused of egotism in imagining that his chances of being return were not less than those of other hon. members present—was evidence that personal interest did not influence him in the matter, but that he voted according to his convictions. The hon. member for Enoggera stated that those members who voted for Mr. O'Sullivan's motion two years since, which gave members free passes once a year in travelling to Northern ports, would act inconsistently if they now opposed the motion. He (Mr. Hamilton) was one of those who supported Mr. O'Sullivan's motion for those free passes; but it must be recollected that those passes were given on the distinct understanding that they should only be used when travelling for political purposes. One trip he took by steamer was for political purposes, and he accordingly

used the ticket. On another occasion when he travelled north he considered he was travelling for pleasure, and consequently paid for his passage and returned the ticket to the Treasury unused. He therefore could not accuse himself of political inconsistency. The only authority quoted by the leader of the Opposition in support of his motion was John Stuart Mill, but a reference to Mill proved that he used the strongest arguments that words could express in reprobation of the system. Therefore, if the leader of the Opposition attached very much weight to the opinions of that gentleman when he imagined they were in favour of payment of members he should now attach equal importance to them when he found them having an entirely different effect.

Mr. GRIFFITH: I will read you what he says directly.

Mr. HAMILTON said theoretically payment of members was good. Any method appeared good which would increase the number of persons from which members could be selected, but instances had shown that the practice did not coincide with the theory. In this instance the Premier had vividly described the bad effects which had resulted in the neighbouring colonies from the payment of members; and writers of high standing in America had attributed the low status American politicians had the credit of bearing principally to the same system. It could not be denied that it would give rise to a class of professional politicians—men who had education and glibness of tongue who, not caring for work and eager to catch a chance of obtaining a comfortable salary and a good position on easy terms, would lose no chance of attempting to ingratiate themselves with electors, and make promises in profusion to attain their object. The strongest argument against it, in his opinion, was that it put Parliament practically in the power of the Ministry. Say, for instance, a Parliament was composed of members whose pecuniary position was such that they could not afford to sit in the House unless supported in this way, and that a vote of no confidence was proposed in the Ministry. If the Ministry threatened to dissolve Parliament, and appeal to the country—if the vote of no confidence were put, was it not reasonable to suppose that some members who had no confidence in the Ministry would, nevertheless, hesitate to record a vote to that effect, if it would result in an appeal to the country, which would cause them to lose their seats and their £200 a year, with the possibility that they would not be again elected? To give another illustration: Suppose that at the commencement of a new quinquennial Parliament a number of members who entered the House under those conditions—and who, unless under those conditions, would be unable to afford a seat in Parliament—were requested to express their opinion on the Government, and that their opinion of the Government was that they had not the confidence of the country, but they were aware that the Government had it in their power to practically fine them each £1,000 by dissolving Parliament—for it must be remembered that £200 a year for five years represented £1,000—was it not human nature that some of those men would rather sacrifice their consciences than forfeit £1,000? Parliaments in Queensland had compared not unfavourably with those of the other colonies, and therefore he should be loth to assist in any experiment which might lead to different results; and for those reasons he should oppose the motion.

Mr. PERSSE said he believed the Assembly of Queensland would compare favourably with any other Assembly in the colonies, and he

thought they would be wise to leave well enough alone. If they gave the proposed bonus to legislators it might not improve the standing that they had at present. The hon. member for North Brisbane had argued that the adoption of the motion would give greater scope for the selection of members for outside constituencies, because men would be placed in a position to take seats in the House who were now unable to do so. He was perfectly satisfied that they would not get a better class of men to represent the outside districts for £200 a year than they got at present; on the contrary, he believed it would tend to demoralise in every shape and form the class of men who would come into the House. He felt satisfied that there were very few gentlemen in the House who did not try to represent the welfare of the whole colony to the best of their ability, and whether they got £200 a year or nothing at all would not make one particle of difference to them—they would still consider the welfare of the colony whether they got £200 a year or not. As a member of that House he was placed at as great a disadvantage as most people. He had his trip up and down to Brisbane every week, and he was happy to do it for the welfare and good of the colony, if his services were any good; and if they were to give him £200 a year it would not make him a single bit better as a legislator than he was at present, nor more straightforward than he was; on the contrary, he believed it would tend to demoralise him in every way. He would then be at the beck and call of every one of his constituents, who would say that he was very well paid for what he was doing, whilst now he said that he did it for the welfare of the colony and for himself. Such being his opinion, he intended to support the non-payment of members. He had heard one or two remarks from members about passes, and so on; and in connection with that he might say that he had been given a pass in accordance with the resolution adopted by the House on the motion of the senior member for Stanley, to travel by steamer up north. Since then he had been twice up north, but he had never used the pass and never would use it as long as he was not going on purely political purposes, and he thought that no man had any right to use it for non-political purposes. He believed that if such a thing as payment of members were adopted they would have every man saying that members were well paid for working for the country, and could therefore afford to do it. He should oppose the motion.

Mr. ALLAN said he did not wish to detain the House any great length, but still he thought it only right for a member to give his reasons for voting in the way he intended to vote on the motion before the House. On the occasion of the late election for Darling Downs he was asked, amongst other questions, if he was in favour of payment of members, and he most decidedly said he objected to it in every possible way. That was his opinion then and always had been, and he had no doubt always would be. If the motion were carried he would perhaps derive greater benefit from it than any other member of the House; but although he worked as hard for his constituents as any member, both out of session as well as in it, he would not think himself honoured by being told by any one of them that he was paid for it. Indeed, if the motion were passed and a sum of money were voted he should give his promise that he would never touch one shilling of it. He observed that the motion was advocated mostly by gentlemen who would not receive any benefit from it, and that certainly proved that they were unselfish; but it was only getting in the thin end of the wedge, and he trusted that it would never be driven home. He had had himself some

experience of Victoria, having resided there for many years, and he knew the effect that payment of members had had there; and that a large number of respectable men in that colony to whom he had spoken on the matter objected very much to legislation being paid for. He had also been in America, and talked much with Americans on the subject—he had talked with one on the subject only that day—and their opinion was that most of the internal troubles were caused by the payment of members. Men who wanted the country to pay them for their services did so, as a rule, because they were incapable of earning a living for themselves in any other way.

Mr. FERGUSON said that as one of the members who were compelled to be away from business during the whole session, and also as one who wished to represent his constituency, he should be very sorry to see the motion passed. It would not bring in the honest working man, about whom so much had been said, but the political adventurer, the public-house loafer, who was sponging and living on the honest working man. That was the kind of man that hon. members on the other side seemed to wish to get into the House. The working men of the colony were not so easily gulled as some hon. members seemed to think they were. What were they all but working men? He was not ashamed to say that for years he worked at the bench as hard as any man in the colony; but he felt certain that if he had come into the House as a paid working-man member he would have been a working man still. It would be ruinous to a working man to induce him to come into the House; he could not afford it even with the £200, and would be far better off attending to his own business. He should vote against the motion.

Mr. LOW said it was not working men who would seek seats in the House, but stump orators; and they had too many of them already. That was his opinion, and he should vote against the motion.

Mr. BAYNES said the hon. member (Mr. Ferguson) had made the most sensible speech of the evening. The question seemed to be, was the House to be a House of representatives or a House of delegates? The motion was not introduced for the benefit of the country, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Griffith) must know that he had done wrong in bringing it forward. His sentiments on the subject were pretty well known, and he should not detain the House by repeating them. The real working man's friend was not the stump orator—not the man who would come there and be bought for a paltry £2 a day; and the leader of the Opposition knew that better than any man in the House.

Mr. JESSOP said that so much had been said on both sides that it was almost unnecessary for him to take up the time of the House. It would take a Philadelphia lawyer to find out what some of the arguments meant, while others had been so openly absurd that he felt bound to show the contempt he felt for them. England, with its hundreds of years' experience, had never found it necessary to have payment of members. If men would not come forward to contest constituencies without being paid for it they were not worth having. Hon. members talked about £200 a year enabling them to send good men to the House. There were already plenty of good men in the House. Men were found willing to go about stumping the country and spending hundreds of pounds to enable them to get into the House, and now they came forward and asked the country to pay them £200 a year for doing so. To be a member of Parliament was looked upon as an honourable

position, and if men had the ambition to seek a seat in the House in order to do good to their country they ought not to want payment for it. It was almost disgusting to ask such a thing. Some people were ambitious to have a seat in Parliament, others looked for honours as aldermen in municipalities, and members of divisional boards, and other public institutions. Why should not the latter be paid as well as the former? The member of the municipality or the divisional board represented a certain number of people, and his aim was the same as that of the member of Parliament—namely, to do the best he could for his constituents; and if one man was entitled to payment for his services, surely the other was also. He would not detain the House longer. He objected to payment of members, and should vote against the proposition.

Mr. KELLETT said it was his intention to support the motion, and his reason for so doing was that he believed, if it was carried, the House would be better represented in the interests of the country generally than it was at present. If he did not think so, he would not vote for it. He was satisfied, from the way the motion was introduced, that it was entirely for the benefit of outside constituencies, many of which were certainly not represented at the present time. He could easily name them if necessary. There were several members who, if the system of payment was introduced, would certainly not have the honour of sitting in the House after the expiration of the present Parliament; and, from the speeches that had been made on that (the Ministerial) side of the House, some hon. members seemed to be afraid of the motion being carried for that very reason. There were exceptional circumstances in the large size of the colony; and in the outside districts there had been always a great difficulty in getting local men to come down to Brisbane to represent them. The hon. member for Clermont, in speaking against the motion, advanced the very argument which would influence him (Mr. Kellett) in voting for it. The hon. member said that in many instances outside districts had been represented by Brisbane lawyers, and he argued that it was not advisable that men should represent districts in which they held no property and had no particular interests. Such people certainly could not care much about a place in which they had never lived and had no acquaintances or connection. He (Mr. Kellett) was perfectly satisfied that in such cases the electors would not have chosen a Brisbane man if they could have got a man on the spot to represent them, and he held that it was not advisable that the greater part of the colony should be represented by Brisbane men. An hon. member said that a payment of the kind proposed would not make a member more honest or more dishonest. He (Mr. Kellett) was not likely in any case to participate in any scheme of payment, but if he did he should not consider himself in the slightest degree degraded by accepting payment, because he considered the work he did was well done and should be paid for. If the colony were a country like England, where there were a large number of independent men in every county, he would prefer that the constituencies should be represented by unpaid members of that class rather than by paid members. Under existing circumstances, however, it was better to have a good man and pay him than to have a bad man for nothing. Many instances had been seen in the House of men not representing their constituencies, and many other similar cases might occur again. Sometimes a man had money or someone was willing to find money for him; and on that qualification alone he would be sent down to represent a constituency. If the proposed

scheme were adopted, there were many good men in the outside districts who would take advantage of it, and a great change in the parties in the House would be the result. At the present time there were only two parties in the House, and when one party went to one side of the House the other went straight away to the opposite side like a flock of sheep when a dog was run through it. One party must be black and the other white on every question. He wished to see some change take place, in order that some better state of things might be introduced. When he saw the way in which hon. members voted on many questions he came to the conclusion that there must be some influence at work on both sides of the House. For the reasons he had given he should support the motion.

Mr. HORWITZ said he wished to say a few words before recording his vote. There were, he believed, several people about Warwick who were ambitious of representing the constituency, but did not come forward because they could not pay the election expenses. He (Mr. Horwitz) was not particularly ambitious of being in Parliament, and he had no doubt that some good citizen of Warwick would be glad to come down and represent the constituency honestly and fairly if he could be paid £300 a year. On the Darling Downs, also, there were plenty of farmers who would represent the constituency well, but were deterred because they were not in a position to pay their own expenses. For those reasons he should support the motion.

Mr. McLEAN said it was scarcely necessary for him to speak, seeing that his opinions on the subject were already pretty well known. Not a week since he had held meetings all over the constituency he represented, and had expressed himself in favour of members of Parliament receiving remuneration for the time they devoted to the interests of the country. He was prepared to go to the length of giving a certain sum to members while they attended and knocking it off when they were absent. It had been stated that the members of the English Parliament were all wealthy men, but such was not the fact. The working men had in several cases found it necessary to send in men to represent them. Alexander Macdonald was the representative of the miners, and Thomas Watt represented the miners of one of the northern constituencies in England. One of those men was paid, and he believed that both were. He, however, objected on principle to the payment being made by the constituency. If there was anything degrading in payment of members it was when one constituency paid its representative and others did not. Why should the working men of one particular constituency have to pay for the services of a representative who devoted his time to the interests of the whole country? If payment of members was right, it was right on principle that the country should pay for the representative and not any particular electorate. He intended to support the motion.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he desired to say a few words by way of reply. Of course, the remarks he had made in moving the adoption of the motion had been objected to by hon. members on the Ministerial side of the House. The attitude of the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government reminded him sometimes of that elderly maiden aunt described by Oliver Wendell Holmes, whose niece declared:—

"Whatever I do, and whatever I say,  
Aunt Tabitha tells me that is not the way."

Had he (Mr. Griffith) made a long speech, garnished with extracts from many authorities, the hon. gentleman would have said, as he had said on previous occasions, "We don't want to be

troubled with a lot of rubbish of that sort; we are perfectly competent to furnish our own arguments; does the hon. gentleman think we can't read and think for ourselves?" As, however, he (Mr. Griffith) had given hon. members credit for being able to read and judge for themselves, and, being desirous of confining the debate to the limit of one evening, had made his remarks brief, the Premier said he had not spoken at sufficiently great length, and had shown no earnestness on the subject. Such accusations were not worthy of the hon. gentleman who made them. If the hon. gentleman was of opinion that he had not spoken in a sufficiently loud tone he apologised to the hon. gentleman. He had risen to speak at ten minutes to 6—a very inconvenient time—and had finished shortly after 7, with the interval of one hour for dinner. Under the circumstances he had thought the wisest course was to address the House as briefly as possible on the subject—use only plain common-sense arguments, and allow the House to decide the question on its merits. The hon. gentleman at the head of the Government said he had not given a single instance of any change that would be effected in the present House if the principle were in operation. He had no wish to be personal, and had therefore wisely refrained from mentioning any names, but it would not be difficult to point out a great many hon. members whose position would be affected. The hon. gentleman then went on to give the reasons why he had changed his mind on the subject, but in this the hon. gentleman was most unfortunate. He said that he and some other members changed their minds on the subject in 1876 and 1877 in consequence of what happened in Victoria, but nothing particular had happened there until after those dates. Sir James McCulloch was in power until 1877, the general election having taken place in April or May of that year; and Mr. Berry came in in 1877, and remained in until 1880. How could circumstances that took place between 1877 and 1880 affect hon. members' opinions in 1876? The fact of the existence of payment of members had nothing whatever to do with the fact of Sir James McCulloch being in power and being afterwards beaten by a large majority, nor with the fact of Mr. Berry being in power and being afterwards beaten by a large majority. The causes of those troubles would be found a good deal further back when Sir William Stawell refused a dissolution to the Kerferd Government. That was the cause of all the trouble. They might just as well say that in 1874 the Gladstone Government was beaten by an overwhelming majority because there was no payment of members in England; or that Mr. Disraeli was beaten at the general election after that for the same reason. He could not see the connection between the two things. The hon. gentleman said he (Mr. Griffith) was wrong in quoting Mr. Mill. At the time, he (Mr. Griffith) said he was speaking from recollection; he had not the leisure that some members had to search for authorities. But while the hon. gentleman was speaking he had looked into Mill's work, and found that he was not so very far wrong. Mill spoke in much the same way as he did on protection—sensibly taking the view that general principles gave way to circumstances. On page 216 of his work on "Representative Government," he said:—

"If, as in some of our colonies, there are scarcely any fit persons who can afford to attend to an unpaid occupation, the payment should be an indemnity for loss of time or money, not a salary."

That was the very principle he had contended for, and which he had endeavoured to embody in the resolutions. The hon. gentleman said that really he (Mr. Griffith) had no business to refer

to Continental legislatures, because Prince Bismarck was defeated lately by a large majority on some proposals with regard to the tobacco duty. But he (Mr. Griffith) could not understand what the defeat of Prince Bismarck on the tobacco duty had to do with the subject of payment of members. He could not answer such an argument, he confessed. Then, one great argument that was used by the hon. gentleman and other hon. members was that they would get professional politicians. Upon that he was going to read from a speech made by the Minister for Works. He did not know whether the hon. gentleman had changed his opinion now or not; but he had put the case so well that he (Mr. Griffith) would like to adopt the words as his own. In 1874 the hon. member was reported in *Hansard* to have said:—

"There could be no doubt that if the professional agitators, stump orators, and political adventurers succeeded in attaining seats in the House it would be a very unfortunate thing, and might lead to serious consequences; but there was another kind of professional politicians who were quite as dangerous to Queensland as stump orators. He referred to that class of professional politicians who were banded together simply by the bond of self-interest—men who under the pretence of patriotism came down to the House to represent nothing but their own interests; who, under the pretence of patriotism, opposed the passing of a Bill because they knew full well if it became law many of them would not have an opportunity of sitting in that House again. There was scarcely a constituency in the colony in which, if this Bill became law, some honest, able man, willing to represent the people, would not be elected, and very few of the class he had referred to would ever take their seats in that Assembly again. Some hon. members, in opposing the Bill, alluded to America, and the evils which resulted from legislation there; but this he considered simply clap-trap. It was within the knowledge of several hon. members that there were thirty-six or thirty-seven States in the Union, each of which had a legislature of its own; and it must be a principle of reason that out of so many legislatures a few corrupt men would get in. But if the legislatures were all corrupt, how was it that America had become the home for the oppressed people of Europe and all other parts of the world?"

That, he thought, was a sufficient answer to the argument as to professional politicians. The class of professional politicians who were most dangerous were not the people who would go in for a paltry remuneration of two or three hundred a year, but the class who came there to serve their own purposes in a different way. It was that class which they ought to discourage. Then another hon. gentleman said that members in Victoria were guilty of crimes. So they were in Italy. There had been most scandalous cases in that country. In England, also, and in New South Wales, members had been convicted of crimes. But what had that got to do with the question. The one great argument underlying the whole was that with payment of members constituencies would have a larger field for the choice of representatives. The Premier had alluded to the fourth and fifth resolutions, and had said that he (Mr. Griffith) had some object to gain in dividing them. The hon. gentleman knew perfectly well that when it was reported from the Committee that it was desirable to bring in a money Bill an address went to the Governor, and when the Governor sent down a message the Bill could be introduced, and not before. He had only very briefly addressed the House before the division came on, because there were several members desirous of leaving immediately; and now he could only say that, even though the resolution did not now pass, he had not the slightest doubt that before he was many years older he should sit in that House with members who received remuneration for attending Parliament.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Question!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said the hon. gentleman had quoted from a speech of his,

and had also challenged him at the beginning of the evening. Had the hon. member not done so, he (Mr. Macrossan) would not have risen to say anything on the subject, but now he felt bound to reply. It was scarcely fair to call "Question" after such a challenge. It was very like the hon. member for Moreton to do so.

Mr. GARRICK: Yours is a very unfair policy.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said the opinions he expressed in 1874, in the speech read by the hon. gentleman, were opinions which he then sincerely believed in, and which he had given expression to, he believed, when before his constituents in 1873, when he was elected member for the Kennedy district; but he held that no man was bound all his lifetime by the opinions he expressed at one period of it. He (Mr. Macrossan) had a perfect right to change his opinion, and he did change it in 1876 or 1877. He called his constituents in the Kennedy district together, and told them that he retracted the promise he had given them to support payment of members. Afterwards he stated the same thing in that House in the hearing of the hon. gentleman himself. Of course the hon. gentleman had quoted that speech as an eloquent one.

Mr. GRIFFITH: It was a splendid argument.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he did not believe in looking at the question from a theoretical point of view, or quoting opinions on one side or the other. It was a question of practical politics, which every member must decide for himself according to the best of his ability and experience. The opinion he had formed was that the *personnel* of the House would not be improved by the system. He believed that the *personnel* of the Victorian Assembly had deteriorated. He was not going to make any comparisons, but that was his opinion. He believed that the *personnel* of the American Legislature would be improved if there were no payment of members. But no alteration could possibly take place there; the system had got too great a hold on the country. Besides that, there was something in the American system which made it more logical than it would be in Queensland. In America every member must reside in the district which he represented; but in Queensland—and, in fact, all over Australia—a person residing in any one part of the colony could represent any other part. The conclusion of the hon. gentleman was therefore not a logical one. One of the arguments which the hon. gentleman had himself used, and which had provoked a great deal of discussion, was the statement that it would be repugnant to his feelings to accept payment as a member. If the hon. gentleman made the statement, would he tell the House why he did so? Was it because he would feel degraded or less independent?—or was it because he had said the thing himself?

Mr. GRIFFITH: No.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said that the hon. gentleman stated so in a very able speech, in which he said that it would be extremely distasteful to himself to accept payment, and that he would feel more independent without it; but that he thought that it was for the good of the country that it should become law, and, further than that, that every member should be compelled by law to accept the payment, because if they gave it away to institutions or hospitals it would become a species of bribery which the colony would not tolerate. That was the substance of a speech made by the hon. member in 1872—a much abler speech than he (Mr. Macros-

san) could make now, and than he was able to make in 1874. He would not detain the House any longer. He had satisfied himself by telling hon. members who were not in the House when he made the speech which had been quoted, that he had retracted his opinions as to payment of members, not because he was a Minister, or because he was supposed to belong to the Conservative party—for he did not, but held that his opinions were as liberal now as they were in 1874. It was no test in any case on that point whether he was in favour of or against payment of members.

The PREMIER said that, as the hon. member for the Northern Downs was in his place, he would apologise to that hon. gentleman for contradicting him during the evening. He contradicted the hon. gentleman in rather a good-humoured way, when the hon. gentleman interjected that the Legislative Council of Victoria was not paid at the present time. He (the Premier) had since ascertained that to be the fact; and he found that while he was in England the Service Government accepted a compromise on the point. He found, therefore, that the hon. gentleman was right, and he wished to say that he apologised to the House and to the hon. member for the statement he had made.

Question put, and the House divided:—

AYES, 21.

Messrs. Griffith, Dickson, McLean, Miles, Garrick, Brookes, Buckland, Rutledge, Foote, Kellett, Beattie, Horwitz, Isambert, Fraser, Aland, Stubbley, O'Sullivan, Thorn, Bailey, Grimes, and Macfarlane.

NOES, 28.

Messrs. McIlwraith, Macrossan, Perkins, Pope Cooper, Price, Archer, H. W. Palmer, Stevenson, Low, Baynes, Lalor, Kingsford, Stevens, H. Palmer, Perse, Black, Ferguson, Allan, Govett, Scott, De Poix-Tyrel, Jessop, Pezz, F. A. Cooper, Weld-Blundell, Norton, McWhannell, and Hamilton.

Question resolved in the negative.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

In answer to Mr. GRIFFITH, the PREMIER said the order of business on Tuesday next would be the debate on the Financial Statement, and the second reading of Licensed Victuallers Bill.

The House adjourned at seven minutes after 11 o'clock until the usual hour on Tuesday.