

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 1884

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 20 February, 1884.

Elections and Qualifications Committee.—Motion for Adjournment.—Questions.—Elections Act of 1874 Amendment Bill—committee.—Auditor-General (Salary) Bill—committee.—Elections and Qualifications Committee.—Chinese Immigrants Regulation Act of 1877 Amendment Bill—committee.—Petition of Charles Francis Cumming.—Adjournment.

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

ELECTIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a letter from Mr. J. Ferguson, one of the members for Rockhampton, and one from Mr. M. Hume Black, the member for Mackay, resigning their positions as members of the Elections and Qualifications Committee.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he would conclude the remarks he was about to make with the usual motion for the adjournment of the House. He rose for the purpose of drawing attention to the announcement just made by the Speaker. He knew nothing about it, but assumed that the resignations had arisen from some very serious difference of opinion which must have taken place in the committee, and he trusted that the committee, crippled as it was in number, would not proceed to the consideration of the remaining case in their hands. Two members on the Opposition side of the House having resigned, four members were left who usually voted for the Government; and the public, who expected justice to be done to all parties, would hardly think it right that further action should be taken until the vacancies were filled up. He presumed the Speaker would lay his warrant on the table for the appointment of two new members of the committee, and until that was done the House had no power whatever to fill up the vacancies. As he had said, two prominent members had resigned—gentlemen respected by both sides of the House—and what their reason was he knew not; but he thought the vacancies should be filled before any further action was taken. He moved the adjournment of the House.

The PREMIER (Hon. S. W. Griffith) said the House knew nothing of the proceedings of the committee until its reports were brought before them. He did not know what might have arisen to cause members to resign in the middle of their proceedings upon one case, if not two; but he had been informed some weeks ago that an attempt would be made to prevent the committee bringing up any report, either by members absenting themselves or by resignations such as had taken place. He hoped that the committee would do their duty—what they conceived to be their duty—and not take their instructions from the House. He hoped they would not allow themselves to be obstructed in the prosecution of that duty by any action that one or two members might take.

Mr. FOOTE said he was not present to hear all the remarks of the hon. leader of the Opposition, but from what he could gather from the latter part of his speech he understood that two members of the committee had resigned. If they had resigned he was not aware of it.

Mr. MOREHEAD: The Speaker has received their resignations.

Mr. FOOTE said he understood, according to the rules of committees, that so long as there was a quorum the committee could sit. He was not aware of any enormous breach of privilege that was committed so long as there was a quorum. Of course if any member of the committee resigned the Speaker had power to appoint another. Those two hon. gentlemen who had resigned had been very attentive to their business, and had spent a great deal of time in attending the committee. So long as there was a quorum the committee had a perfect right to sit; at least, that was his opinion.

Mr. BLACK said that, as one of the members of the committee who had resigned—for reasons which he did not think it was necessary to state—he would make a few remarks. The hon. member for Rockhampton and himself still remained on the committee until others were appointed to take their places. They had not resigned for the purpose of obstructing the decisions of that committee; but they felt compelled to take the step they had on a much more serious ground, which it was hardly necessary and which it would not be right for him to allude to until the whole evidence taken by the committee on the cases before them had been laid on the table of

the House. So far from agreeing with what the hon. Premier said—that they had resigned when certain cases had been left undecided—they had done nothing of the sort. They had completed two of the cases; and while tendering his resignation he had also to inform the House that he should take steps to carry out the decision which had been arrived at that morning. They had left nothing unfinished, but they declined to go on with the third case, which had been commenced that morning. There was no reason why the committee should cease to act; the leader of the Opposition simply appealed to the feeling of the House as to whether—considering that a very serious difficulty had arisen in the committee—their good sense would not delay the proceedings of that committee until they got two other members appointed to fill the vacancies.

Mr. FERGUSON said he endorsed what had been said by the hon. member for Mackay. They had stated before they left the committee-room that they would go back and finish the Aubigny election. They had gone so far that it was almost finished, and they would not obstruct it. His own reason for resigning was because he considered that the Elections and Qualifications Committee was a perfect farce, as it was a mere question of voting, and he thought that such matters should be left in the hands of Judges of the Supreme Court. It was simply four to three and nothing else, and the sooner the law was altered the better. His reason for taking the step he had was to bring pressure upon the House to alter the law and get matters of that kind settled by gentlemen outside Parliament altogether.

The SPEAKER said he would read what was said with reference to the matter, in the 17th clause of the Legislative Assembly Act:—

“After the appointment of the said committee every member appointed shall continue to be a member thereof until the end of that session, or until he cease to be a member of the Assembly, or unless and until the committee report that he is disabled by continued illness from attending the committee, or until the committee be dissolved as hereinafter provided, or until he resign his appointment (which he may do by letter to the Speaker), but which resignation shall not take effect until the appointment of another member in his place.” The question for the House to decide was, would the appointments be considered to take effect from the time the warrant was laid on the table, or at the expiration of three days?

Mr. MOREHEAD said it was in the power of the House to dissent from an appointment, and to displace any member whose name should be put on that warrant during that period.

The PREMIER said that was apparently the effect. The point never occurred to him before. But looking at the 15th section of the Legislative Assembly Act, it was provided:—

“In the first session of every Assembly, and within seven days after the election of a Speaker, and in every subsequent session within seven days after the commencement thereof, or in either case at any later period with the leave of the Assembly, the Speaker shall, by warrant under his hand, appoint seven members of the Assembly, against whose return no petition is then pending and none of whom is a party to any petition complaining of any election or return, to be members of a committee to be called ‘The Committee of Elections and Qualifications.’ And every such warrant shall be laid on the table of the Assembly, and, if not disapproved by the Assembly in the course of the next three days on which the Assembly meets for the despatch of business, shall take effect as an appointment of such committee.”

The warrant took effect if it was not disapproved of in three days, and it was not complete until three days had elapsed. If the warrant had the effect of displacing the resigning members before the appointment of other members in their place was complete, it might take an indefinite length

of time. The Speaker might appoint a member who was disapproved of, and another, and so on. The intention of the 17th section was that under no circumstances, except those which were inevitable, should the committee cease to consist of less than seven members. The warrant did not take effect as an appointment until it had lain on the table of the Assembly for three days.

The SPEAKER: I have brought the matter before the House so that they may express their opinion upon it. I understand that in one case the report of the committee will be completed to-morrow morning, and I will not lay my warrant on the table until to-morrow, so as not to interfere with it.

The PREMIER: It won't interfere.

Mr. HAMILTON said he did not agree with the Premier's reason for objecting to the appointment of members in the place of those who had tendered their resignation. The Premier's objection was that, as the warrant for their appointment had to lie on the table of the House for three days for approval, that at the end of that time it might not be approved, and a further delay thus occasioned. There was no chance of that occurring, because, as the Government wished these cases concluded, they would by their majority carry any nomination the Speaker might make.

Mr. ARCHER said the Act from which the hon. gentleman quoted said:—

"In the first session of every Assembly, and within seven days after the election of Speaker, and in every subsequent session within seven days after the commencement thereof, or in either case at any later period with the leave of the Assembly, the Speaker shall, by warrant under his hand, appoint seven members of the Assembly against whose return no petition is then pending, and none of whom is a party to any petition complaining of any election or return, to be members of a committee to be called 'The Committee of Elections and Qualifications.' And every such warrant shall be laid on the table of the Assembly, and if not disapproved of by the Assembly in the course of the next three days on which the Assembly meets for the despatch of business, shall take effect as an appointment of such committee."

It was perfectly clear that the appointment was made by the Speaker's warrant, and if the House disagreed with his appointment, then another member would have to be appointed. That would be a new appointment. There could not be the slightest doubt in the mind of any one reading the section, except a lawyer, that the appointment was made by the Speaker's warrant, which had to lie on the table for three days.

Mr. NORTON said it was a mere matter of common sense. He agreed with the hon. member for Blackall that the appointment was made when the Speaker laid his warrant on the table. Although a person might be appointed to an office, he might not be entitled to enter upon the duties of that office until a certain time had elapsed, but the appointment was made all the same. In this case the appointment was made when the Speaker laid his warrant on the table, but it did not take effect until a certain time had elapsed. In the event of certain circumstances happening and the appointment being disapproved by the House, a fresh appointment had to be made. To argue that the appointment did not become an appointment until the end of three days was absurd.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said it might just as well be said that if the head of a department were to nominate a person whom he intended for a certain office by submitting his name to the Cabinet, that that was an appointment, although the Government might not agree to it and the Governor might refuse to sanction it. The mere fact of the insertion of a name in a document which was necessary as the foundation of sub-

sequent action did not make it an appointment, but the action that had to be performed afterwards. He submitted that there was not the slightest ambiguity as to the meaning of the 15th section of the Act; but, even if there were, it was abundantly cleared up by sections 16 and 17. The 16th dealt with the disapproval of the warrant of appointment. It could not be a legal appointment in any sense until the three days, during which the Assembly might express disapprobation, had elapsed. To contend that the appointment took effect when the warrant was laid upon the table was so contradictory that it was absurd. One of the fundamental rules in construing Acts of Parliament was that they should never be construed either against the grammatical sense or in such a manner as to lead to absurdity; and he submitted that to construe one part of the section as being an absolute appointment as soon as the Speaker laid his warrant on the table, and the other part that it should take effect at the end of three days, made the construction of the section an absurdity, which was a thing that could never be done.

Mr. STEVENSON said hon. members opposite had evidently made up their minds that as much delay as possible should take place in the appointment of members of the committee to take the place of those just resigned; and it appeared that on his side of the House they were very much in the same position as the Elections and Qualifications Committee—that it was utterly useless trying to convince hon. members opposite by argument or in any other way. They had heard it stated by one hon. member who had resigned his seat on that committee—the hon. member for Rockhampton—that that committee was a perfect farce; that it was simply a matter of voting. But if that side of the House was in a bad position when they had three members as against four on the committee, they would be in a very much worse position when they had only one to four. He thought the House should give some expression of opinion as to whether it was judicious or proper for that committee to proceed with any more business until the new members of it could sit and act.

Mr. PERKINS said it was rather singular that so little should apparently be known about Acts of Parliament which had been passed and been in operation for so many years. It would appear that they had all been asleep, and they had now to get the meaning of those Acts from amateur lawyers and from the head of the Ministry, who put his own construction upon it. His mind was very elastic, and his conscience—if he was encumbered by one at all—did not inconvenience him in any way. It was lamentable that they should have to come to such a state of things. He was entirely disinterested himself, and it did not matter to him whether the Speaker appointed members of the committee or whether he did not, or who those members might be, because he had ceased to take any interest in the proceedings since the Speaker had made his original appointments—doubtless in obedience to instructions from the Premier. It was a lamentable spectacle that there should be a doubt about the meaning of the clause, and as to what were the functions and powers of the Elections and Qualifications Committee, or what the duration of their office might be. It seemed that two members of the committee had resigned; and as he understood the discussion which had been going on, it was as to when the new members appointed in their place would enter upon their duties. If the Speaker made the appointments that day, or if he delayed them until to-morrow, he thought the reading of the clause was plain enough, and it had been already read to the House. There might then be more than seven members on the Elections and Qualifications

Committee. The members who had resigned, according to the construction put upon the clause by some hon. members, might continue to sit on the committee, but he did not think they would, and if they did they might very justly be objected to by other members of the committee. Supposing, however, three members had resigned, and they had not a quorum, what would be their position then? It was, no doubt, evident that the members which the Speaker would appoint in lieu of those who had resigned might enter upon their duties at once, though they might, by a vote of the House, be expelled within three days from their office, and the Speaker might have to make a fresh appointment. This was the situation: The Attorney-General gave one construction, and the Premier gave another, but the matter was quite simple until the lawyers came to interfere with it, and then it got any twist or turn which suited their convenience. It was an unfortunate thing for the House and for the country that those doubts should be continually arising, and that they were to be getting opinions which were not paid for from lawyers in that House. No trust could be placed in the opinions given that evening by the Premier and the Attorney-General, because they were not paid for and were biased opinions. No doubt the Premier wanted a committee of voting machines who would carry out his intentions and inclinations, and carry out the bargain which he had before stated that hon. gentleman had made with the Speaker about two years ago to accomplish certain things. It did not matter who might be appointed to the vacant offices on the Elections and Qualifications Committee. They would be in a minority, and reason and right would have no weight whatever with a majority who knew what they were sent there to do. They had certain work to do, and the wonder to him was that they had been so mild over the business. He could not see why they had protracted their labours for such a time when they might have given a decision at once or immediately they entered upon their duties, instead of going through the farce of calling a number of witnesses. He perhaps might be allowed to express an opinion, having been present at many of the proceedings of that committee, and he could say this—

Mr. GRIMES said he rose to a question of privilege. Was it right for the hon. gentleman to divulge anything he might have heard said in that committee?

Mr. PERKINS: I have nothing to divulge about you.

The SPEAKER said the rule laid down and followed frequently was that on a motion for the adjournment of the House a member might travel over any ground. The hon. gentleman was, he thought, at liberty to state what had come to his own knowledge while referring to the proceedings of the committee.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that, speaking to the question of privilege, the hon. member for Oxley knew as well as he did that the proceedings of the committee were open to every member of the House, and if he did not know that he ought to know it.

Mr. PERKINS said he was not going to refer to the hon. member for Oxley. He did not recollect anything concerning the hon. gentleman in particular which had struck him in the proceedings of the committee; but he must say this of the chairman of that committee: while a host of witnesses were called in a certain case to prove certain allegations contained in a petition, the chairman was not content that the accuser was represented by counsel—in fact, both sides were represented by counsel—the chairman was not content to allow people to transact their

own business, but he always attempted at the close of the examination, by counsel, to weave a story together and get the witness to say "yes." A more rotten or more corrupt proceeding he had never witnessed anywhere, whether in a police court or anywhere else, in his life, than that of the chairman—who was sworn to do what was impartial and give strict justice—interfering with the witnesses on every possible occasion, and trying to direct and mislead witnesses into stating what would suit himself. From the first appointment of the committee he had known what their decision would be. It was simply a matter of so many voting machines. He had hoped that if any member of the House was questioned upon his right to sit in the House, they would be prepared to rely upon the evidence, and there would be some sense of fair play shown; but from the time he saw the chairman acting in the way he did he knew that there was no hope that either justice or impartiality was to be gained. He expressed his opinions some time ago about the Elections and Qualifications Committee, and he now wanted hon. members to read the evidence and the proceedings of the committee, though he did not know whether it was all taken down. He thought the Speaker must come to the conclusion that there could not be nine members of the committee. The gentlemen who had been appointed to act as members of the committee, and the others who might be appointed tomorrow, would make nine; and that was a thing not contemplated. He could express his entire indifference as to who might be appointed. He could only say now that a day of reckoning would come to the Premier. The hon. gentleman would reap as he had sown.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. PERKINS: There would come the harvest sooner than he expected. Sir Henry Parkes, in New South Wales, stood on a citadel a good deal stronger than that occupied by the Premier, and he tried to attain his ends by ousting certain members. He succeeded to such an extent that his position was considered unassailable, and it was thought he would keep it for seven or ten years at least. But, then, how soon he came to grief! The Premier was making use of the same levers as Sir Henry Parkes had done, but the people would awake from the dream they were indulging in. They would find out the deceit that had been practised upon them. They would find that out from the Elections and Qualifications Committee, to which the Premier and the Speaker had been parties. Had the Speaker not worked hard and talked about it two years ago, and let it be known that that was the end to be arrived at? The people of the country would see the distrust, the want of confidence, and the want of cohesion in the present crowd behind the Government. There was nothing but brag and bunkum; nothing but pandering to the crowd. The Premier had told them that he would take away the best industry from those who had it and give it to them. There were no greater sticklers for what they had than the members of the Ministry who had anything; and they wanted to stick to all they had and get more. But he had been alluding to Sir Henry Parkes. That impostor came to grief in a way that he did not expect; and the same fate awaited the Premier. His party and the people would turn round on him; they would see the frauds that were practised upon them; they would see the proceedings of the Elections and Qualifications Committee in the public prints, and they would read the evidence; and they would see all the Premier's sophistries and scheming and tricks, and his different scenery and many sides that he used. Then the hon. gentleman would come off the perch that he

had obtained by false pretences and false promises; by deceit and trickery; by roll-stuffing; by getting a lot of corrupt persons to go about and put men on the roll and take them off just as they were inclined. The people of this colony would not be ruled by sectarian differences. They would come round in two or three years and see the gross deceit that had been practised upon them, and remember the statements of the Premier, that the most notorious ruffians were in the magistracy; while at the same time that he made that statement he added to the Commission of the Peace the most notorious ruffians. That he (Mr. Perkins) could prove on the floor of that House. He had intended taking them name by name, and if he had had an opportunity, he would have named them. No consideration whatever was shown to persons qualified to fill the position, but there was simply brag and bunkum-brag like people playing poker, and saying, "I like if I make a statement to know that there is not likely to be any inquiry into it." That was the position which the hon. gentleman held. He could go into a court to plead a case; he was a good lawyer, and did his work well. It was supposed that lawyers never got paid, that they only received honorariums; but he knew they got paid, and returned their briefs when there was something better on the other side. The case of Meston against the *Zeitung* newspaper was a case in point. Lawyers were "honourable" by Act of Parliament, and they were supposed to be gentlemen; but the honour disappeared as soon as anyone had business to do with them. He had to do with one of them; and he should like to characterise him by his proper term, if he were in the House; he believed he was a cobbler one time, and drove a baker's cart. That lawyer conducted his case up to half-past 11 on Saturday, and at twenty minutes to 12 a note was received from him stating that he could not attend to any Supreme Court business in the following week. He (Mr. Perkins) happened to know that he had nothing to do that week; but he did not like the case. He knew he (Mr. Perkins) was going to win; if he had expected he would lose he would have been willing to take the case up.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Who was that?

MR. PERKINS: It was Mr. Garrick. He was a specimen of those who were called "gentlemen" by Act of Parliament. He (Mr. Perkins) would like to say a little more about his character, and about his pedigree and his antecedents, and about what he thought of the working men whom he tried to ride over now. He (Mr. Perkins) gave him as a specimen of what could be done. The judges and the jury might be right, but the lawyer might at half-past 11 get up and capsize the whole case just to suit himself. Saturday, as all knew, was a half-day, and it was impossible to negotiate with a lawyer nad get fresh counsel before 10 o'clock on Monday morning. He hoped the Premier would not get up to defend his colleague in the Upper House, because if he did he (Mr. Perkins) might have a little more to say about him, and would show that that gentleman's ill-acquired wealth was not going to enable him to override the people of Brisbane. Indeed, if the people knew a little more about him they would think a great deal less of him. That gentleman was bound in honour to return him the fees he had paid him, and to pay the expenses to which he had been put in those proceedings. Had such conduct been practised towards some persons it might have had the effect of putting them into the gutter for life. There was a peculiar trick amongst those honourable gentry, the barristers, of whom he supposed the Premier called himself the head. They wanted five or six guineas every year as a refresher. Things were very different in Vic-

toria. Mr. T. H. Fellowes was his lawyer in Melbourne for a great many years, and he gave him at the start a retaining fee of five guineas, and a refresher of only one guinea a year afterwards. But the Brisbane barristers must be refreshed with five guineas a year, and even then a client was liable to be told that somebody had retained his counsel earlier. When the Premier was his counsel he made some excuse that the *Telegraph* newspaper had retained him earlier. But on the particular occasion to which he now referred the hon. gentleman's coadjutor and colleague in the Upper House was not retained by anyone. He (Mr. Perkins) made those remarks for the information of the country. Of course they would not take away from the Premier's practice, nor did he want them to do so, because he would trust him again to-morrow in law, although his opinion of him as a statesman was quite another matter. To return to the subject more immediately before the House. The appointment and the functions of that committee were a very important matter, and he trusted the Speaker would have it carefully looked into and explained to hon. members, because it was evident they could not rely upon the explanations given by the legal gentlemen who had spoken. His own impression was that when members of the committee resigned they were at once relieved of their duties, and that immediately upon the Speaker issuing his warrant for the appointment of their successors they entered upon their duties, although, of course, they might be disqualified by the vote of the House. He again expressed a hope that the Premier would not attempt to defend his colleague in the Upper House, for if he did there would be a very long tale to tell. That gentleman had no claim to the position to which he aspired, using the people as a lever to pitchfork himself into office, not in Queensland, but in a far-off land, whither he soon intended to take wing, if he could.

MR. KELLETT said he merely wished to call attention to the very few remarks made by the last speaker on the question before the House. Those remarks were, that if the resignations of the two members was accepted, and that if the Speaker's warrant was laid on the table for the appointment of their successors, there would be nine members on the committee. That was perfectly absurd. As to the remark of the hon. member for Rockhampton, that the proceedings of the committee were a farce, he thought it about the most extraordinary statement he had ever heard in the House, and it was certainly a direct insult to the other members of the committee.

MR. ISAMBERT said the discussion reminded him of the saying, "A cobbler to his trade." For the last five years, when the party now in opposition were in power, whenever they found themselves in a corner they tried to get out of it by a side movement. They all knew by what a side movement that party got out of the difficulty of the steel rails, by which £60,000 was lost to the colony; and now, when they had got into another queer hole, they were trying to get out of it by similar means. But that had been their common practice, and it was needless to enumerate the cases, which would present themselves to every hon. member. Their action now in vilifying the Elections and Qualifications Committee was quite in keeping with their old policy. Therefore he said, "A cobbler to his trade."

Question put and negatived.

QUESTIONS.

MR. HAMILTON asked the Minister for Works—

1. Will he ascertain by wire if any of the Railway Surveys from Port Douglas to Herberton, from Cairns to Herberton, and from Mourilyan Harbour to Herberton, are completed?

2. Also, which of the above-mentioned surveys are uncompleted, and the probable length of time that will elapse before their completion?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. Miles) replied—

I have already given the hon. member all the information which the department is in possession of on this question, and I am not prepared to concede to the request made to obtain the information asked for by wire. I hope, however, to receive the report of the Chief Engineer on the subject shortly.

Mr. ISAMBERT asked the Colonial Treasurer—

Has the Manager of the Queensland National Bank, Mr. Drury, received any remuneration for his services in connection with the floating of the last Queensland loan.

The COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. J. R. Dickson) replied—

Mr. Drury has not rendered any claim in connection with the floating of the loan, and no remuneration has been paid to him.

ELECTIONS ACT OF 1874 AMENDMENT BILL—COMMITTEE.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the Speaker left the chair, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole, to consider the Legislative Council's amendments in this Bill.

The PREMIER moved that the amendment in clause 2 be agreed to. The amendment was to test *bonâ fide* residence for a period of one month. It was a very good amendment, and one that the Committee might accede to.

Mr. MACROSSAN asked if the Premier would say how he thought the amendment would operate. He knew some people were of opinion that it would operate so as to nullify the operation of the whole of the Bill. He should like the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill to tell them how the amendment would operate.

The PREMIER said the Bill as brought in was intended to prevent persons who had ceased to reside in an electoral district, and whose names were upon the roll with residence qualification, from voting under that qualification. As originally introduced, it provided that when a man ceased to be a resident he should not be entitled to a vote at all. In committee that was amended to the extent that if he had ceased to be a resident for nine months he should not be entitled to vote. The clause was then worded in this way :—

"No person whose name is entered on the roll of electors for any electoral district in respect of the qualification of residence shall be entitled to vote in respect of that qualification at any election for such district unless at some time within nine months before such election he has been actually and *bonâ fide* resident in the district."

It was pointed out that some question might arise as to what was *bonâ fide* residence, and the Legislative Council had amended the clause to the effect that *bonâ fide* residence should mean residence for a period of one month. The voter must be for one month out of the nine a *bonâ fide* resident of the district. The amendment would also operate in another way by reducing the period of absence from nine months to eight. If an elector had resided in a district up to eight months before an election, and had then gone away altogether, he would be entitled to vote. But in a case where he had been away over eight months he would not be entitled to vote. A very small number of persons were, however, likely to be affected by that.

Mr. PERKINS : Is the residence to be continuous?

Mr. MACROSSAN said the intention of the Committee in passing the clause as amended was that no man whose name was on the roll in a district should be disfranchised through merely going to another district. It was

pointed out that he could not possibly have his name put on the roll in less than six months, and probably it would take nine. The amendment of the Legislative Council reduced that time by one month. If they had increased the number of months during which the applicant might have his name put on the roll to ten, it would have left the intention of the Committee untouched. But at present it took away one month from the nine, and reduced a man's chance of getting his name on the roll to that extent. The amendment certainly operated against the intention of the Committee when the Bill left that House.

Mr. PERKINS said he had asked the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill if the residence was to be continuous, or if it might be for a few days or a week at a time.

The PREMIER : It must be continuous residence.

Mr. NORTON said, if continuous residence was meant the clause should say so, because residence was residence, whether it meant continuous or for a week or a few days at a time. He thought the amendment was a mistake altogether. There could be no doubt that what had been said by the hon. member for Townsville was quite correct—that the intention was that no man should lose his vote simply from the fact of having moved from one district to another; and nine months was fixed as a reasonable time to ensure his getting his name on the roll of the district to which he moved. As to the words "*bonâ fide*," he thought that the hon. gentleman would see that they were merely superfluous. If it was residence it was residence, and it did not matter whether it was called *bonâ fide* or not.

Mr. ARCHER said the reading of the clause itself showed that it did not mean continuous residence. It said :—

"Unless at some time within nine months before such election he has been actually and *bonâ fide* resident in the district therein for a period of one month."

It did not say "continuous."

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said there could be no doubt as to what a month meant. It meant a period of time commencing and ending at a certain specified moment or day. A calendar month—

Mr. NORTON : It does not say "calendar month."

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said the Acts Shortening Act provided that where the word "month" was used it should mean "calendar month." It would not be correct to say a period of thirty-one days was a calendar month if they took some days out of January, some out of February, others out of March, and so on. No sane man would add those days together and call them a calendar month. It must be a period of time beginning and ending where months always did begin and end.

Mr. PERKINS said, with regard to the residence being continuous, he thought no one would deny that he had a right to vote at Toowoomba, and yet he could say that during the last five or six years he had never been able to reside a month continuously at Toowoomba, although he had every desire to do so. The consequence was that, according to the interpretation put upon the clause, he would be disfranchised. He thought it would be as well to substitute twenty-eight or thirty days, so as to cover the period mentioned. It would be much better to settle the matter at once, and not have to call upon lawyers afterwards to unravel the story and tell them what it meant. He thought the Committee had a right to know what they were doing. It would be a great hardship in his own case to be disfranchised in the way he had mentioned, but he had

only put himself forward as an illustration. No doubt other hon. members could tell the same tale, and it was well to know what their qualification should be.

Mr. CHUBB said the hon. member for Townsville had taken a correct view of the case, because the clause, as it stood, took one month out of the nine. It said, "at some time within nine months." That must mean some one time, and a person to be entitled to a vote must reside a consecutive number of days amounting to a calendar month in a district. The hon. member for Aubigny had referred to the lawyers unravelling these matters, but so long as they were dealing with contested elections it was a matter that would not be determined by lawyers, but by members of the House who formed the Elections and Qualifications Committee, or by gentlemen who performed the duties of returning officers.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he could not support the Premier with regard to the amendment. He knew, as the hon. gentleman did, that the House was very jealous of its privileges and rights, and he maintained that the rights and privileges of the House had to a certain extent been interfered with by another Chamber in the present instance. If there had been any material alteration necessary in the clause he could quite understand that Chamber interfering and amending, if necessary; but the present was simply a trifling alteration of the clause as originally agreed to by the Legislative Assembly, and he should not yield one iota of the rights and powers of the House. Although legally the other Chamber might have a right to alter a Bill of that sort, still they should not tamper with it, he thought, unless some apparent blunder had been made. Hon. members would agree with him that they should not allow gentlemen in the other House to interfere in that way.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Mr. Miles): They are all new appointments.

Mr. MOREHEAD said some of them were the hon. gentleman's disappointments; but it did not matter who appointed them. If the appointments had been made by his side of the House, they were certainly showing a greater interest in the welfare of the Assembly than those who were appointed by hon. members opposite. That was not the question, however. He maintained that the man who should guard the privileges of the House was the Premier and leader of the House, and he maintained that their privileges were being infringed in the present instance by the members of the other Chamber, if not in the matter of the law, at least in that of usage; and, unless some great blunder were committed, he did not think they should accept any such amendments made by the other House.

The PREMIER said that when he saw the amendments it occurred to him to inquire if such amendments were usually made by the Legislative Council in Bills of that kind, and he addressed himself first to the circumstances attending the passing of the two Acts which the Bill before them was intended to amend. He found that in both those cases the Legislative Council made very important amendments upon the Bills as agreed to by that House. He did not think it necessary to go further than that; but he had ascertained that it was the practice of the House of Lords to amend such Bills. In one of the cases he had mentioned an amendment made by the Legislative Council imposed a new disqualification on members of the Assembly.

Mr. MACROSSAN: That should not be allowed.

The PREMIER said that it had been allowed, nevertheless, and it was the custom in Great Britain for the House of Lords to make amendments upon such Bills.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that if they went back to the history of the Reform Bill, they would find that the House of Lords had thrown it out time after time.

The PREMIER: And they amended it afterwards.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Yes, and what was the result of amending it afterwards? Did the House of Lords at home, though they had much greater privileges than the nominee Upper House they had here—did they dare now to make such amendments on a Bill? If the Premier was not going to maintain the privileges of the House, he would undertake to do it, and he would probably be better able to do it, as he had some experience of both. With all due deference to that august Chamber, the Legislative Assembly was much more calculated to pass a measure likely to do good to the country than members of the Legislative Council were. The present was a question which dealt solely with the constitution of the Legislative Assembly, and it had nothing whatever to do with the other Chamber, and they surely had the right to legislate upon matters solely concerning themselves! He could quite understand the other Chamber interfering in such a matter if they were an elective Chamber, and he might say that he would very much prefer to see the Legislative Council made an elective Chamber, though, if that were done, he did not know that any members of that body would be left. So long as they represented the people in the Assembly, it was their province and privilege to legislate as to how they were to be returned to that House, and it was not the province or privilege of the other branch of the Legislature to interfere with them in any way whatever in that matter. Whatever legal rights they might have, they were dormant, and had remained dormant, and if they were revived now it would only tend—not to damage the Legislative Assembly, but another place which should be nameless.

The PREMIER said that no one could be more conservative of the privileges of that House than he was himself. He always had been so, and he always would be so; but in this case he did not think the privileges of the House had been infringed in the slightest degree. He saw that by the very best instances he could submit—namely, the passing of the Acts which the present Bill was intended to amend.

Mr. MACROSSAN said he would leave the defence of the privileges of the House against the encroachment of the other Chamber to his hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, as that gentleman understood both Houses better than he did. What he wanted to know was, whether they should allow the other House to curtail by one month the period fixed by the Assembly as the time during which a person might be absent from a district before he lost his right to vote in it. With all deference to the Premier, who was in office when the Acts quoted by the hon. gentleman opposite were passed, he did not think he should have allowed them to be amended as they were, nor did he think there was any reason why they should now follow that example. The Assembly had defined the time during which a man might be absent from a district before he was deprived of his right to vote in it, and that had been fixed, after a good deal of discussion, at nine months, and the Council had since undertaken to reduce that period by one month. He did not think the clause should be amended in any such way. If they had made the period ten months,

it would have included the nine months proposed by the Assembly, and would not have made any difference; but the Legislative Council had not done that. They had chosen to curtail the period by a month. And he did not think that they should be permitted to make such an amendment, or that the Assembly should agree to such an amendment.

The PREMIER said he thought the amendment a good one. In the majority of cases the difference between eight and nine months would amount to very little. His own opinion was that eight months was a better period than nine, and he thought that if a man was away from a place for eight months he had certainly no right to vote in it as a resident. That was his opinion, and always had been his opinion.

Mr. MACROSSAN said the hon. gentleman had missed the object which the Committee had in fixing the time at nine months. That object was that a man should be allowed a sufficient time to be absent from a district in which his name was on the roll to get his name on the roll for the other district, in order that he might be able to vote when an election came on. The Committee of that House had come to the conclusion that nine months was the shortest period during which that could be done. The other Chamber had reduced that period by one month, and consequently there was one month during which an elector might be deprived of his vote if an election took place at that time. The hon. gentleman probably thought it was no great hardship that a man should be deprived of a vote, but he (Mr. Macrossan) remembered elections where it had been considered a hardship. He had known men deprived of their votes, and they looked at the matter very seriously. He had been deprived of a vote before now himself, and he had considered it a serious matter; and attempts had been made since then to deprive him of his vote, which he certainly objected to. He thought the hon. gentleman had made a mistake in moving that the amendment be agreed to.

The PREMIER said it would not probably affect more than ten people in the whole colony—just the people who happened to have been absent between eight months and nine months when an election came on; but how often would that happen on the doctrine of chances? The thing was not worth discussing. He thought the amendment was a good one.

Mr. MACROSSAN said it affected the unsettled population, which was very numerous. Nearly one-sixth of the people of the colony were unsettled, and it would affect them. That would certainly be more than ten people in the whole of Queensland.

Mr. NORTON said he thought if it affected only ten people, it should not be agreed to. He did not see why those ten people should be deprived of their votes any more than a hundred. If a man was out of his district three or four days, he ceased to be a resident according to the proposal—although for all practical purposes he was a resident—and he would be disqualified; of course, it applied only to men of migratory habits.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that, to show what the leader of the Government in the other House thought of the amendment, he would read what he said on the 12th February:—

“The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said if they really wanted to reject the Bill the way would be to amend it and send it back, for he was quite sure the amendments would not be accepted.”

He thought that they should not, at any rate, accept that amendment. He contended that whatever hon. gentlemen opposite might think

of the privileges of that House, they were neglecting their duties in not insisting that the Bill, which was considered in the Assembly, should not be tinkered with by the other branch of the Legislature. If the Premier and those who sat with him thought that that branch of the Legislature was justified in interfering with the Bill in that way, let the unfortunate precedent be cast upon the hon. gentleman and those who supported him. It had been pointed out to him that the Hon. Mr. Mein, who would be admitted by every hon. member to be an authority on these matters, said in the other Chamber, in replying to Mr. Walsh:—

“He had taken a prominent part in the discussion on the Electoral Rolls Act; but for all that he could not admit that two wrongs made a right, and he contended that they had no business to alter the measure.”

The Hon. Mr. Mein did not assert that they had no right, nor was the right denied by any member in the Assembly, but it was a right which had never been used by the other House.

The PREMIER: Yes, in two instances, both affecting these Acts.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he did not care if there were two dozen instances. He thought it was a mistake that, in a matter affecting the construction of this Chamber, the Upper House, which was purely a nominee Chamber, should have any right whatever to interfere with the Bill, except to correct some glaring mistake. He should therefore move that the amendments be disagreed with.

The PREMIER: They can be negatived.

Question put, and the Committee divided as follows:—

AYES, 21.

Messrs. Griffith, Rutledge, Miles, Dickson, Dutton Sheridan, Foote, White, Midgley, Bailey, Beattie, Higson, Macfarlane, Salkeld, Horwitz, Isambert, Mellor, Jordan, Buckland, Aland, and Kates.

NOES, 16.

Messrs. Norton, Morehead, Archer, Chubb, Hamilton, Black, Palmer, Macrossan, Perkins, Lissner, Ferguson, Jessop, Nelson, Lalor, Scott, and Moreton.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

The PREMIER moved that the Legislative Council's amendment in clause 3—namely, after the word “resident,” insert the words, “for a period of one month”—be agreed to.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he really thought the Premier should give the Committee some reasons why they should accept the amendment before the motion was allowed to pass. Were they to have measures affecting the constitution of the Assembly amended by the Council, and then to have those amendments forced upon them without any word from the Premier? Was the Premier going to surrender the rights of the Assembly to the other Chamber—to those stern, grey-bearded men whom he saw now sitting just outside the bar? The hon. gentleman would be wanting in his duty, not only as Premier, but as a member of the House, if he failed to defend the privileges of the Assembly against the encroachments of the other Chamber.

The PREMIER said he did not defend the privileges of the Assembly, for the simple reason that he did not think they had been invaded.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Your colleague in the Upper House says so.

The PREMIER said he had not had an opportunity of consulting his colleague on the subject since the amendments were made. In 1874 the Elections Bill was in charge of Mr. Macalister, one of the most experienced politicians who ever led the House, and who always jealously maintained the privileges of the Assembly. Mr. Macalister allowed that Bill to be altered in the Upper House by the insertion of quite a new disqualification of members of

the Lower House. In 1879, when Sir Thomas McIlwraith was Premier, a Bill to amend that Act was introduced by Sir Arthur Palmer, one of the stoutest defenders of the privileges of the Assembly, and that Bill was allowed to be amended by the Upper House without a protest. That showed that the Council were strictly within, perhaps not their right, but their province, in making amendments in Bills which specially dealt with the constitution of the Assembly. Besides, it was the practice in the House of Commons to allow amendments of that kind.

Question put and passed.

The PREMIER moved that the Legislative Council's amendment in clause 6—namely, omit the words "Specify the age of the claimant," and insert the words "State that the claimant is of the age of twenty-one years"—be agreed to. He approved of the amendment, because, so long as a man had attained his majority, it did not matter whether he was twenty-one or eighty-one years of age.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the hon. gentleman seemed prepared to swallow anything, and was now submitting to the correcting rod of the Upper House, after having been smartly corrected in the Lower. But as the hon. gentleman had made his bed so he must lie.

The PREMIER said he was always glad to receive amendments from any source, and he thought the amendments made in the Upper House had improved the Bill now before them.

Question put and passed.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the CHAIRMAN left the chair, and reported to the House that the Committee had agreed to the amendments of the Legislative Council.

The report was adopted, and the Bill ordered to be returned to the Legislative Council, with a message intimating that the House had accepted its amendments.

AUDITOR-GENERAL (SALARY) BILL—COMMITTEE.

On the motion of the COLONIAL TREASURER, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider this Bill.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that, in moving the second reading of the Bill, he had explained the object of it very fully, and he did not know of any further information that he need supply. He then stated, what he might repeat in that Committee, that had it been possible to introduce the proposed increase of salary in the ordinary Estimates he would have done so; but hon. members were aware that special legislation was required. The necessities of the case and the merits of the officer were, he thought, sufficient to justify him at present in merely referring to it. He trusted that hon. members would consider the onerous duties performed by the gentleman, and the very conscientious way in which those duties were always performed; and, seeing that they were happily in a position to give increased salaries to other officers whose cases would come on in the Estimates-in-Chief, he asked the permission of the Committee to increase the salary of the officer in question.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he should certainly oppose the passing of the clause, and should do so for several reasons. The first was that he thought the Auditor-General was very well paid at present, and that, in spite of the statements made that he had been so many years in the Government service, he had received very good pay all the time he had been there. He went in almost at the top of the tree. He had never had to do any subordinate work whatever,

and up to the present he had had a very large salary, which perhaps he had earned. He would also point out that Mr. Drew had got a very happy way of fastening his relatives on to the Civil Service of the colony. He had a memorandum made up which showed that Mr. Drew and his relatives and belongings drew from the Treasury of the colony the sum of £1,585 per annum. That was not at all bad for the Auditor-General and his hangers-on to get out of the colony. There was not the least doubt about it that that gentleman had taken the position of a partisan. He did not think that would be denied even by the Colonial Treasurer. At any rate, the hon. gentleman's denial did not affect the truth of his statement. Mr. Drew had taken, he said without fear of contradiction, the position of a partisan, and his objection to the increase of salary was not so much that the Auditor-General should not be paid £1,000 a year, but that the £200 extra should be given as a reward to Mr. Drew for his past services, and as a premium to induce him to take the part of a partisan, as being under an obligation to that party which gave him the increase of salary. He held that the position taken up by Mr. Drew had been a highly improper one, having regard to the position that he occupied in the State. He was a servant of the State, and was supposed to be perfectly unbiassed, and to serve out equal justice to all and every one that he had to deal with. As regarded the management of his department, he had a word to say about that. He maintained that the department was managed in a very extraordinary way, and a way which showed an immense amount of favouritism. For instance, his head clerk—as he thought he was called—he did not know what his title was;—Mr. Horstmann—was down for an increase of salary. He had been told, upon what he believed to be undoubted authority—if his authority was incorrect he should submit to correction by whoever might be in a position to refute what he had to say—but he had been told that Mr. Horstmann did an immense amount of private work, for which he received a considerable amount of remuneration. He was accountant for a very large number of estates, and took advantage of his month's leave of absence, which he had regularly every year, to wind up the accounts of those estates which he had been keeping up to that period. He always adjusted his leave so as to allow it to fit in with the yearly balances of those estates. He was also informed that Mr. Horstmann was in the habit of very often leaving the office—that he was very often absent from his office for a day or two at a time, attending to private business. He maintained that Mr. Drew, knowing that, should have put a stop to it. It had been going on for years, and it was no new mode of action on the part of Mr. Horstmann. If Mr. Drew knew that, he was acting improperly in his position as Auditor-General, and yet he had reason to believe that every year he recommended that that same Mr. Horstmann should receive an increase of salary. He had not heard from the Treasurer any full and sufficient reason why Mr. Drew's salary should be increased in the way it had been proposed. Mr. Drew had taken upon himself to adopt, amongst other things, a perfectly different position as Auditor-General in regard to the Under Secretary of the Treasury, than that he took up when he was Under Secretary for the Treasury and Mr. Darvall was Auditor-General. That was the opinion of many members of the Committee. Mr. Drew was going to ride a very high horse. If the Government could show them why Mr. Drew should be paid the same salary as Cabinet Ministers, or the Speaker of that House, or the President of the Council were paid—if he

could show any reason why he should receive more than any official occupying his position should be paid, he could understand the Government bringing down the Bill. It had been stated on a previous occasion that Mr. Tully was paid, as Surveyor-General, £1,000 a year, the sum proposed to be paid to Mr. Drew; but the positions were very different. There was of parallel between the two cases. Mr. Tully must of necessity, from the nature of the position he held, be a gentleman of high scientific attainments, as every hon. member knew he was; but that was not absolutely necessary in the case of Mr. Drew, because, as he (Mr. Morehead) said before, his scientific attainments consisted of one of three or four things. He had been paymaster, or assistant paymaster, in the navy; he had been a clerk in a bank; he had been Under Secretary to the Treasury, and he was the correspondent of a newspaper, and Auditor-General. Those were his various qualifications. He did not think any analogy could be drawn between the two positions. The Surveyor-General must, as he had said, possess high scientific attainments, while the Auditor-General need not be much better—as he believed Mr. Drew was not—than a skilful manipulator of figures, and apparently the author of letters in the *Courier*, and also of highly coloured disingenuous reports which he issued from time to time. Those appeared to be the only qualifications Mr. Drew possessed. And he thought the Committee could fairly see that the attempt to draw a comparison between the Surveyor-General and the Auditor-General was not tenable. It had been said that the Auditor-General of New South Wales, until lately—he did not know whether the office was still occupied by Mr. Rolleston, a Civil servant of the highest character; no gentleman throughout the colonies, either as a private individual or as an official, stood higher, not only in New South Wales but also in Queensland, than Christopher Rolleston;—it had been said that he received £900 a year, and that there was another £100 a year granted, which he refused to accept. But no comparison existed between Mr. Rolleston and Mr. Drew. Mr. Rolleston, in 1881 or 1882, had served the colony for forty-two or forty-three years, having risen to the top of the tree. Mr. Drew had served considerably less than half that time, and commenced, so to speak, at the top of the tree. He therefore asked the Committee to consider whether they were justified in giving this very large salary of £1,000 a year to an officer who had only served half the time that a man in a somewhat similar position had served, and the duties of the offices being not comparable, as far as work or services were concerned. Before they assented to such a large increase they should have very good and sufficient reasons given for it. Those reasons, he maintained, had not been given up to the present time; and having regard to the comparatively small salaries paid to gentlemen who occupied positions of equal importance, the sum asked for was too much, unless the Government were prepared to advance other salaries in proportion. He maintained that the office lately held by the hon. member for South Brisbane, that of Registrar-General, was quite as important, if not more—in fact, he held it to be more important than that of Auditor-General. The salary for that was £700, and as far as they could judge from the Estimates there was no intention to increase it. Then another office—which the hon. member for Maryborough knew the responsibilities of and the ability necessary to fill it properly—that of the Collector of Customs, got only £700 a year. Under all the circumstances he did not see why they should be asked to give Mr. Drew £1,000. He had mentioned only two cases,

but he could mention many more who were in receipt of lesser emoluments. He could only imagine that this increase was being given as a reward for services performed by the Auditor-General; and he was perfectly certain that not in all the records of Parliaments in Australia could such a charge be levelled against any Auditor-General in any of the colonies as could be fairly and justly levelled against the head of the Auditor-General of this colony. He said the very fact of such a charge—which, he believed, could be incontestably proved—that he was in the habit of corresponding with newspapers, and abusing the Government of the day or any Ministry, no matter what—the very fact of his doing so was unprecedented in the action of any Auditor-General throughout the colonies, and it led one to believe that this increase of salary was intended as a reward for political services, and a bribe for future assistance to the Government. That was the construction put upon it by many, not only inside but outside the House; and in view of those things he should be failing in his duty if he did not enter his protest and do all he could to prevent this increase of salary. He protested against it as an injustice to many other Civil servants as not having been earned, as one for which no justifiable claim had been proved by those who had introduced the Bill, and he protested against it as being given in the way of a bribe to an official who had degraded the high office which he now held.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said, in dealing with the hon. gentleman's remarks, he should refer first to that part of them in which he said that this increase was given as a reward for political services or partisanship. If he thought it was looked upon for one moment in that light he should be the last man in the Committee to recommend it. He trusted that the Auditor-General of this colony would never become a political partisan; but he did not think that because an Auditor-General, in framing his reports for Parliament, expressed his own views boldly and fearlessly as to the custodianship of public moneys, it could be construed into a charge of partisanship. With regard to the charge of being a newspaper correspondent—he knew nothing about it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You don't want to know.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: He hardly thought the Auditor-General would be so imprudent as to write in terms of abuse of the Government, and if he did so, it was very indiscreet.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He has done so.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had heard nothing to warrant the assertion beyond the hon. member's word, and he could not believe that Mr. Drew would be guilty of such a grave indiscretion. That was not before them now. He maintained that so far from the reports furnished by the Auditor-General from time to time being frivolous or unworthy of being framed by that officer, they were very carefully prepared statements, expressing the opinion of the Auditor-General upon the manner in which the public moneys of the colony were dealt with. If that was a crime, he hoped it was a crime that would attach to all successive Auditors-General. A man holding that high position, representing not a department, but the Parliament—need not necessarily be loyal to Ministers. He had a far graver and responsible duty—to be loyal to Parliament, and to the country; and he trusted that successive Auditors-General would be found fearlessly performing their duties in that respect, and pointing out what they thought should be pointed out concerning the manner

in which the public funds of the colony were from time to time lodged on deposit. Hon. gentlemen could not say that anything in that gentleman's official reports of Parliament should call down upon him the indignation of the other side of the Committee, or sustain the accusation made against him of being a political partisan. He (Mr. Dickson) distinctly disclaimed bringing in the Bill as a reward for political services. If the circumstances of the colony did not justify increases, such as had been recently made in the Civil Service, and such as the Committee would shortly be asked to approve of, he would not at the present time have introduced the Bill to increase the salary of the Auditor-General. At the same time, he would say that an increase to that gentleman's salary was amongst the very first which the Committee should ratify and sanction, because, in his opinion, the office of the Auditor-General was the most responsible and important position in the Civil Service, and the occupant of it should be placed beyond any pecuniary necessities. He was debarred from receiving extraneous emoluments coming to gentlemen holding directorships and other similar offices of responsibility; and when he had shown the Committee further that Mr. Drew was actually receiving less at the present time than he had when he entered the office of the Auditor-General, he thought he had fairly urged that gentleman's claim to consideration. The hon. member for Balcombe had stated that Mr. Drew was continuously receiving that salary—£800—from the Treasury. That was not a fact. Mr. Drew entered the Service in 1862, and had consequently been twenty-two years in the Service. In 1873, he thought—at any rate, for three years before leaving the Treasury—Mr. Drew's salary was £850 per annum—£700 from the Treasury, £100 as Commissioner for the Savings Bank, and £50 from another appointment. When he entered the Auditor-General's Office he was receiving £850 per annum, and he had since been receiving only £800. So that, although he had been promoted to a position of increased responsibility, the salary allowed him was diminished. It was certainly never intended that by his advancement to the office of Auditor-General he should be a pecuniary loser, and he did not think that hon. members opposite would affirm that by promotion an officer of the Public Service should sustain a loss of income with increased responsibility. It had been always understood that, when the circumstances of the colony justified it, an increase of salary would be awarded the Auditor-General. The consideration of the matter had been delayed in 1873 and 1879, when, in consequence of bad times, no salaries were increased. When the season of depression was over, the matter of an increase to the Auditor-General's salary was still delayed, and his claim apparently had been simply held over, though he could not see why the late Government should have thought it wise to hold it over when they had not only given increases to other officers, but had made some of those increases retrospective for as much as twelve or eighteen months. The Auditor-General, as he had already explained, was in such a position that he must apply to Parliament for the consideration of his claim.

MR. ARCHER: What increases were retrospective?

THE COLONIAL TREASURER said that the increase to the Commissioner for Railways was one. That dated back to June, 1882, though it had never yet been sanctioned by the House. Although the salary appeared on the Estimates at £900 per annum, his salary had been increased to £1,000 per annum, and had been drawn at that rate since June, 1882. The present Government did not intend to deal with

the Auditor-General's salary in that manner; they considered it a question for Parliament to decide, and unless Parliament decided in the affirmative they did not intend to grant the increase by Executive authority, though he considered that gentleman was justly entitled to it. The revenue and expenditure of the colony had largely increased, and the duties of the Auditor-General had also increased, and since the introduction and passing of the Divisional Boards Act the work of the Auditor-General had been added to very largely. An hon. member, on the second reading of the Bill, said the duties of the Auditor-General in New South Wales were far greater than in Queensland, but he thought that hon. member must be labouring under a misconception. They had a great many more departments and a great deal more official work to accomplish in this colony than in New South Wales. He knew that the transactions of some of the other colonies were a great deal larger than those of Queensland, but hon. members were aware that the work was not necessarily heavier because the amounts were greater. The Auditor-General of New South Wales was rewarded for his services at the rate of £900 a year; but the circumstances under which he was paid were different from those existing here. His salary was fixed by statute at £900, and it was customary to vote on the annual Estimates an additional £100. The present Auditor-General there drew the £900 only because his personal needs enabled him to dispense with the additional £100. He (Mr. Dickson) had seen a letter in that gentleman's own handwriting to the effect that his personal needs did not warrant him in drawing the additional amount from the Treasury. But what did they find in the other colonies? In South Australia there were two Audit Commissioners who did the work of the Auditor-General here, and they each received £1,000 per annum. In Victoria there were three, each drawing £1,000 a year. In New Zealand the Auditor-General got £1,000 a year, and there was a Deputy Auditor-General drawing £800 annually. He might say that he was convinced that the duties of the Service in Queensland were far more extensive and elaborate than in South Australia, and he believed that they involved greater care and a larger responsibility than the same duties in New South Wales. He was constrained also to say this: that he deprecated anything like a comparison being made between individual officers in the Civil Service, but after what had been said on the other side he felt quite justified in expressing his belief that in every respect Mr. Drew was quite as able and competent a man as any other gentleman in the Service, no matter whether it was Mr. Tully or anyone else. He believed that had Mr. Drew never entered the Civil Service, but remained connected with banking institutions, as the manager of a bank, he would be receiving a far larger amount of salary in such a position than he was receiving at the present time. He could say, also, that Mr. Drew had received many personal applications requesting him to leave the Service and enter banking institutions. Would any hon. gentleman tell him that a bank manager, even in Brisbane, where there were not many head offices, would consider £1,000 per annum a liberal allowance? He did not think so; therefore he contended that an able officer like Mr. Drew, who had devoted his life to the public, was entitled to receive reasonable remuneration. He (Mr. Dickson) did not care to enter into the question of the relatives that Mr. Drew had in the Public Service. He might have some relatives there; but he had never tried to introduce any into the Treasury. In the Savings Bank there was a junior clerk who was a relative of Mr. Drew's,

but he was there simply on his own merits. He (Mr. Dickson) did not think the insinuations made by the hon. member for Balonne were at all justified. If Mr. Drew had relatives in the Public Service, they were there entirely on their own merits. A question arose on the second reading of the Bill concerning employees in the Audit Office, and it was complained by hon. gentlemen opposite that Mr. Drew had shown neglect in allowing them to perform duties outside office hours. He had thought it his duty to communicate with Mr. Drew and learn from him why he had not given effect to the instructions made by his predecessors on that subject. Before he read Mr. Drew's reply he might say that he was aware some years ago that Mr. Horstmann was frequently applied to to prepare some intricate forms—namely, average statements in connection with marine insurance. It required the services of a professionally trained accountant to draw up a statement of the proportion of loss to be borne by owners and consignees when a ship's cargo was damaged. At that time there were very few skilled accountants in Brisbane who were acquainted with that particular work, and in fact there were very few at the present time; and consequently Mr. Horstmann, who had had a professional training, was applied to by merchants and others to prepare those statements, and he had been of great benefit to the community. The work was performed outside office hours, and no loss was sustained by the State. He understood also that some years ago Mr. Horstmann administered the property of a gentleman of high position here, but that the administration had recently ceased on account of the death of the proprietor. That, therefore, was hardly sufficient ground for charging the Auditor-General with neglecting his duty. He would now read the reply that the Auditor-General sent to him:—

“Audit Department, Queensland,
“Brisbane, 14th February, 1884.

“SIR,—In reply to your inquiries—

“1. With reference to certain statements made by the late Colonial Treasurer, Mr. Archer—when the Auditor-General (Salary) Bill was under consideration—to the effect that complaints had been made to him again and again, when in office, that officers in this department were receiving large sums of money for work done by them after office hours, in the face of an express Executive minute to the contrary, I think it right, as the same question is not unlikely to again arise, to formally address you on the subject.

“2. In the first place, I was unaware, until the present time, that any complaints of the nature referred to, with regard to Audit officials, had ever been made to Mr. Archer; he certainly never advised me that such was the case, nor did he ever communicate with me upon the subject, directly or indirectly.

“3. With respect to the Executive instructions referred to, which are assumed to preclude officers from employing their time, after office hours, in private work, I think Mr. Archer has been misinformed. The only regulations or instructions which I am acquainted with are those contained in *Gazette* Notice dated the 12th July, 1872, prohibiting officers from becoming directors, etc., in public companies. Even this regulation has been allowed to become almost if not altogether inoperative. The late Auditor-General was a director of more than one company, until the passing of the present Audit Act in 1874. The late Collector of Customs always retained his directorships.

“4. Mr. Herbert, when Colonial Secretary, endeavoured to deal with the subject, but after due consideration refrained from taking any action, on the ground that the proposed regulation would press unequally on the officers of the Service, the industrious and intelligent minority being alone affected; and that it would be hard to debar them from profitable employment within reasonable bounds in their leisure hours.

“5. The question was subsequently taken up by Mr. Heenan when at the Treasury, towards the end of 1874. I was Under Secretary at the time, and know that he was most anxious to frame some regulation upon the subject, but found it impossible as expressed by himself to lay down any absolute rule affecting the

manner in which Civil servants shall employ their own time. I have been quite recently informed, and Mr. Archer himself has stated in the House, that he also had the matter under consideration, with, as I am advised, a precisely similar result.

“6. In the face of the foregoing, and seeing that Ministry after Ministry have had the matter under consideration, but have refrained from passing any regulation for the guidance of Civil servants generally, I respectfully submit that even if it is not, as I believe it to be, absolutely beyond my legitimate power to interfere with any officer under me as to the manner in which he employs his own time (so long as he does nothing to bring discredit upon the office or the Public Service), it would be manifestly unjust to endeavour to place an irksome restriction upon Audit officials which does not apply to the Public Service generally.

“7. Personally, as you are aware, I am adverse to officers in the Public Service competing in any way with those who are endeavouring to earn a living outside the Service. I object, on principle, to the payment even of overtime for clerical work by the Government departments, except in very special cases, such as to the Savings Bank officials at balancing time, etc. I have never paid overtime to any officer, either at the Treasury or in this department. Much, however, as I should like to see these matters definitely settled, I believe it to be impossible to frame any satisfactory regulations for definitely deciding what public officials may or may not do after business hours.

“I have, etc.,

“W. L. G. DREW.

“Auditor-General.

“The Honourable the Colonial Treasurer.”

He had read that to show that no instructions were issued by his predecessors—as would be inferred from the speeches made by the hon. member for Balonne and the hon. member for Blackall. He trusted that in time the present Government would be able to frame a new Civil Service Act, and in dealing with that he took it that the duties and privileges of all officers in the Civil Service could be strictly defined and regulated. He thought he had shown sufficient reason to justify him in asking on behalf of Parliament—not on behalf of any department—for an increase of salary to one of the best officers of Parliament. He had pointed out, without wishing to enter into a comparison of the talents of the Auditor-General, the Surveyor-General, and other officers in the Government Service, that the ability shown by the Auditor-General in the discharge of his duties was such as would have secured to him, had he chosen to remain connected with banking, a much better position than he had attained to in the Government Service.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I am sure it would not.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he was convinced, with all respect to the opinion held by the hon. member for Balonne, that if Mr. Drew had chosen to remain connected with banking institutions, he would have secured a much better position than he now occupied. He maintained that the Auditor-General of Queensland ought to occupy a position equal, if not superior, to that of manager of any of the banks doing business in the colony. He had also shown that the statement made by the hon. member for Balonne, that Mr. Drew had received his present salary since he entered the Public Service in 1862, was not correct.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I never made any such statement. What I said was that Mr. Drew entered the Service at the top of the tree—not that he was receiving the same salary as he is getting now, for I knew he was not.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he understood the hon. gentleman to say so, but he of course accepted the disclaimer. In 1862, Mr. Drew entered the Service as head of his department, because his abilities entitled him to that position. Up to 1874 Mr. Drew received £600 a year, and in 1875 he was paid £700 as Under Secretary

to the Treasury. But it could not be contradicted that in 1875 Mr. Drew was receiving a larger income, as Under Secretary to the Treasury, by £50, than he was receiving in 1884 as Auditor-General; and that larger amount was now being drawn by his successor in office at the Treasury. The leader of the Opposition had stated his case temperately and fairly, and he ventured to express a hope that hon. gentlemen on the other side would not consider the question as a political question. If the Bill passed through committee the Auditor-General would have to thank Parliament for the increase. It was not a reward given by the Government, for the Government did not recognise any political services rendered. He disclaimed strenuously the accusation that Mr. Drew was a Government partisan. Mr. Drew had spoken out boldly and manfully upon what he conceived to be an undesirable investment or disposal of Government money, as he had a perfect right to do. It would be a graceful act on the part of the Opposition to let the Bill pass almost without dissent, and it would be looked upon by Mr. Drew as a recognition by Parliament of long and faithful services. That would be a suitable way of rewarding the services of an officer of Parliament who had received less encouragement, less substantial reward, than any other Civil servant during the last ten years.

Mr. ARCHER said that before entering into the merits of the question he wished to correct a misstatement he had made on the second reading of the Bill. On that occasion he stated that there was an Executive minute ordering that Civil servants should not be employed outside the departments. Since then he had ascertained that that statement was not exactly correct. What the minute really stated was that no Civil servants should be directors of companies. He had said on the second reading that he saw no reason why the Auditor-General's salary should be increased. He looked upon it that the remuneration of a Civil servant depended upon the responsibility which the administration of his office entailed; and several of the under secretaries had far more responsible duties to perform, a far larger office to conduct, and infinitely more work to do than the Auditor-General. It had been stated by the Colonial Treasurer that the work of the department had greatly increased of late years; but it did not follow that any additional work had fallen to the Auditor-General. It would fall upon the clerks in the office. Neither did he think that either the responsibility or the amount of work in the Auditor-General's department was so great as that which fell to the lot of the Under Secretary to the Treasury especially—who dealt with all the finances of the country—or the Under Secretary for Lands, or some other heads of departments whom he could name. He did not therefore see that, as far as work and responsibility were concerned, the Auditor-General had any claim to higher remuneration than the under secretaries had. The most extraordinary argument brought forward by the Colonial Treasurer was that a person in the responsible position of the Auditor-General ought to be relieved from all anxiety as to his means of living. He had never heard of anything more extraordinary. The poorest clerk in a bank had far greater opportunities of robbing his employers than the Auditor-General had. No money passed through the hands of the Auditor-General, and anxiety for the future could only mean a temptation to commit fraud to supply himself with funds which were not supplied to him by Parliament. The thing was altogether too absurd. The first duty of a man was to live within his income, and a great many men could live on £800 a year without

complaining a bit. Anxiety for a man's future did not depend upon the salary he received, but upon the style in which he lived. The first duty of a man was to live within his income, and the Auditor-General had to do so as well as other people. He would never for a moment have thought of accusing Mr. Drew of being connected with fraud; but the Treasurer suggested that, when he spoke of removing pecuniary anxiety. He considered that everyone through whose hands money actually passed was far more subject to temptation than an auditor was, and he had a better means of gratifying that temptation. He did not think that ought to have been advanced as one of the reasons why they should increase the salary of the Auditor-General. Another matter to which the Treasurer referred was that the Auditor-General of New South Wales had private means. In what way did that refer to a matter of this kind? It had not the slightest bearing on the subject. There were some hon. gentlemen in that Committee who had private means who could afford to come and attend to the business of the House, while there were others to whom it was now a case of hardship to be spending money to perform duties, which they could ill afford. Private means had nothing to do with the Civil Service. If a man had private means, so much the better for him; but certainly they had nothing to do with taking into consideration what private means a man might or might not have. It was utterly outside the question, and therefore he failed to see how the long argument the hon. Treasurer used really affected the case at all. Another thing was that the hon. Treasurer said that the Auditor-General was a good financier. He (Mr. Archer) doubted it very much; he believed he was an exceedingly bad one. But that did not matter one bit. He believed he was a good accountant. He believed that the Auditor-General once, when he was Under Secretary for the Treasury, had an opportunity of advising the then Treasurer (the late Sir J. P. Bell), to do something in the matter of finance which certainly did not redound to his credit as a financier. Besides, finance was a matter upon which no two people could agree. Finance was a science which had nothing to do with an actuary or auditor, whose business was simply to see that figures were rightly added, and that vouchers were produced for all expenditure. A financier was a man who had studied finance, and could give advice. But the Auditor-General had nothing to do with that. The only occasion on which he had done it was when Sir J. P. Bell was Treasurer, and he did not think that the advice he then gave, and which, he was told, Sir Joshua Peter Bell followed, redounded to his credit. Nor was it necessary that he should be a financier. At all events, if he was a financier, the only means by which they could decide that was by means of his publications in the newspapers—as a newspaper correspondent. As he had said, he had made a mistake the other evening. He said that he believed that Mr. Drew was not only a newspaper correspondent, but that for the purpose of gratifying his own vanity, or seeing a report in the papers a little earlier, he furnished the papers with his report before the members of the House had it. He knew that he saw a leading article in the *Courier* about the Auditor-General's report two days before he had the report in his (Mr. Archer's) hands. He considered that that was a breach of the privilege of the House. He believed that the Auditor-General was honest, so far as honesty went; but would that gentleman as frankly admit that he had made a mistake as he (Mr. Archer) had? He had never admitted that it was he who gave that paper to the *Courier*.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Who—the Auditor-General?

Mr. ARCHER said that he had stated on the second reading of the Bill that, unless the Auditor-General gave his word of honour that he did not furnish the report to the papers, he would believe he did give it before it was furnished to members of the House, or at the same time, at all events. Was that gentleman honest enough to admit he had made a mistake, as he (Mr. Archer) had done? Not he; he was one of those men who was too proud to own he had made a mistake. He had got that insane vanity which made him think that he could not make a mistake, and that was one great objection that he had to him. It was not that he was not a good auditor, or that he did not see that the work of his office was carried on properly. He did all that. But, to use a mild term, he did not believe he was loyal. He was a newspaper correspondent, and took advantage of the office he filled to put before the public statements that suited his own views, while he should never write to the papers at all. The hon. Premier asked them not to make it a political question. He certainly did not intend to do so. He only stated the reason why he thought that the Auditor-General was well enough paid, and that other men in the Government service performed functions more onerous and had far greater responsibility, and that they should certainly be as well paid as the Auditor-General. It was neither a political question nor was it a constitutional question. As he said on the second reading of the Bill, he would oppose it to the best of his power. It was not a constitutional question which he thought he should persistently oppose; but he did not think he would be justified in detaining the Committee by any factious opposition. He could only sever himself completely from it, and say that the gentleman who filled the office did not deserve the high encomiums that had been spoken of him by the hon. Treasurer, and that in several ways he failed to meet the dignity of the office. He should oppose the clause because he thought that the increase was unearned, because the Auditor-General did things that he ought not to do, and chiefly because he believed he was not loyal. The hon. Treasurer had said that the gentleman would have received a far higher salary in a bank. Why did he not go into a bank? It was too absurd to bring that matter before the Committee. If a man mistook his vocation, was that a matter for them to consider? He did not think the Auditor-General's qualities were such as would make him a good banker, but that was nothing to do with them; to say that if he had remained in a banking establishment he would have got a higher salary than he now received, had nothing at all to do with the question. He (Mr. Archer) might have been a very wealthy man if he had taken some other line of life than he did; but the State had nothing to do with that. To bring such arguments before the Committee showed that the hon. the Treasurer was driven to try very peculiar ways of defending the Bill.

Mr. STEVENSON said he had not intended to speak on the Bill until he heard some remarks from the hon. the Treasurer, which ought to be taken notice of. The hon. gentleman said distinctly that this gentleman should have some reward. Now the word "reward" to him always meant that some special service had been performed in the past, and that some special gift should be given for it. He therefore thought the hon. the Treasurer had made a great mistake in bringing forward this increase to the salary of the Auditor-General as a reward. Was not every Civil servant in the employment

of the Government supposed to do his duty to the best of his ability? He got his salary for that; and why a Bill should be brought in to give a reward to a gentleman who was only supposed to do his duty, and had been paid for it, he did not know. They could only come to the conclusion that some special service had been performed by the Auditor-General. What was that special service? Was it something political? It must be that his reports had tended to be more favourable to the party now in power than to the present Opposition. He could only come to that conclusion from what the hon. the Colonial Treasurer had said; and that was no ground why the salary should be increased. He did not say for one moment that the Auditor-General's salary ought not to be increased. He knew very little about the work that officer had to do, but he held that no sufficient reason had been shown why the Bill should be passed. The Auditor-General had entered into an agreement with the Government to do certain services for certain payment, which he had received; and he did not see why in the world that officer should be brought before the House as a gentleman to be rewarded for past services. He thought the haste displayed by the hon. the Treasurer in bringing the matter before the House showed him that there was some special services to the hon. gentleman or his party for which the Auditor-General was to be rewarded. He had no doubt that the Auditor-General had helped the hon. the Treasurer to make up his financial statements: he had made up his reports in such a way as to put the Opposition side of the House as much as possible in the shade, and to try and represent the other side in a more favourable light. He believed that that was the reason why the Bill had been brought in. He held that the Auditor-General as Auditor-General had certain duties to perform, and that no reward ought to be given for past services. He had been paid for them. He believed that that officer had been very well paid for his services for many years. He was thrust into a position that gave him a very large salary, even at the very commencement of his career as a Civil servant in this colony. The hon. the Colonial Treasurer had told them that the Auditor-General could have made more money had he remained in the bank, because he would have been sure to get the management of a branch bank, which would have brought him in more money than he was earning at the present time, or even than it was proposed to give him under the Bill. Now, he (Mr. Stevenson) did not know any manager of a branch bank in this colony who got £1,000 or even £800 a year.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS on the Government Benches: Yes!

Mr. STEVENSON said he believed there was no manager of a branch bank in the colony who received £1,000 a year. But that had nothing to do with the question. If the hon. gentleman thought he could have done better by remaining in the bank, and that he was fitted for the position, he would have stopped there, and would not have accepted the office of Auditor-General. There was no argument in that. In the colonies, or in any part of the world, every man accepted the position in which he thought he could do the best for himself. Even the hon. the Attorney-General, who was just coming into the Chamber, finding that he could not do well enough in the Church, left it and went to the Bar.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I recommend you to let the Attorney-General alone, while you are safe.

Mr. STEVENSON said he would accept no advice from the Attorney-General. He simply saw

the hon. gentleman coming in, and thought he was a very good instance to illustrate his argument. He was trying to show that, if the Auditor-General had thought he could have got on as well in the bank as he did in the Government Service, he would have stopped there, and that the Attorney-General, if he had been doing well in the Church, would not have left it to go to the Bar; but, seeing that he was not doing very well in the Church, he went to the Bar, and he (Mr. Stevenson) would do the same thing. He would do the best he possibly could, and take up any position in which he could make the most money, so long as he could do it honestly. That was no argument for the hon. the Colonial Treasurer to bring forward, and it would be much better if some sounder arguments in support of the Bill had been brought forward than had been introduced up to the present time. He understood that there was to be no obstruction to the Bill; but hon. members had to make their protests, and he did so in the best way he could. He believed the Auditor-General had been very one-sided in his reports; and from what had transpired, and from what he had seen, he believed that that officer had rendered the present Treasurer very great assistance in bringing arguments against the late Treasurer, and in helping him to make his financial statements. He did not think that that ought to be. The Auditor-General should be thoroughly impartial; and, as had been pointed out by the late Treasurer, he ought never to have been a newspaper correspondent. He should take no side in politics, and should recognise himself, and be recognised, as a thoroughly impartial servant. He protested against the undue haste shown in bringing the matter forward, and thought it might very well have been allowed to remain as at present until next session, and certainly the arguments adduced by the other side to gain the end they aimed at were not sound.

Mr. BLACK said he thought it one of the duties of the Opposition to criticise most severely any proposed expenditure initiated by the Government, not exactly to disapprove of that expenditure, but to protect the public against possibly wasteful servants or too liberal Ministers, especially when they found themselves in possession of a surplus not brought about by their own efforts. In that spirit he was prepared to criticise the present Bill. It appeared to him they had an officer—the Auditor-General—who performed most important duties, responsible only to that House, a gentleman whose salary did not come before them annually in the Estimates, who was as much for the protection of one side as the other, and whose duty it was to exercise a most strict supervision over the expenditure of the funds of the colony. It was quite possible that that officer might, in the discharge of his duty, have given offence to previous Ministers—and from what he had seen in that House he could readily understand that he had done so—but he thought in the interests of the public it was really better that he should err on the side of strictness than that he should be in any way lax. He had never heard it said that their Auditor-General had been lax; on the contrary, all the opposition he had heard against that gentleman in the House had been raised against him, he thought he might say, personally, rather than that the office he filled was not entitled to a higher remuneration than was at present attached to it. He had not the honour or pleasure of knowing the Auditor-General, nor did he want to know him; but he thought, from what he heard on both sides, that gentleman, as compared with other Civil servants, was underpaid. He thought the responsibility attaching

to his office was so great that he should be placed in such a position of independence that it should not be necessary for him to undertake newspaper correspondence or private work of any kind.

Mr. PERKINS: But he will do it.

Mr. BLACK said he did not know whether he had done so or not, and he did not want to know it; but in his opinion it was derogatory to a gentleman holding the high position of Auditor-General of the colony, a gentleman in whom should be vested the confidence of both sides of the House, who had to see that the funds voted by the House were properly applied, and that no unnecessary expenditure took place. It was a high responsibility he held towards that House, and he thought that if the House honestly believed that he performed those duties in a satisfactory manner, the House should pay him that remuneration which he deserved. He could only say that, if the Auditor-General criticised the present Government as keenly as he did the last, the country would benefit by it. If the last Government, by his criticism, were brought into unmerited contempt, it was for them to get up and set themselves right before the House and the country at large. He liked occasionally to have a charge brought, even if it might be unfounded. He liked to be in the position to be able to refute an unfounded charge, and he must say that an unfounded charge, properly refuted, reacted against the individual bringing that charge. The Auditor-General was accused of having gone beyond the functions appertaining to his office. That was for the Government of the time being to repudiate, and he believed they did so satisfactorily. He was not going to blame the Auditor-General for doing what he did, but gave him every credit for exercising a keen supervision over the way in which the late Government carried on the financial affairs of the country; and he only hoped—and he was sure hon. members would join with him in expressing that hope—that he would be just as keen in his criticism of the financial actions of the present Government as he had shown himself to be in criticising those of the past. For those reasons he considered the present was a question in which no political bias should enter. It was a question simply of right or wrong—whether the salary of £800 at present received by the Auditor-General was sufficient compensation for the office? He considered that as other heads of departments had received increases, and as the Auditor-General would undoubtedly have received an increase had he not made himself objectionable to the late Government, now that a new Government had taken office, and recognising the value of the Auditor-General to the colony, and the necessity of having a thoroughly independent man in the position—and he was not saying whether the present Auditor-General filled that position or not—for the reasons he had stated, and in the interests of the country at large, he did not think that it would be a good thing to vote against the increase to the Auditor-General's salary, and therefore he would vote for the Bill. He knew that the present Government was not going to be in power always; but he hoped that if they found the Auditor-General or any other officer in the Civil Service did not perform his duties satisfactorily, they would simply get rid of him and put someone else in his place. He might be wrong in saying that the Government could remove the Auditor-General, but, as they had brought in a Bill to increase his salary, a Bill might be brought before the House even to remove the Auditor-General, if it was found that he did not conduct his duties satisfactorily. On the merits of the case as it was before them, he considered that the Bill should be allowed to pass through committee.

Mr. KELLETT said he had great pleasure in supporting the Bill before the House, because he thought the Auditor-General should have had an increased remuneration long before. No doubt hon. members had read the correspondence during the last session which passed between the Auditor-General and the late Premier, in which the Auditor-General showed clearly that increases were given to the heads of other departments and he was excluded from any increase, and asked for the amount proposed by the Bill, and to which he (Mr. Kellett) thought he was fairly entitled. He was one of the oldest officers in the Civil Service, and had been a member of it, in his knowledge, since 1863. He had been for some time in the Treasury before he was appointed Auditor-General. He was considered a good and faithful servant in the Treasury, and he had the position of acting as Under Secretary. For that reason, he was raised to the highest office that could be given him in the department. At the time he was raised he was in receipt of a higher salary than any of the under secretaries; and since that time the colony had become more prosperous and increases had been going on pretty well all round. All the heads of departments had been raised, and he stood alone without any extra emolument. The hon. member for Normanby cavilled very much at the word "reward." He (Mr. Kellett) thought it was a very good word, because other heads of departments had received extra emoluments as a reward for faithful services. All servants, whether public or private, who did their duty well were generally considered to be entitled to some extra reward for their services. The hon. member for Mackay said he hoped that Mr. Drew was always to be considered by both sides of the House as a good servant; but they happened to differ on both sides at present. It was easy to trace back when that difference began. There was one standpoint, and that was when the new banking business was initiated. When that business was transferred from the Union Bank to the Queensland Bank there was an agreement which some people did not consider advisable, and in the interests of the country; Mr. Drew made that statement more than once. Ever since that time, when he objected to the terms given by the Ministry of the day—certain members of which were interested in the National Bank, by being directors of it—the difference had existed. Mr. Drew objected to an unlimited supply of money being given to that bank, and he considered it unadvisable for the welfare of the country. He always thought it was not advisable—and he (Mr. Kellett) believed so too—that the directors of the bank should be members of the Ministry. Ever since that time hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side had shown that they had taken an objection to the Auditor-General. Whether he was right or wrong, he (Mr. Kellett) believed that, to the best of his ability, the Auditor-General said what he considered was just and right; and considering that he was placed in an independent position—and rightly placed—he thought he ought to give an opinion on the subject. But he (Mr. Kellett) knew that a large number of people agreed with the Auditor-General that such an enormous amount of money placed in that bank might be prejudicial to the interests of the colony, and it was to be hoped that it would not long continue so; because, in case a crisis came, and such a large amount of money was held by the National Bank, there might be great differences between the Government and the directors. He did not see how hon. gentlemen acting in the dual capacity of members of the Government and directors of the National Bank could possibly act fairly to both. While mentioning that he would also say that he thought that in any bank which had Government funds there should be a

special auditor—an officer of the Government—the Auditor-General or some other officer—to see how the funds of the Government were laid out. He thought that would be advisable, and he hoped the time was not far distant when such would be the case. He thoroughly agreed with the proposed increase to the Auditor-General, as that gentleman was fairly entitled to it.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he thought if he characterised the hon. member for Stanley as a most black-hearted man he would be saying what was true, though it might not be parliamentary. There was no more malevolent or malicious man breathing—certainly he hoped not in that House—than the hon. member. The hon. member had attacked an institution, which was not brought before the House that night, without any rhyme or reason whatever, save and except his quarrel with a director of the bank. He (Mr. Morehead) had had no quarrel with the hon. member. Why the hon. member should have stood up and tried to injure an institution—seeing that all the shareholders were not in that House or all the directors—he did not know, except for the reason he had stated. If the hon. member had confined himself to arguing that the Auditor-General should receive £1,000 a year, it would have been all right; but he simply got up to make an attack on an institution in which he was a shareholder.

Mr. KELLETT: I did not make an attack on the institution.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the hon. member did so without any earthly rhyme or reason, except to satisfy his malevolent spleen. He had attacked a gentleman who was not there to defend himself—one of his best friends, whose place knew him no more at present.

Mr. KELLETT said that hon. members on the Ministerial side did not take notice of the language used by the leader of the Opposition. Ever since the hon. gentleman had occupied his present honourable position he had simply acted as a larrikin, just as he used to do when he was at head of the subsection. That was his *role*. He (Mr. Kellett) made no attack on the institution. Not one word had he said against it more than that he considered that it was not good for the interests of the shareholders, of which he happened to be one, that such a very large amount of money should be placed in the hands of the bank without some officer of the Government being appointed to supervise it. That opinion was held by thousands of people in the country and by hundreds of shareholders. As to saying that he was a black-hearted and malicious man, he was not half as black-hearted or malicious or malevolent as the leader of the Opposition. He did not think anyone would give him (Mr. Kellett) the credit for such a character. The hon. gentleman said that he (Mr. Kellett) had attacked someone who was absent. He did nothing of the kind. He could attack any man to his face, both in that House and outside, and the hon. gentleman knew it. He (Mr. Kellett) did not spread insinuations about as the hon. member was in the habit of doing; that was his *forte*. He (Mr. Kellett) denied that any insinuation was made against any absent gentleman. He had no quarrel against any director of the National Bank. He simply said that he thought it was not advisable that such large funds should be placed in that bank with only three directors, which he considered too small a number, and which he thought ought to be increased. He also thought that the Government funds in the bank should be audited by a responsible officer of the Government. He did not want to say one word against the directors, or that they would invest anything wrongfully or wilfully. The present directors

might be saints or sinners. The directors of the Glasgow Bank were considered some of the most eligible men in the country. They were elders of the churches—he did not know whether the hon. member was one—but they went wrong. They were considered men without blot or blemish, but still it was found, through reasons of which they knew nothing, that the trust placed in those men was misplaced. He should be sorry to impute any wilful motives, but he thought it was to the advantage of the country, the shareholders, and the institution itself, that there should be a greater amount of supervision over the directors of a bank holding such large sums of public money.

Mr. NORTON said that as on the second reading of the Bill he said nothing on the subject, it would be just as well, now that he had the opportunity, to give his reasons for opposing it, and he thought he could do so in a very few words. This was one of those Bills brought into the House without any preparation whatever for its coming. It was like springing a mine upon the House, because it was brought in without the least expectation, and on that ground alone he thought hon. members on his side were justified in opposing it, and declining to let it go further than into Committee. There was no occasion, however, to meet that Bill in the very decided manner in which other Bills were proposed to be met, but at the same time hon. members were justified in objecting to it and protesting against it. If the Bill had been allowed to stand over until June, he should have been prepared to enter into the question on its merits; but as it was, he did not intend to take up the time of the Committee in arguing on the point as to whether the position of the Auditor-General entitled him to a higher salary or not. If the measure had been brought forward in June, he should have been able to consider it from that point of view. He thought there was no urgency for the Bill, as the Auditor-General had been receiving the same salary for some years, and surely there was no occasion to press the question, especially when hon. members on his side had not been prepared for any such measure. On those grounds, therefore, he should oppose it. Beyond that, he might say that so far as Mr. Drew personally was concerned, he had never felt anything but a friendly feeling towards him. There was no doubt, however, that there was a general impression among a number of members on the Opposition side of the House that Mr. Drew had acted the part of a political partisan, and that impression was not confined to the House. There was a very prevalent feeling outside the House that Mr. Drew had acted that part. He did not pretend to say whether it was true or not, for he had never spoken one word to Mr. Drew on the subject of politics ever since he had known him. He had never heard that gentleman discuss any political question, but there was no doubt that a general feeling existed among members that the Opposition side regarded Mr. Drew as a political enemy, and the other side looked upon him as a political friend. In addition to the objection he had already taken, the one he had just mentioned ought not to be allowed to pass by without a certain amount of consideration. He should have liked to have had an opportunity to inquire a little more fully into the subject before he was called upon to give a vote, because he had not had the opportunity, or if he had he had not availed himself of it, of gathering any information. When they knew that that feeling existed, when they knew that it was not the intention of the party on the other side of the Committee to overlook the claims of their friends, it was rather hard to reconcile the two ideas. He saw the Minister for Works

laughing. Well, he remembered a late member of the House calling that gentleman a miserable sinner; and to show that the hon. gentleman was still entitled to that name, he would refer hon. members to what was said at a banquet given at Toowoomba. The Minister for Works on that occasion said:—

“He knew that the Liberal party had been reproached that they united to make things pleasant and gave everything to their enemies and nothing to their friends. He believed there was a great deal of truth in that, but on this occasion they meant to take a fresh departure. They had already given some solid indications that their friends would not be passed over for the sake of their enemies.”

He thought the hon. gentleman must have intended that to refer to the gentleman who now occupied the position once filled by the late Mr. Smith, of Ipswich. He said when that feeling existed inside the House and out of it, that Mr. Drew had acted the part of a political partisan, and when the statement of the Minister for Works was taken in conjunction with that, it was rather difficult to reconcile the two statements and come to the conclusion that it was merely on the merits of the case that this gentleman was to get his promotion. He could only say that he did not intend to offer any factious opposition to the Bill, although he was decidedly opposed to it on the present occasion. If it had been allowed to stand over, he might, perhaps, have taken a more liberal view of the case; but as it was now, he should oppose the Bill and vote against any particular part of it that went to a division. He must say that he regretted that the matter had been brought forward now; because he believed, instead of serving as an act of friendship to Mr. Drew, it would do him a great deal of harm, and a sort of harm not easily repaired.

Mr. MACFARLANE said that as he intended to support the Bill he thought it only right that he should give his reasons for so doing. He had never before voted in favour of increases to highly paid officers, but had tried so far as he could to increase the salaries of those who received less remuneration for their services. The leader of the Opposition said that the Auditor-General was well enough paid now; but if they compared his salary with the salaries of highly-paid Civil servants, they would find that the Auditor-General was under-paid. The Engineer of Harbours and Rivers received £1,200 a-year, and the Engineer of Railways £1,500 a-year; and he held that the Auditor-General occupied a position in the colony not inferior to the position held by any other Civil servant. It was also said that the Auditor-General acted the part of a partisan. He wondered whether, if that gentleman had sided with the late Government, the present Opposition would have opposed the increase to his salary. The reason why he was spoken against, was because his political opinions were opposed to those held by hon. members opposite. He did not think that anyone occupying such a position should have anything to do with politics, but it was well known that there were political partisans holding various offices under the Government. The remarks made by the hon. member for Stanley (Mr. Kellett) in reference to the Queensland National Bank were out of place in connection with the Auditor-General's salary, and one remark made by that hon. member was misleading. The hon. member said that if a crisis were to come, it would be dangerous to have so much Government money in that bank; but he (Mr. Macfarlane) believed that instead of creating a crisis, the Queensland National Bank had prevented a crisis from taking place. That bank had been more liberal than any other bank in the colony

and had carried people over who would not have been carried over by other banks in the colony. He agreed with the hon. member for Stanley, that if a large amount of money were placed in the bank there should be some supervision, but the question should not have been introduced into the present discussion.

Mr. MACROSSAN said the hon. member for Port Curtis had read a few words of a speech delivered by the Minister for Works at Toowoomba, and had drawn certain conclusions from that speech, and applied those conclusions to the Bill before the Committee. He (Mr. Macrossan) recollected the time when the Minister for Works posed as the Joe Hume of the Assembly—when there was not an increase that he did not oppose; but the *role* was entirely altered now. He had given reasons—which were, however, fallacious—for the change. He (Mr. Macrossan) believed that whenever the party now in power had been in power before they always served their friends; he did not believe, as the Minister for Works said, that they helped their enemies and forgot their friends. The hon. gentleman simply said that as an excuse for the alteration in his particular line of conduct. He was now going in for extravagance instead of economy.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Justice.

Mr. MACROSSAN said that the existence of a large surplus was one of the reasons alleged by the Colonial Treasurer why the Bill should pass. The Government were in the position of the fortunate heir who succeeded to the wealth left by the old economist; but he hoped they were not going to play the part of the heir, and squander it all. He felt sure that the hon. gentleman who administered the Works Department was going to do that, from the excuse he made at the Toowoomba banquet. The Minister for Works there excused himself in anticipation of what he was going to do with the people's money. He expected something much better from him; he expected, when he saw his name in the Ministry, that the Ministry would be one of economy, but he was sorry to say that his confidence was misplaced.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have always protected the Treasury.

Mr. MACROSSAN said he used to do so at one time; but the watch-dog had lost his muzzle, and was now going to attack the Treasury himself. It was unfortunate that the Queensland National Bank should have been introduced into the discussion, but the hon. gentleman who last spoke put the matter in the proper light before the Committee when he said that the bank had done a good deal for the country. The institution was really a national bank, and it served the country in more senses than people might be led to believe from the remarks of the hon. member for Stanley. The speech made by that hon. member would have been more in place at a meeting of the shareholders; and he did not see why the affairs of the bank should be brought forward at all except so far as they concerned Parliament and the State. It was very unfortunate for Mr. Drew that the proposed increase was introduced now; it would have been better had it been introduced earlier or else put off for a short time. He was certain that gentleman's reputation would suffer, not only in Parliament, but outside, through the inconsiderate action of the Government in proposing that large increase—an increase of 25 per cent. The reasons adduced in favour of the increase were certainly not good ones. One reason was that there was plenty of money in the Treasury; another was that the higher Civil servants had already received increases—but who were they? And what comparison was there between the work done by the Civil

servants who had received increases and that done by the Auditor-General? He had heard something about the responsibility attaching to the position of Auditor-General, but he did not see where it came in—that officer seemed to consider himself entirely irresponsible. The Auditor-General was responsible to nobody. He was supposed to be responsible to Parliament, but in reality there was no responsibility resting on his shoulders. There was no comparison between the work of the Auditor-General and that of the Commissioner for Railways or the Surveyor-General, the latter of whom was receiving £1,000 a year. The only officer in the Service receiving £1,200 a year was the Engineer of Harbours and Rivers, but that was a professional appointment, and therefore quite outside the question. The work done by the Auditor-General could be done by any clever clerk in the Service. The Under Secretary for Lands did three times the work, and so did the Under Colonial Secretary, but they got no more than £800 a year. It had been urged that Mr. Drew's salary should be increased because he was drawing more salary in 1875 than he was drawing in 1884; but if the gentleman chose to give up his position as Under Secretary to the Treasury in order to take up that of Auditor-General he knew very well what he was doing, and the loss, if any, was his own choice. In that position he had less work to do than any of the under secretaries except the Secretary to the Treasury, and that was very little indeed. Indeed, the lightest-worked Minister was the Treasurer, although the people imagined that his work was hard and responsible—unless it be the Postmaster-General. He did not like the mode in which Mr. Drew's salary was going to be raised. He was not altogether opposed to an increase, although there were many reasons why it should not be given; still, he could not divest himself of the opinion that Mr. Drew had acted as a partisan. He had always been friendly to Mr. Drew, and thought that many of his published criticisms on the late Government were correct; still, they displayed a partisan spirit, and he was strongly of opinion that Mr. Drew's criticisms would not be so severe on the party now in power. If the clause went to a division he should certainly vote against it, although had it been deferred till next session he should probably have voted for it. Brought forward under the present circumstances, Mr. Drew's reputation was bound to suffer. Had the proposed increase begun from the next financial year, more might have been said in its favour, but it was actually retrospective, and was to date from the 1st January, 1884. The only wonder to him was that the Government had not made it date from last July. No doubt the Bill would be carried. As for himself, he did not intend to obstruct; he simply entered his protest against the increase on the grounds alleged by the Colonial Treasurer—the only gentleman on the Government side who had attempted to give any reason why Mr. Drew's salary should be raised.

Mr. JORDAN said he had so high an opinion of the Auditor-General, and had known him so long, that he could not remain satisfied without saying a word or two on the subject. He did not think Mr. Drew's reputation would suffer by the action taken by the Government in bringing forward the Bill during the present session. How could that affect his reputation? Not a word had been said against Mr. Drew's reputation, except that he was accused of being a political partisan. He had known Mr. Drew as long as any man in the colony, both privately and officially, and had formed the very highest opinion of his ability generally, and of his very high character. He was satisfied, and everyone

who knew him would be satisfied, that whenever Mr. Drew had occasion to criticise the action of the present Government he would do it just as plainly, as fairly, and, if necessary, as severely as he was said to have criticised the action of the late Government. With reference to the remark of the hon. member (Mr. Black) as to Mr. Drew being a writer for the papers, it must not be supposed that Mr. Drew had ever been paid for writing to the papers; he had never been, in the ordinary sense of the word, a newspaper correspondent. Mr. Drew was said to have written some clever letters to a paper a few months ago, not criticising the action of the late Government, but stating the financiers' view of the present debt of the colony, and pointing out the distinction between the Imperial debt of £750,000,000, and colonial loans utilised for reproductive works, and that the Queensland debt of £16,000,000 ought not to be considered as a debt, inasmuch as the return from reproductive works did away with the interest on half the amount. Those letters were most serviceable to the colony, and, had the Government been floating a loan at the time, would have done a deal of good in the money market at home. It was only surmised that Mr. Drew wrote those letters, and to suppose that he ever got paid for writing to newspapers was a great mistake. It seemed very easy for hon. gentlemen opposite, in some peculiar way, to ascertain who were those gentlemen in the Civil Service who were supposed to sympathise with the Liberal party. It was very easy for them to surmise that gentlemen who were supposed to sympathise with the Liberal party were guilty of certain acts which they considered to be very improper. He had himself been suspected of writing to the papers; but he could honestly say that he never wrote anything for the papers whilst he was in office, except when he was requested to do so by a former Government. He certainly did write several leading articles for papers years ago; but did not do so without the request of some member of the Government, and he took the precaution of getting them to initial every paper, so that they became theirs and not his; yet since he had retired from his office he had been accused of being a newspaper correspondent. He was very glad to see that the common sense of the Committee would carry the Bill through committee, and that Mr. Drew—that faithful servant of the colony, who had exhibited his honesty on all occasions and his great ability in the high office he held—would be indebted to both sides of the House for the increase to his salary.

Mr. PERKINS said he did not think Mr. Drew's character was much bettered by what had been said by gentlemen on the other side of the Committee. The hon. gentleman who had just sat down had said that he had written articles for the late Government.

Mr. JORDAN: I never said so. If I did, I did not mean it.

Mr. PERKINS said he should consider it to his shame if he had ever asked the hon. member to write an article. If he discovered that a gentleman who occupied a certain office in the country had been requested by the Premier, or any other member of the Government, to write leading articles, he should consider it to be his shame. No doubt the gentleman who had just sat down had not written leading articles without being requested. A good deal had been said about Mr. Drew and the articles that were written to the papers by him, and it was very easy for any man of Mr. Drew's intelligence, and occupying the position he did, to deny that he wrote to the papers. If he did not write to the papers, why did he deny it? The accusation had been fastened to him, not by insinuation, but

directly. He (Mr. Perkins) did not know whether he wrote the articles, and did not care. He knew nothing wrong against Mr. Drew. So far as he had been permitted to have his acquaintance, all was in his favour. He was quite competent to do his work, and he (Mr. Perkins) could go further and say that if he was a gentleman who had preserved strict neutrality and would simply do the work that the country delegated to him, without being a partisan or one-sided in the politics of the country—if he would attend to that work and perform his duties industriously and intelligently—he believed that the occupant of that office might on comparison with other officers in the country be paid £1,000 a year. Mr. Drew had not confined himself to doing his work. He certainly could not do his work and write those letters, and become a critic, as he had. He had most glaringly shown that he wrote those letters. He had every opportunity of denying it, and he (Mr. Perkins) inferred that, because his denial had not been given, he did write those letters and had made himself a partisan in political matters.

Mr. JORDAN: How could he deny it?

Mr. PERKINS: He had simply to say he did not write the letters. He had many opportunities of going into print, and, looking at the matter from a reasonable and impartial point of view, if Mr. Drew was not the writer of those papers he had only to say so. He could say in five or six syllables that he was not the writer of them, and there would be an end to the matter. He admitted that a gentleman in Mr. Drew's position or in that of any of the under secretaries stood in a very difficult position with Ministers going out and Ministers coming in. If they did not adhere strictly to the letter of the law and confine themselves to performing those duties they might be a little shaky. He knew some public offices in the colony which were nothing but a hotbed of politicians. They were scheming and contriving a month before and a month after general elections, and there was little or nothing else done. When they had occasion to meet in the passages, and when any of them had an opportunity to go down town, they were electioneering all the time. He knew several of those cases, and could put his finger upon them at once. He knew what they were doing before the late elections; possibly they were not aware of it, but he got information without seeking it, and was very much surprised and disappointed that some gentlemen, occupying the position they did, should interfere and become active partisans. He took care to verify the information that was given to him, and he did it to his satisfaction. He did not receive any rumours like the hon. the Premier, who said it was only necessary to hear a rumour, and, if they believed it, they were justified in telling it to everyone they met, especially if it tended to blacken a man's character. The Premier used to say that, but lately he had tutored so many teachers and schoolmasters to go abroad that he could refrain from repeating those expressions himself, and could leave the dirty work to some others who had as much experience as he had some two or three years ago. He had only to get up a few torchbearers and send them about the street, and get two or three asses to yoke themselves to his buggy, and that settled the matter. Returning to Mr. Drew and his salary, it was unfortunate for that gentleman that his case should have been taken up at that unpropitious time. It might very well and appropriately have been left alone until the regular session of Parliament came round, as it would come in June or July, or possibly even in May. Then they would have a full attendance, and

would be prepared to discuss the matter fully and freely. Now it was forced upon them as much as to say, "We know we have a majority here; we think that Mr. So-and-so is an eligible man, and want to reward him. It would have been very much better for Mr. Drew if the matter had come round in a natural way, when it could be fully and fairly discussed, instead of dragging it in at a time when there was more pressing business to be transacted. He did not think any hon. member would deny Mr. Drew's right to reward for the honourable and onerous duties he had to perform; but nevertheless he desired to remind the Committee that Mr. Drew was not a Civil servant. He was far away perched above that. Civil servants could be removed by the political head of a department, and if they were not removed when he made the request he knew that he must dissolve partnership with the company he was in. But Mr. Drew could not be removed in that fashion at all. He was answerable to Parliament, and they all knew what that meant—that, unless he became a blackguard or an idiot, he was there for life; so long as he was a respectable man, put on a good coat to walk into his office, and attended divine service, he would stop there. He did not pretend to say that Mr. Drew had not other elements to recommend him for the position. He believed he was thoroughly efficient and qualified for the position in every way; but he desired to call attention to men who were placed in that position. The bargain with the State—whether it was in print or not—the contract was, that they were to be impartial; to preserve strict neutrality. Why were the judges of the land paid the high salaries they received? To enable them to be independent; to be beyond the reach of poverty—that was, if they lived in a moderate plain way, without indulging in riot or luxury, but lived in a way that was good for themselves. They were paid high salaries, so that they could be thoroughly impartial and independent; and he took it that Mr. Drew was in the same honourable position. He held the most onerous appointment in the country, the same as Auditors-General in other places, and he ought to be thoroughly impartial. If he condemned Mr. Drew, it was for the fact of his having become a political partisan, a tool or instrument in the hands of a few gentlemen who now occupied the Treasury benches, and writing letters to the newspapers. That was a thing to be deprecated in any Civil servant, but more particularly so when coming from a gentleman occupying the position that Mr. Drew did. He was in a position to get information of every kind before any other men—before the Speaker, the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, or the under secretaries, and he might, by writing articles or corresponding with newspapers, anticipate what was going to occur two or three days ahead, and give a colouring to things which, upon examination afterwards, they would not bear at all. That was his objection to this increase of salary. He regarded it as a bribe or reward to the Auditor-General for his past services—for his partisanship; and for that, and also because he was a newspaper correspondent, as he (Mr. Perkins) believed him to be, and would continue to believe him to be until he (Mr. Drew) contradicted it, he should oppose it. He had heard an hon. member make a remark about helping one's friends. Well, he had been five years, within a few weeks, in office, and had had many opportunities of helping his friends; but he could say that there was not a single friend or relation, or hanger-on, that he had thrust into the Public Service in any way whatever, either prospectively, directly, or in any other

direction. He heard the hon. member for Gympie, who, he was sorry to see was not in his place, remark the other night that the public offices were crammed with incapable people; that Mr. Drysdale and others came from Victoria. That was a great crime, of course. He believed, however, that the hon. the Colonial Treasurer had graduated in Victoria before coming to the colony. He (Mr. Perkins) had been told the other day about a race the hon. gentleman ran down Bourke street many years ago, and he felt very interested in the story. The hon. member for Gympie, in speaking of Mr. Drysdale, said he had been looking for work in Gympie, and that seemed to be all the objection he had to him. He would like to ask that hon. member, or any of his friends who could speak for him, if he had ever looked for work, and if he thought it any degradation to do so? He (Mr. Perkins) did not know whether Mr. Drysdale looked for work at Gympie or not; but this he did know—that he was a very efficient and very faithful man. There was no one in the Public Service who had greater experience than Mr. Drysdale, and he got his appointment from him (Mr. Perkins) as Commissioner for Lands at Gympie, not through any personal friendship or admiration of the man—because if he (Mr. Perkins) wanted to wreak vengeance, or have revenge, he had reason to regard him in another light altogether;—but he got the appointment through his (Mr. Perkins') previous experience of him and his well-known ability as an efficient officer, and his (Mr. Perkins') difficulty of getting a more competent man to fill the position. When Mr. Drysdale got the appointment he (Mr. Perkins) was informed by the Railway Department that they could not excuse his services until some bridge works he was watching at the time were cleared up. The consequence was Mr. Drysdale had to remain some six months in the Works Department supervising some bridge-building. He then entered on his duties, and after he was some two or three months Land Commissioner at Gympie and Maryborough, and after he (Mr. Perkins) had made several attempts to find an eligible person to fill the position of Inspector of State Forests, and offered it to some men in the Public Service whom he thought were suitable for it, and they declined it, he appointed Mr. Drysdale to that position, which was one in which he believed he could give every satisfaction. He was not going to enter into details about what that gentleman did perform there. He was merely answering the hon. member for Gympie, who alluded to Mr. Drysdale the other night in a sneering way, because he came from Victoria and got his appointment from him (Mr. Perkins), after he had searched in every direction he possibly could, with the aid of the officers of the department, and all the information he had at his command; and when he found that at last he had to fall back unwillingly upon Mr. Drysdale, and so give him the appointment, he gave it to him because he knew he was the most suitable and competent man in the colony for the position. Then the present Ministry entered office, and they were scarcely seated there five or six weeks when he got notice of three months' leave of absence, which was an intimation to leave. He was quite sure it was for Mr. Drysdale's benefit that he should leave the Public Service. He never knew a man yet, who was worth anything, in the Civil Service, who had come to him to discuss matters, that he did not say to him, whether he was a young man or a man in middle life, "In the name of God, take something else." He had never encouraged a man yet to hang about in the Civil Service or to go into the police or into any of the other occupations in the Public Service. He was saying that in answer to the hon. member

for Gympie, Mr. William Smyth. How long was it since that hon. member had left the pick and shovel, he should like to know? He might tell him that he was not fit to tie the shoe-strings of Mr. John Drysdale, who was a man who could carve a way for himself in this country or in any other place. Like a great many of them, he had met with reverses. None of them knew what was before them; and the hon. member for Gympie had better beware, as he did not know how soon he might have to turn to the pick again, and Mr. Drysdale and himself might change places. He believed that in justice he ought to say what he had said for Mr. Drysdale, because, of all the officers in the Lands Department, putting aside a few in the head office in Brisbane, Mr. Drysdale was one of the most industrious and efficient. Respecting Mr. Drew, he need say no more about that gentleman. He had been scrutinised and criticised quite closely enough. Even if the Bill were carried, he did not think Mr. Drew would have much reason to be thankful to the introducer of it for his intended kindness, and he would probably have preferred that the matter had been delayed until some other time. If they only knew that Mr. Drew would become an officer of both Houses, and of both sides as he pretended to be—had they only the assurance that he was an impartial officer of the House supervising the financial affairs of the country, seeing the public accounts audited and the business properly transacted—he believed not one word would be said against the Bill. But for the reasons he had given, he would have to vote against the clause.

Mr. JORDAN said he must say, in explanation, that if he had said that he had written letters to the newspapers during the time the late Government were in office, he made a mistake. He should have said the former Government—he alluded to the Liberal party. He must add that once or twice he had written to the papers while the late Government were in power, but it was at their request. He had written two articles on the Marriage Bill which was intended to have been brought before the House by Sir Arthur Palmer; but those articles were written at that gentleman's request. He would like to add, that he had never been paid a single farthing for any article which he had ever written to any periodical during the fifteen years he had been in the Public Service, either by the Government or by the proprietor of the paper.

Mr. PERKINS asked, if the hon. member for South Brisbane said that Sir Arthur Palmer had employed him to write those articles?

Mr. JORDAN said he did not say that Sir Arthur Palmer had employed him to write the articles, but he had written two articles on the Marriage Bill which that gentleman had intended to bring before the House, at his request, or perhaps he should say with his permission—it might have been with his permission. Sir Arthur Palmer, at all events, distinctly authorised him to write them, and he could produce the articles now, and Sir Arthur Palmer would bear out what he said. He had been previously accused of writing to the papers, and had spoken to Sir Arthur Palmer about it, and that gentleman had said, "You need not deny it: I know you are incapable of doing so." He meant by that that he was incapable of doing so in the sense referred to by some hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MACROSSAN said he must have been a member of the Government at the time which the hon. member referred to, when he said that Sir Arthur Palmer had asked him to write those articles. He might say that he thought it a very wrong thing for any Government to do. If they could not, by any other means than by employing Civil

servants to write to the papers, get their policy printed through the papers, they had better have no policy at all. He, for one, protested against any Government doing anything of the kind. He had certainly been no party to anything of the kind, and he knew of its being done, that evening, for the first time.

Question—That clause 1 stand part of the Bill—put and passed.

Clause 2 put and passed.

On the motion of the COLONIAL TREASURER, the CHAIRMAN left the chair and reported the Bill to the House without amendment.

The report was adopted, and the third reading of the Bill made an Order of the Day for tomorrow.

ELECTIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE.

The PREMIER said that a question was raised at an earlier portion of the day with respect to the constitution of the Committee of Elections and Qualifications, and some doubt was suggested as to whether the existing members, whose resignations were reported by the Speaker that day, would be competent to act pending the three days after the Speaker had laid on the table his warrant for appointing their successors. Upon consideration, he thought there could be no doubt upon the question. It was quite impossible that any new members could be appointed, or that the warrant for their appointment could take effect as an appointment until, in the words of the statute, three days had elapsed after the warrant was laid upon the table. On the other hand, it was provided by another section of the statute that the resignation of members from the committee should not take effect until their successors were appointed. It was very desirable that their appointment should be made at once, as it was important that there should be no unnecessary delay, as he believed the committee had further work to do. He was speaking now particularly in reference to what had fallen from the leader of the Opposition that afternoon as to the undesirability of the committee proceeding while not completely constituted. If the Speaker laid his warrant for the appointment of the successors of the members of the committee who had resigned upon the table that evening, there would be to-morrow, Friday, and Tuesday as three days upon which his warrant would lie upon the table of the House. The new members could be sworn on Wednesday next, and a week only would elapse before they could enter upon their duties. If that course were not followed it would practically mean a delay of another week. If the warrant was laid upon the table that evening, it would make a difference of a week in the proceedings of the committee; and, as he had pointed out, no difficulty could arise. He therefore would move, without notice, as a matter of privilege:—

That, in the opinion of this House, Mr. Speaker should forthwith lay upon the table his warrant nominating two members of the Committee of Elections and Qualifications, in place of the members whose resignation has been reported to this House.

Question put and passed.

The SPEAKER, in accordance with the resolution, laid on the table his warrant for the appointment of two members in place of those who had resigned.

CHINESE IMMIGRANTS REGULATION ACT OF 1877 AMENDMENT BILL.—COMMITTEE.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the House went into Committee to consider this Bill in detail.

Preamble postponed.

Clause 1—"Act to be read with 41 Vic., No. 8"—put and passed.

On clause 2—"Repeal of sections 3, 6, and 7 of principal Act"—

The PREMIER said that clause 3 in the principal Act provided for the number of Chinese that a ship might carry; clause 6 provided that a certificate should be given as a receipt for the £10 paid; and clause 7 provided for return of the money on the departure of the Chinese from the colony.

Clause put and passed.

On clause 3—"Ships not to carry more than one Chinese passenger for every fifty tons register"—

The PREMIER said that on the second reading of the Bill there was a good deal of discussion on this clause, and some hon. members were of opinion that it was not sufficiently severe. He had not then taken the opportunity, when speaking a second time, of giving the reasons which the Government had for thinking that the provisions of that section were preferable to those adopted in New South Wales and Victoria. In those colonies the number of Chinese coming in ships was limited to one for every hundred tons, and the poll-tax was £10. Those were the most severe measures passed in the Australian colonies up to the present time against the influx of Chinese. There was this difference with respect to Queensland, which influenced the Government to a great extent in making the modification they had done. The restrictions on coming by ships appeared to be a matter of passage money; and he took it that practically it would be ten times as difficult for the Chinese to come under this Bill as it was before. The distinction between Queensland and New South Wales and Victoria was that there was a considerable trade between Eastern ports and Australia, which he was sure they did not wish to discourage, except as regarded the Chinese. Those ships sailed from Hongkong, called at two or three of the Northern ports, and then came on to Brisbane, Sydney, and Melbourne. Now the prohibition was against them having Chinese on board, whether as passengers for Queensland or not; and as the present section provided that no ship should have more than one Chinaman for every fifty tons register, that meant that Queensland, where the first ports of call were, would prohibit more than that number coming to all Australia, including Sydney and Melbourne. There was considerable traffic between Hongkong and Sydney and Melbourne, and the passenger traffic would be continued; they could not prevent it; but if a ship was 1,500 tons register, she could only carry thirty Chinese passengers for any part of Australia. Practically, therefore, the number of Chinese who would come here would not exceed ten or twelve by every ship. Our position was different to that of Sydney and Melbourne, as they did not want to prevent a ship coming into Queensland ports simply because she had Chinese passengers for Sydney and Melbourne on board. He thought the proposed restriction would be sufficient to keep the Chinese out, and the departures would, he felt sure, more than balance the arrivals. There was another reason why he did not care to adopt the extreme views advocated by some hon. gentlemen: He was anxious that the Bill should be one to which it would not be difficult to get the Royal assent. He did not think there would be any difficulty, judging from the history of the previous Act, in getting the assent to a Bill framed on the moderate lines of the present Bill, although its actual operation might not be so moderate. He apprehended there would be no difficulty in securing the Royal assent to the Bill as it stood, whereas if they were to adopt a measure which might be in form more pro-

hibitive there would be considerable difficulty. He hoped that the provisions of the clause, which was the only one about which there was a difference of opinion, would be accepted.

Mr. MACROSSAN said the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government had given three reasons why the provisions of the Bill should not be made more strict than they were, and he would analyse those three reasons and show that they were fallacious. The first reason that the hon. member gave was that by the provisions of the Bill it would be ten times harder for a Chinaman to come here than at present. He should like the hon. gentleman to say how he arrived at that conclusion. A Chinaman cost £6 10s. in passage money to come to the colony at present, and he or someone else had to pay £10 down before he could land. Did the hon. gentleman tell him that the passage money would exceed £65? Was that what he meant by making it ten times harder for a Chinaman to land here? That was an utterly fallacious argument. Why, the Bill would not make the passage money any greater. It would cost no more to bring ten Chinamen here in a ship under the Bill than it did at present, because it must be remembered that the Chinamen fed themselves on board ship, and that the £6 10s. simply represented a deck passage. The hon. gentleman forgot that part of the transaction. That argument was, therefore, disposed of. The next reason given was that there was a considerable trade between Hongkong and this colony and the other colonies, which the Premier wanted to preserve. He (Mr. Macrossan) had no desire to injure the trade from China or anywhere else, but he would not desire to preserve trade if it interfered with his inclination to prevent Chinamen coming to the colony. The hon. gentleman's argument on that point would not hold water. The Bill could be amended so as to prevent Chinamen coming to Queensland altogether, and there could be no danger about Chinamen landing along the coast if the officers of Customs did their duty. They could, of course, come over from Adelaide—the Northern Territory—very easily; but, so long as the Government officers did their duty, they could not land at any port of Queensland from vessels passing down the coast. He came now to the third reason, and he thought that that was not much stronger than the rest; in fact, the hon. gentleman had got it into his head that the Chinese were not so dangerous as some people believed them to be. How he got that idea into his head, he (Mr. Macrossan) did not know. It could not be from the hon. gentleman's own experience; it could not be from the experience of the people of the colony; and it could not be from the experience of the Americans, who spoke the same language and belonged to the same race as they did themselves. It was ridiculous to suppose that Chinamen were not so dangerous as coolies or kanakas. He contended that they were more dangerous than coolies, and certainly more dangerous than kanakas, because the Chinese were able to compete with their own people, and that was where the great danger was. The argument always was and always had been that the Chinese were too much for the white man, and could live upon too little. As he had pointed out the other day, from the report presented to the Senate of America, the Chinese could live upon a pittance which would starve the white man out, and if it came to a matter of competition the white man must go to the wall. So from as there being an increase of the passage money under that Bill, there would not be a single farthing of increase. What was the increased cost to the Chinamen? It was simply the poll-tax, and there would be no other increased cost under the Bill. As he had said before on the second reading, a kanaka cost

£31 to bring here. The planters were willing to pay £30 for a coolie; and therefore they were leaving the door open for any number of Chinamen to come into the country if the Bill passed into law, and the planters would lose nothing by it. It would cost them actually £1 or £2 less per head to bring in Chinamen under the Bill than it cost to bring in kanakas, and there could be no question that the planters would bring them if they were put to it. They were told that the Polynesians were not so plentiful now as they used to be, and that that was an additional reason why the planters would take advantage of the provisions of the proposed new Act. Two thousand six hundred Chinese came into the colony last year, and he contended that the Bill must be put into such a shape as to lessen the temptation to the planters to import those people. Our position was very different to that of the other colonies. No one wished to introduce Chinese into Victoria or New South Wales in great numbers; and anyone who read the newspapers could see that the Chinamen who went to Victoria under the one-man-to-100-ton condition and the £10 poll-tax paid their own passage money. They were not imported there for any special work; but in Queensland there were capitalists who had work but no labourers, and there was a special inducement to bring Chinese to the colony in large gangs. They had better stop the evil in time, and with that view he intended to move an amendment. As he pointed out the other night, the number of Chinese in Queensland was greater in proportion to the population than in the United States; and there was consequently much greater danger. He proposed that after the word "every" in the 3rd line of the clause the words "two hundred and" be inserted. That would limit the number of Chinese brought to the colony to one for every 250 tons.

Mr. CHUBB said he had an amendment to propose which would come earlier than that of the hon. member for Townsville. The 1st line of the clause said, "If any vessel shall arrive at any port in Queensland"; but it was possible that a vessel might arrive on the shores at a place which could not be called a port, and it was advisable to insert some word to cover such a case. The word "port" was not defined in the Bill; but in the Navigation Act it was defined to be "any port, harbour, haven, roadstead, channel, navigable creek, or river in Queensland," and he doubted whether that definition could be made to apply to the word in the Bill before the Committee. He thought it advisable, therefore, that the Bill should contain a definition of the word "port." He would move that after the word "port," in the 1st line of the clause, the words "or place" be inserted.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member for Townsville withdraw his amendment?

Mr. MACROSSAN: I withdraw my amendment to allow the amendment of the hon. member to be put.

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted be so inserted—put.

The PREMIER said he did not see what would be the benefit of the amendment. A ship sailing down the coast might be said to be in a "place" in Queensland, and a ship could not sail from Torres Straits to Sydney without going through Queensland waters. No foreign-going ship could come to any part of Queensland for the purpose of landing anybody without going to a port, and what they wanted was to prevent Chinese immigrants being landed illegally.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he thought the word "roadstead" in the definition of the word "port" would cover any place at which a ship might land passengers. With regard to the amendment of the

hon. member for Townsville, the Premier said that the colony did not want to lose its Eastern trade, but at the same time he would do all he could to prevent the introduction of the Chinese. He (Mr. Morehead) thought the best way to do that would be to accept the hon. member for Townsville's amendment, which would make the clause far more stringent than it was at present, and the more stringent the better. The intention of the Committee was to do all they could to keep Chinese out of the colony, and he would support the clause if it were made entirely prohibitive. To say that the Imperial Government could not assent to a Bill containing such a clause was simply wind. If the colonies decided that they would not have Chinese the Imperial Government would not be likely to stand in the way.

Mr. CHUBB, with the permission of the Committee, withdrew his amendment.

The amendment of Mr. Macrossan became therefore the question before the Committee.

The PREMIER said the effect of the proposed amendment of the hon. member for Townsville on the large shipping trade which had sprung up between China and Australia would be to prevent those ships from coming into any of the Queensland ports. At present the colony got its tea direct from China, and it would be worse than folly to destroy a very lucrative and valuable branch of trade. Indeed, the late Government thought so highly of it as to remit in favour of those vessels certain port and light dues. Those ships always carried passengers, and was it worth while, for the sake of twenty or thirty Chinamen—the maximum number in most cases—to destroy that trade? The matter must be looked at from all points of view. It had been said that there were several capitalists determined to introduce Chinamen into the colony in large numbers for plantation work; but, according to the statement of the hon. member for Mackay, that would be effectually prohibited by the clause as it stood, because the large vessels could not carry more than twenty or thirty passengers. Supposing 120 Chinamen were imported during the year, what was it? The number who went away last year was over 1,000. An attempt had already been made to introduce agricultural Chinamen from Hongkong, under a special agreement, to work under a boss Chinaman; but when they reached Queensland the Chinamen repudiated their agreements, and said they would work for the current wages. They did so, and the persons who imported them were so sick of their venture that they were not likely to try it on again. That was the history, up to the present time, of the attempt to import Chinamen under a boss Chinaman. His desire was to keep Chinamen out by some practical means which would not work to the injury of the shipping trade between the two countries.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the hon. gentleman had based his calculations on vessels of 1,500 tons register, on board which thirty Chinamen might be carried by the clause as it stood, and six under the amendment of the hon. member for Townsville. The passage money, they had been told, was £6 10s., which would be earned by the owners of the vessels. That was to say that, under the clause as printed, the ship would earn £195 as against £39 that would be earned by them if the amendment were adopted. The hon. gentleman told them the trade between the colonies and China would be stopped for a matter of £156. The thing was too absurd. They did not want to scotch the introduction of Chinamen into the colony, but to kill it, and that could best be done by the amendment of the hon. member for Townsville.

The PREMIER said the hon. gentleman had misunderstood his argument. Under the amendment, vessels carrying more than six Chinese passengers would not be able to enter Queensland ports at all. There was a passenger trade with the other colonies which they could not interfere with, and the effect of the amendment would be that our tea would be taken on to Sydney and then sent back to Queensland.

Mr. MACROSSAN said the remedy was a very simple one—it was to let the Chinese passengers go to New South Wales and Victoria, and to prevent them from landing in Queensland. The hon. gentleman seemed to think it alarming that Chinamen on board should not be allowed to land in the colony. Did he mean to tell him that if they passed the amendment, they would get no more tea and chow-chow from China? The thing was ridiculous. When the American Government stopped the introduction of Chinese under a penalty of 500 dollars for every passenger landed on any part of the American coast, there was a trade worth between six and seven million dollars between the western coast of America and China. The American Government did not consider the interests of the steamships or the steamship owners. They knew the cargo trade would still go on between the two countries, but they stopped the passenger trade entirely; and since they had stopped it, he had not heard of any diminution in the carrying trade. If the hon. gentleman was so tender about Chinese passengers going to New South Wales or Victoria, it might be got over by accepting his suggestion of inserting the words “Chinese passengers intended for Queensland.” He knew the hon. gentleman could do it if he chose. He was willing to withdraw his amendment and let the hon. the Premier insert one to that effect.

The PREMIER said he had omitted to notice that argument of the hon. gentleman. What was necessary was, that they should provide some summary mode of discovering whether the law was obeyed or not. The machinery provided for working out that scheme was contained in the 2nd clause of the principal Act.

“The master of every vessel having Chinese on board shall, immediately on his arrival from beyond the colony in any port of the colony and before making any entry at the Customs, deliver to the collector or other principal officer of Customs, a list of such Chinese, specifying the name, the place of birth, the apparent age, the ordinary place of residence, the place and date of shipment, and the calling or occupation of each such Chinese. And for each default herein, such master shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding £200.”

When a ship arrived there were two things which could be easily ascertained. The tonnage of the ship could be seen by the ship's papers, and the number of Chinese could be obtained by counting. Those were two simple things, and if the number of Chinese was greater than the number authorised by the registered tonnage, there was an offence. If they agreed to the amendment of the hon. member for Townsville, the door would be opened for an evasion of the law in the simplest possible manner. There would be three Chinese intended to land in Queensland, and 200 more to land in Sydney. They would change their mind, and land as they came down the coast, and the authorities could not prevent them. They could not enter into the mind of the captain and see where the men were intended to land, as they would all be shipped for Sydney or New Zealand, or perhaps for New Guinea. No better scheme had been devised than the one in the Act, that the offence should be in the number of Chinamen being greater than was authorised by the registered tonnage according to the Act. He did not know of any other practicable scheme. A summary rule for dealing with such cases was always found the best.

Mr. HAMILTON said that the first reason given by the Premier for not making his measure more restrictive was in direct variance with his public statements, in which he stated that they had the power to deal with the matter as they liked. The example of other colonies showed them that they could make the measure more restrictive and still have the Royal assent, because both in Victoria and New South Wales the restrictions with regard to tonnage were just double those they had, although China was nearer to Queensland than the other colonies, and the inducements for persons to obtain Chinese were much greater than they were in the other colonies. He could not see the force of the statement that because there was a direct trade between China and Queensland which it was desirable to preserve, that the restrictions should not be increased. The trade was simply a freight trade, and if the Premier's argument were to hold good, it would be an argument against any restriction being placed upon the introduction of Chinese. The restrictions which the hon. member for Townsville had proposed to place upon the introduction of Chinese, would not affect the freight trade any more than the restriction proposed by the Premier. He did not consider it desirable to preserve the passenger traffic. Another argument was, that a certain planter had made an arrangement with Chinese in Hong-kong, and that those Chinese had repudiated their agreement; that there was therefore no danger from their incoming. Such argument was absurd. He agreed with the hon. member for Townsville, in the remarks he made the other night, that one Chinaman in the colony was a Chinaman too much.

Mr. CHUBB said he would like to point out that when the first case in connection with Chinese coming to Queensland in excessive numbers was before the Supreme Court, the very question raised by the learned counsel who appeared for the owners of the ship was that the meaning of the words “Chinese passengers” under the 3rd section referred to Chinese passengers for Queensland. The difficulty was pointed out that the Premier had referred to—that it would be quite competent for these Chinese to be booked for Melbourne, and, after having arrived at the first port of call in Queensland, to land in the colony. There was no law to compel a man to go on. He did not see how the difficulty could be got over. There was no doubt that there was a danger; but it might be overcome by inserting the words “for Queensland.”

Mr. NORTON said he could not quite understand the objection taken by the hon. the Premier with regard to the proposal, because under the existing arrangements the matter was made as simple as possible. All their ports were connected by telegraph lines, and if three passengers landed at Cooktown it could be telegraphed that the number for Queensland had landed. Even if there was the risk of the telegraph line not working, they might make it compulsory for the captain of a steamer to hand to the police magistrate, or someone appointed for the purpose, a statement of the number of the passengers landed at each port as he passed by, and until that statement had been received, no Chinese passenger should be allowed to land at any port whatever. The difficulty was not such an insurmountable one that some scheme could not be devised to prevent it. He had intended to refer to a paper he mentioned the other night in connection with his objection to Chinese landing. A great deal had been said about the revelations recently made at Sydney. All he had to say was that that paper disclosed the fact that those terrible crimes were almost similar to what had been committed constantly for years by the Chinese in Sydney.

The only difference was that, in the case where the two unhappy women died, the acts were committed either by violence or by the influence of spirits; whereas, in the case of the Chinese, opium was the medium used to enable them to carry out their object. He believed that those cases would never have happened if it had not been for the example set by the bad class of Chinese residents in Sydney. He thought it was quite enough to refer to the fact to open the eyes of hon. members to the absolute necessity of precluding Chinese from coming to the colony as much as possible, if not altogether.

Mr. MACROSSAN said he still thought the difficulty could be overcome. The hon. the Premier had imposed the very severe penalty of forfeiture upon owners or charterers of Polynesian labour ships violating clauses of the Act passed last week, and what was to prevent him from imposing a similarly severe clause in the Bill on owners and charterers of these steamships? It would then be to their interest not to violate the law. They would not run the risk of landing passengers who were not allowed to land according to law. The Americans had done something like that in the following section dealing with the introduction of Chinese there:—

"That the master of any vessel who shall knowingly bring within the United States on such vessel, and land or permit to be landed, any Chinese labourers from any foreign port or place, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanour, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than 500 dollars for each and every such Chinese labourer so brought, and may also be imprisoned for a term not exceeding one year."

Why could not some similar provision be made here? They had not to deal with the Chinamen, but it was the captain they would have to punish, when a penalty of that kind was likely to be inflicted he would not be likely to run the risk of incurring it. He (Mr. Macrossan) therefore thought that by inserting "for Queensland" after "Chinese passengers" the difficulty would be met; and then they could impose a penalty such as he had suggested besides. Why did the hon. gentleman not take the same stand upon this matter that he did with regard to the Kanaka question? Why did he refuse to impose that penalty here? For the sake of his own reputation he should do so. He had been accused of favouring Chinese—whether rightly or wrongly the hon. gentleman knew himself—but if he did not mete out the same measure to the Chinese that he did to the kanakas, a colour would be given to the accusation made against him. And if he dealt more leniently with the Chinese than he did with the coolies, whom he excluded altogether, the same thing would be said. The hon. gentleman was not acting wisely in the course he was taking. He (Mr. Macrossan) held that they ought to legislate not to allow a single Chinaman to come to the colony. There were enough here already, and the more that went away from the country the better. If 1,000 left next year, and 1,000 every year, in ten or twelve years there would be none left. At present there were 12,000 or 14,000 Chinamen to a population of 240,000. That proportion was altogether too great, and if they put a stop to another Chinaman coming to the country they would be only doing their duty. He maintained that it was to the hon. the Premier's interest to make the Bill as prohibitory as possible.

Mr. STEVENSON said he did not speak on the second reading of the Bill, because he was sure that a majority of the House would pass it; but he had decided to make a few remarks, after some arguments he had heard brought forward that night. He might as well say at once that he had no sympathy with the Bill or the amendments. Those who had argued in favour of the Bill had done so from a very selfish point of

view indeed. The hon. the Premier had told them that he tried to look at the question from both points of view—that he wished to exclude Chinamen as far as he possibly could, and yet he wanted to cultivate the trade from China. If they were making such a profit out of the China trade, surely it seemed a mean thing for them to be legislating to keep out the poor Chinaman who was bringing that trade to the colony! That seemed a very selfish point of view to argue from—that they would allow the Chinamen to come so far as they had the command of sailing ships in the trade down here—that they would make a profit out of them in every possible way, and yet exclude the men from coming here. He said that was a mean kind of legislation. The hon. member for Townsville had stated that they had enough Chinamen here; that he was perfectly satisfied with what they had got, and showed in that way that they had been of some use to the colony. He (Mr. Stevenson) was going to say a word or two in favour of the poor Chinaman. He had some sense of justice, and he did not care whether it was a Chinaman or kanaka, he believed in protecting the weak. The hon. the Premier had told the electors of the colony in public that he had got a leaning towards Chinamen.

The PREMIER: I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. STEVENSON said he had no more leaning towards Chinamen than he had towards kanakas or aborigines, or any man, whether with a black or yellow skin; but he hated to see injustice done. His blood recoiled and curdled when he saw such injustice being done in this way. He knew this was a kind of Bill upon which hon. gentlemen opposite made electioneering speeches; but he did not care a single rap what his constituents thought of what he said—whether they put him out at the next election or not; and when he saw any class being set upon in that House, and that injustice was being done, he would say a word for them as far as he could. He knew that, notwithstanding what he might say, and what the hon. member for Townsville, who had admitted that, at any rate, Chinamen, had been of some use in the colony—

Mr. MACROSSAN: I never said so.

Mr. STEVENSON said the hon. gentleman said that we had enough of them here at present, and that showed, at any rate, that he admitted that some of them were required.

Mr. MACROSSAN: No.

Mr. STEVENSON: Then he would say they were required, and had been of great use in the colony. He was prepared to say that many a man now living would have been in his grave if it had not been for Chinamen growing vegetables when white men were not game, or would not take the trouble to grow them. The great argument brought forward by the hon. member for Townsville was that the Chinaman could compete with the white man. Very well, it was a poor argument. Was not the life of trade competition?

Mr. BROOKES: No; fair trade.

Mr. STEVENSON said he thought the life of trade was competition. White men competed against white men, and he said if they were afraid of competition with Chinamen they were a mean lot. The arguments used that night were, he thought, very selfish. And he said a word for the Chinaman, as he did for the kanaka or the coolie, when he thought they were being subjected to injustice. They had been of some use in the colony, and had done, at any rate, a certain amount to increase the prosperity of the colony.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the question they had to discuss was, whether the Bill before them would be strict enough to keep Chinamen out. He held it was not, and hoped it would be improved in that direction, and that was why he supported it.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said the hon. member for Townsville did the hon. Premier a great injustice when he said, in effect, that the Premier was more solicitous about the welfare of the Chinaman than about the welfare of the kanaka or the coolie. He did not think the hon. gentleman, in the legislation he had attempted in that House, had sought to go so far with regard to coolies as he proposed in the Bill to go with regard to Chinese; and, as to kanakas, they knew very well that provision was made by which kanakas under certain restrictions could be introduced to any reasonable extent. The hon. gentleman opposite supposed that there would be no difficulty in reaching the master of a ship who was guilty of a breach of the law such as he had suggested should be introduced. Supposing the law were to provide, that if the master of a ship were to bring more than a certain number of passengers, with the intention of allowing them to land within the colony, he should be punished as the hon. member suggested, what could be more easy than for a number of Chinese to walk into a boat as soon as the ship dropped anchor at Townsville or any other port, and thirty or forty of them row themselves ashore and disperse amongst the inhabitants, and in such a case how could the Government reach the captain of the ship?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The Chinese could be brought up for stealing the boat.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said, of course the Chinese could be brought up for stealing the boat and they might be imprisoned, but what good would that do? When their term of imprisonment expired they would be free to distribute themselves all over the colony. The master of the ship could escape the penalties unless some such machinery was provided as was provided under the existing Act. He was as anxious as the hon. member for Townsville was to protect the interests of the white working man by the restriction of Chinese, but everyone knew that if they grasped at too much they invariably lost all. It was far better that their legislation on the question should be reasonable than that it should be unreasonable and deprive itself of the power of doing what they intended should be done. It was better for their legislation to be moderate and effective than that they should attempt to bring about entire prohibition and fail in accomplishing that. What was said with regard to the trade between China and the various Australian ports was not, he thought, susceptible of any misapprehension whatever, and the cases cited by the hon. member for Townsville were certainly not parallel. The hon. member said that the American Government passed a restrictive measure, one of the clauses of which he read that night; and he went on to say that, although that restrictive measure was enforced, yet the trade of China with America was in no way diminished. But, as he had said, the cases were in no way parallel. They all knew that there was an enormous population in America which consumed the various products of China, and that there was a trade between China and America altogether irrespective of the passenger trade. It could not be contended, however, that in Queensland there was a consuming population of sufficient magnitude to justify shipowners in laying on a line of ships between Hongkong and Brisbane for a supply of Chinese pro-

ducts. If they were to have tea and other products from China brought direct to their shores instead of being taken past them and on to Sydney, and from Sydney back, they must give facilities by which the ships engaged in the trade might be allowed to call in at the Queensland ports whenever they might be passing on to the other colonies. Again, they knew that there was not only a large class of Chinese labourers, but a large class of Chinese who were more wealthy, and many of the latter class were continually passing in ships between Hongkong, Brisbane, Sydney, and Melbourne. If the amendment which the hon. member for Townsville suggested were passed, no ship which had on board, say, six of those Chinese gentlemen could call into any port of the colony at all to land cargo which they might have intended to land here, simply because those wealthy Chinese gentlemen were on board and intended to go on to Sydney or Melbourne, and not to come into this colony and compete with the labourers here at all. If they were to avoid making themselves ridiculous they must try and make themselves reasonable; and in proportion as they were reasonable in their legislation, that legislation would be effective in carrying out what they proposed to do. His constituents—or, at all events, the great bulk of them—were as extremely anxious to effect the practical prohibition of Chinese as the hon. member for Townsville or his constituents could be. With their views on that subject he entirely sympathised; still he could not think of accepting an amendment such as that proposed by the hon. member for Townsville, as he certainly did not think it would have the effect which the hon. gentleman intended.

Mr. MACROSSAN said the hon. gentleman who had last spoken should take his place alongside the hon. member for Normanby, for that was his proper place on the Chinese question. It was not the place of a Minister who professed to be interested in the restriction of Chinese. The hon. member talked about his constituents, but if his constituents were polled to-morrow to decide between the amendment he (Mr. Macrossan) had proposed and the Bill before them, he knew very well what the result would be. He knew the hon. gentleman's constituents very much better than the hon. gentleman did himself. The argument he used against his (Mr. Macrossan's) amendment, when he spoke about the master of a ship being able to avoid the Act if the Chinese got a boat and pulled to the shore, had just as good a bearing upon the present Act as upon the amendment.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The captain is to hand in a list under the present Act.

Mr. MACROSSAN said the captain would have to keep a list under the amendment. The hon. gentleman was talking because he was the friend of Chinese. He was sorry to have to come to that conclusion respecting him, but he felt quite certain he was not sincere when he said he was as anxious as he (Mr. Macrossan) was to restrict Chinese. If he was so anxious to restrict Chinese, he could give the Committee a little of his legal ability in trying to frame the clause, and put it in such a shape that Chinamen could not steal a boat and row themselves ashore. It was the captains that they wanted to punish; and if they made the clause stringently severe on the captains they would take good care that the Chinese did not take boats. He was not at all anxious about the trade; they would get the trade, whether there were passengers or not. There were plenty of people here to use tea—quite as many as in America in proportion to the trade. The hon. member for Bowen said the only difficulty was in proving the offence when it was

committed; but how many offences were there for which men were indicted and escaped punishment? That was no reason why they should not pass laws against those offences. He should stick to his amendment. He was sorry he could not induce the Government to support it; but he hoped that there would be a sufficient number of their supporters in favour of it to carry it.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he had as great a desire as any hon. member to see the importation of Chinese abolished, and if he thought the amendment of the hon. member for Townsville would carry that out he would have great pleasure in supporting it; but he was afraid if they made the Bill too stringent they would defeat the very object they had in view. He would suggest to the hon. member to allow the clause to pass, and then he would be glad to support him in increasing the poll-tax to £30 or £50 even.

Mr. HAMILTON said that if the arguments used by the Attorney-General, that the provisions of the clause might be dodged by captains of vessels allowing Chinese to go ashore in boats, were believed in by the other members of the Ministry, then they were introducing a clause which they knew would not have the desired effect. The arguments used by the Attorney-General against the amendment would apply equally as well against the clause as it stood. If the amendment could be made a dead-letter by Chinamen landing in boats, then that argument applied equally to the clause.

Mr. NORTON said that, when the Coloured Labour question was under discussion, the argument used was that if the sugar industry could not be carried on without coloured labour it should perish. Now, in connection with the present question, hon. members opposite said that if they raised a great difficulty in the way of Chinese coming here they would lose the Chinese trade. He would ask the hon. member for Kennedy, if he used that argument to his constituents, what they would say? Would they not say, "Perish the trade"? What was the Chinese trade after all? It was merely a bagatelle. Did hon. members suppose that those ships would be knocked off because they were deprived of a few Chinese passengers? Why, it was only a matter of a few hundred pounds; and to say that the ships would be stopped for that was ridiculous; he could not imagine hon. members having the face to use such an argument. When the Coolie question was under discussion, the Premier said he was not afraid of the Chinese at all, and he had no anxiety about them; they had shown all the world what they could do with them. But many hon. members wanted to go a great deal further; they did not want to be tiddly-winking—he thought that was the word that had been used—they wanted something more than that, some real practical obstacle. Hon. members, he believed, were afraid that if the Act was made too stringent the Imperial Government would not assent to it. If that was the objection that was taken, it was just as well to say so at once. He did not believe that the Imperial Government would object to it. They objected before, but as soon as they found that the colony was in earnest they withdrew their objection; and there would be no objection now if they saw that the colony meant to keep Chinese out. But if hon. members on the other side would persist in their present course—saying that if the Bill was made too stringent it would not go through—that would bring about the very difficulty that they professed to be anxious to avoid. Let hon. members show that they were in earnest in trying to keep the Chinese out; then they would be listened to. He held that they wanted to keep out every

Chinaman if possible. They did not want to legislate for New South Wales and Victoria, but for Queensland. If the laws here prevented those colonies getting the number of Chinese passengers that they wanted, let them arrange to get them in some other way. They had nothing to do with Victoria or New South Wales. Let them pass their own Acts and let them regulate their own affairs.

Mr. FERGUSON said he intended to support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Townsville, as, if it was adopted, it would really make the Bill one dealing with the Labour question. As it stood at present, it was neither one thing nor the other. The measure was not nearly strict enough, and would not prevent Chinese from coming into the colony. He was rather surprised that a Bill of that kind should come from the Government side of the House, especially as the views of that side on the Labour question were well known. He had no hesitation in saying that the members on that side held their seats in virtue of their views on the Labour question; and now that they had an opportunity to deal with the Chinese Labour question, which he held to be the most dangerous class of labour, why did they not do so in a serious manner? There was no class of people who would interfere so much with the white population of the colony as Chinese, and especially with the white working men of the colony. Last week they passed a Bill restricting Polynesians to field labour and to prevent the competition of Polynesians with white labour, but they now had a Bill before them dealing with a much more serious class of labour which, however, was really an encouragement more than anything else to the Chinese to come to the colony. A ship of, say, 2,000 tons could bring forty Chinese, and he thought the planters would find them cheaper than kanakas. Increasing the poll-tax from £10 to £20 would have no effect whatever. It was only a few years ago that a kanaka could be imported for half his present cost, yet now that the cost was double what it used to be they did not find the demand was less. There was more demand now than when kanakas cost only £12 or £13, and last year 5,000 came into the colony, or more than double the number of any previous year, while the present cost of introduction was something like £30. He considered the Bill an attempt to deal with the Chinese difficulty without going to the root of the matter at all. In Rockhampton there were at the present time something like forty cabinet-makers, who were driving all white artisans of the same trade out of the town. They manufactured their furniture in the back slums, and sold it to the wholesale furniture-dealers, and prevented the possibility of white men earning a living. No class of people could be so injurious to the working white people of the colony. He would support the amendment, and even if it were more stringent still he would support it. He did not know that there was a single member of the Committee who wished to see Chinese in the colony at all; but, at all events, they would see when the amendment came to a division whether there were any such members.

The PREMIER said one could not but be surprised to see the new-born zeal shown by the Opposition to keep Asiatics out of the colony. He did not refer to the hon. member for Rockhampton, because he had always been consistent, or to the member for Townsville, who had always objected to Chinese; but other members on the other side had systematically set their minds on other occasions on forcing the Government to accept Asiatic labour. Hon. members should bear that in mind when they found Opposition

members in their new-born zeal trying to force the Committee into passing a law so stringent that it was likely not to become law at all. The object the Government had in view was to pass a law which would effectually keep out Chinamen, and he confessed that he regarded with the greatest suspicion the assistance so generously proffered by hon. members opposite, who were determined, if they could, to flood the country with Asiatics, but of a slightly different colour. If those hon. members could have their way the result would be that there would be no Chinese legislation this session. Hon. members knew that perfectly well, and they knew that the desire of the Government was to pass a Bill through the House that would become law before the end of the present half-year. The hon. members on the other side professed to be willing to assist the Government, but he regarded their assistance with great suspicion on a subject of that kind. The fable had been repeated again that night that he had a leaning in favour of Chinese. If it had, as he believed, been repeated one hundred times let him for the hundredth time give it the flattest contradiction. No statement that was ever made by him would bear that construction. He had said once that the country had nothing to fear from Chinese, and he adhered to that statement. The fact that the Bill before the House, and if passed, would entirely deliver the colony from any danger whatever, was sufficient proof of the accuracy of that statement. Members who misquoted what he said knew what he really did say, but it suited them to misquote him. He hoped the Committee would not be carried away by the imaginary enthusiasm of members opposite; for if those members who misrepresented him, apparently, did want to keep out Chinese, it was in the hope that they would get coolies instead, and not with any real desire to shut out Asiatics.

Mr. MACROSSAN said he hoped the appeal that had just been made would be disregarded by members of the Committee. The hon. gentleman had been trying to throw party feeling and passion into the measure before them. He (Mr. Macrossan) knew that the hon. gentleman had been accused of having a leaning towards Chinese, but he had never accused him of it, and in refusing for the hundredth time to have that charge passed upon him, he was sure the hon. member did not allude to him. He (Mr. Macrossan) alluded to the subject so that the hon. member's own reputation would not suffer, but his action that night would lead those who had accused him to believe the assertion. There was no new-born zeal, so far as he (Mr. Macrossan) was concerned, in regard to Chinese, and he might tell the Committee what he had done in regard to keeping out Chinese when he had the power of legislating on the subject. He passed the Mineral Lands Act two years ago, and if he had been able to pass that Act sooner the mineral lands of the colony, especially at Stanthorpe, would not have been in the unfortunate position they were in to-day. The Act prevented a Chinaman from getting a mining license or a lease, and therefore he could not take up land. With some difficulty he got the House and the hon. member (Mr. Griffith) to assent to that Act. By regulations he framed afterwards he made it impossible for a Chinaman to be employed in connection with any mining claim in the colony, because there was the danger against which they had to guard of Chinese being employed by small mining capitalists to the exclusion of European miners. That had been the case at Stanthorpe, and would have been the case in Northern Queensland but for the Act he had named. Therefore, his zeal was not new-born—it was as old as his own existence. The imputation

that hon. members on the Opposition side wished to introduce Asiatic labour was a mere figment of the brain, and the hon. member (the Premier) knew that it could not be introduced without the consent of both Houses of Parliament and of the Governor. It was of no use to appeal to the passions of hon. members to defeat his object in trying to prevent Chinese from coming to the colony at all. He had always maintained that the introduction of even one Chinaman was an evil, and he was certain that the tradesmen of Brisbane were beginning to feel the evil very much. Lower Georgestreet in Sydney, and streets running into it, were occupied entirely by Chinese who were everywhere competing with white men and taking their places. Even if hon. members on the Opposition side did desire to introduce Asiatic labour from India—was that a reason why they should not be assisted in preventing the introduction of Chinamen? Let hon. members be consistent, and act according to the declaration made before the electors that they were opposed to all kinds of coloured labour. The Premier now said that there was no danger from the Chinese, but the danger was greater now than ever. There was no special attraction on the goldfields, but there was on the sugar plantations. The planters had the means, and would employ Chinese labour if possible, and the Bill would only compel them to pay a little more; it would not prevent them from employing that class of labour. The only difference would be that, instead of 100 or 150 coming at a time, they would come in thirties and forties. There were other members on the Opposition side as well as himself who had done all they could to keep out the Chinese, and they were prepared now to assist—no matter what their opinions on other subjects might be—in making the Bill as stringent as possible. As to the Bill being made so stringent that there was danger of it not becoming law, the Premier told him across the table the other day that he was not afraid that any Act, passed by the Australian Legislature to prevent the introduction of Chinese, would be disallowed by the Imperial Government. So long as they did not deal with Asiatics as British subjects, the Imperial Government would not interfere.

The PREMIER said the hon. member (Mr. Macrossan) informed the Committee that he was actuated by a desire for his (Mr. Griffith's) reputation—

Mr. MACROSSAN: I said I thought you should be actuated.

The PREMIER said his reputation could take care of itself; and when he could point to an Act which had the effect of excluding Chinese, an Act which was at the same time moderate and effective, he should not have done anything to injure his reputation, and he was satisfied that if they passed the Bill it would have the desired effect. He was also satisfied that if the amendment of the hon. member were carried, there would be but a small chance of the Bill becoming law. He gave the hon. member every credit for being in earnest, but on the present occasion the Government were charged with the responsibility of introducing legislation in connection with the Chinese. He did not go to the extent of saying that not one Chinaman should come to the colony, and he had never taken up that position with respect to any class of men. The Government were satisfied that the Bill would effect the object in view, and he hoped they would not be thwarted by extreme propositions. He remembered very well the struggle in connection with the restriction of Chinese in 1876 and 1877. He had a vivid recollection of the correspondence with the Home Government, and of the trouble that arose. He knew very well the responsibility which rested on the

Imperial Government in dealing with such a matter. There was no treaty obligation to prevent any part of the British dominions from absolutely excluding Chinese; but he did not think the Imperial Government would assent to such a law. The Government were bound to deal with the matter, and they did so with a full sense of their responsibility. It was all very well for members in opposition to take an extreme view, for they could go afterwards to their constituents and say, "This is what we wanted to do." But a Government could not be led away by considerations of that kind. They ought to be actuated by a sense of responsibility, and adopt the wisest means for attaining their object, and those means the Government had adopted on the present occasion.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he should like to have heard the Premier, in opposition, replying to a speech like the one he had just made. The hon. gentleman had talked about the responsibility of the Government, and about what the Opposition ought to do. Did he expect better treatment at their hands than he meted out to the late Government?

The PREMIER: Not so good.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the hon. gentleman's expectations had been more than realised, for during the present session the conduct of the Opposition would compare extremely favourably with the conduct of the hon. gentleman when he had the honour of leading the Opposition; and that could be proved by the evidence of reported facts. The hon. gentleman seemed to ignore the fact that the intention of those who supported the amendment was to prohibit the introduction of Chinese into the colony. As to the doubts whether the Bill, if amended as proposed, would receive the Royal assent, they had heard a great deal of those warnings. But what happened with respect to the Act of 1877? The Bill was passed at the end of July, and received the Royal assent on the 20th August following. The present amendment was only a further development of the principle contained in that Act, and if the Committee had the power to develop it as far as was proposed by the Premier, it had the power to develop it as far as was proposed by the hon. member for Townsville. The Premier proposed to develop it from ten tons to fifty tons, and the amendment proposed to extend it to 250 tons. There was, therefore, no danger to be apprehended as to the amendment not receiving the Royal assent. The Premier was not perfectly fair in saying that it was the intention of the Opposition to so mar the Bill, by means of the amendment, as to prevent its becoming law. The hon. member had admitted that the hon. member for Townsville had been from the first one of the strongest opponents of Chinamen coming into the colony; and, having admitted that, he ought to see that the Opposition had no intention of marring the measure. He (Mr. Morehead) had held for many years that Chinamen were the most dangerous people they could get into the colony—people whom even lawyers might well be afraid of; and, holding those views, he did not think it fair to say that the amendment was intended to hamper or embarrass the passing of the measure. A division might well be taken now, and the question as to the Royal assent might be spoken about afterwards.

Mr. HIGSON said he was glad to find that his colleague in the representation of Rockhampton had spoken so strongly against the introduction of Chinese into the colony, and he himself felt somewhat inclined to go with the hon. member for Townsville and do away with Chinamen altogether. But he felt convinced that to take so extreme a step would be to

defeat the object they all had in view, as no British Government would ever accede to it. It would be far better to take a more moderate view of the case, and if they found the law was not severe enough it would be an easy matter to bring in another Bill at some future date, and make it stringent enough to keep Chinamen out of the colony.

Mr. HAMILTON said that, although the Premier objected to the statement that he favoured Chinese, he could not alter public opinion, which was guided, not by his utterances regarding that question, but by his actions. The Premier had repeated as his excuse for not agreeing to the stringent amendment proposed by the member for Townsville, that the amendment was so strict that it might not receive the Royal assent. He would read the Premier's own utterances on the subject, delivered at a public meeting in Brisbane, and repeated in the *Telegraph*, which would prove that he did not believe anything of the kind, and that, consequently, the reason he gave for opposing the amendment was not his real reason. What he said was as followed:—

"We have the matter entirely in our own hands; we have fought the battle and we have won, and in that sense Chinese immigration is not to be feared, because we can keep them out whenever we like. We are perfectly free to legislate as we think proper."

And now the hon. gentleman ate his own words, and stated that he did not believe they could do that which he then emphatically stated they had the power to do. The statement of the Premier, that the action of the Opposition in trying to totally prohibit Chinese proved that they wished to flood the colony with coolies, was absurd. That argument of his evidently showed that he himself considered some kind of coloured labour necessary, and that his reason for not totally prohibiting Chinese was that he considered that when coolies were stopped Chinese should be allowed to take their places. The fact that the Coolie Bill had been repealed, and coolies thus prevented from coming into the colony, was an additional reason for placing a stringent restriction on the introduction of Chinese, because the inducement to planters to introduce Chinese was increased. One of the strongest arguments of the present Opposition when in power, against totally restricting the introduction of coolies, was that if it were done the planters would flood the colony with Chinese. That argument would be taken away from them if the amendment of the member for Townsville was carried, and the introduction of Chinese totally prevented.

Mr. JESSOP said it was too late to go into any argument; but he felt that it was his duty to let the Committee know his objection to the clause, for the simple reason that he objected to the introduction of Chinese. As there were other clauses to come before the Committee, he should say very little; but he believed that Chinese were worse than Bathurst burr or any other noxious weed, and the sooner they were out of the colony the better. He should support the amendment of the hon. member for Townsville.

Mr. PERKINS said he would support the amendment. He had not very much to say about Chinese. His view of the question was perfectly well known. There were some queer characters in his constituency, but there were no Chinese. The only danger he apprehended was that it would encourage speculators to charter ships and load them with Chinese, and take them to New South Wales, and in spite of the vigilance of the Custom House officers it was quite possible for them to come over the border. He believed the Chinaman had been a curse in all the other colonies. He had had a

varied experience in the colonies, and had met those who had howled against Chinamen in public. He had seen them in private afterwards, and had found out that all the products of the soil that were consumed in the place were raised by Chinamen, while there were 600 or 800 white men walking about, none of whom would cultivate or make gardens. He just mentioned that to show that the Chinaman had been useful, and that his usefulness had been recognised. In public he had been hounded down, while in private it was admitted that some of the luxuries of life could not be had without him. He rose chiefly to notice the anger and chagrin of the leader of the Government. He happened to be acquainted with some of the hon. member's constituents. There were many of them spurious merchants in Brisbane who, apparently, did everything that was right. Those men employed Chinamen. They had them in their cellars, and at work during the night making furniture, etc., and the articles they made were turned into their warehouses and sold as articles of English manufacture. Were they not meaner than Chinamen, to have recourse to such dodges, tricks, and artifices? Those were the men he should like to reach. Then look down in Albert street! Let anyone who had to pass through that street to the railway station at half-past 5 in the morning, or between 11 o'clock at night and 3 o'clock in the morning, witness the disgraceful scenes there! For that reason alone, if he had no other, he should support the amendment. He had the same objection as the leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Townsville, and others against Chinamen coming here and polluting the community. Look at the havoc they had worked upon people in that street, in the midst of this city of churches and psalms, with police and Government officers whose duty it was to look after those places where prostitution and rascality were going on day by day—licensed, he might say, because it could not be carried on without countenance being given to it by those who had to carry out the law for the time being. If he had no other objection than that alone, he should endeavour to prevent Chinamen from coming to the country or associating with white people. The hon. gentleman should communicate with some of his constituents. He must be aware of these things a good deal more than he (Mr. Perkins) was. There were some of his constituents who were employing Chinamen, knowing that they indulged in those dirty, filthy habits; and encouraged them to locate and domesticate themselves so as to become colonists, and send home for their friends to come to the country, and smuggle them in no matter what the poll-tax might be. These were persons who called themselves warehousemen or merchants, who manufactured furniture and other articles made solely by Chinese handicraftsmen, and then passed them off as English imported furniture, deceiving the public. It was quite time that the people knew these things, and that the leader of the Ministry looked a little nearer home, and did not cast his eyes to the north or the south, but looked through his own constituents and saw what they were doing. Those were people who posed as the cream of society, but he (Mr. Perkins) called them "spurious" people. That was the term applied to them by the person who called his attention to them, and he had since verified it. He knew the hon. gentleman would like to get his information from some other source than himself (Mr. Perkins), but he could indicate to him what was going on. All the information was not centred in himself (Mr. Perkins). There were other hon. members who knew it as well as he did, if they liked to stand up and give the information.

Therefore, he should be glad, no matter how stringent the provision introduced by the hon. member for Townsville was, to vote in favour of it.

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted be so inserted—put, and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 12.

Messrs. Archer, Norton, Chubb, Morehead, Hamilton, Black, Macrossan, Perkins, Lalor, Nelson, Jessop, and Ferguson.

NOES, 18.

Messrs. Macdonald-Paterson, Dickson, Bale, Bailey, Rutledge, Griffith, Foxton, Sheridan, Dutton, Beattie, Jordan, H'gson, White, Isambert, Buckland, Brookes, Mellor, and Aland.

Question resolved in the negative.

Mr. MACROSSAN said he proposed that the word "fifty" in the 3rd line of the clause be omitted, with a view of inserting the words "one hundred." He did not think the hon. gentleman who was in charge of the Bill could object to that. He believed he was ignorant, when the Bill was laid upon the table of the House, that the regulations of the Acts of the neighbouring colonies said that there should be one passenger to only every 100 tons. The hon. gentleman spoke of the Acts in the neighbouring colonies being drawn upon more moderate lines than this Bill, evidently believing that the Acts there were more moderate than the Queensland Acts. Also, when he (Mr. Macrossan) was speaking on the second reading of the Bill, the hon. gentleman interjected that it was not the law in Victoria—that was, that one immigrant to 100 tons was not the law in Victoria. Therefore, he took it that had the hon. gentleman, knowing the law in Victoria and in New South Wales, said one immigrant for every 100 tons, he would have assimilated his proposed measure to the lines of those of the other colonies. The Victorian law used the term "immigrants" instead of "passengers," and he might also add that the penalty under the Victorian law was much greater than the hon. member proposed to make it. The Victorian law imposed upon the master or charterer of a vessel bringing or introducing one more than one immigrant for every 100 tons a penalty of £100. He had intended to move that it should be 200 tons; but seeing the division which had taken place, and believing that some hon. members on his side of the Committee might be as anxious as he was himself to restrict and limit the number of Chinese coming to the colony as much as possible, he would move that the words "one hundred" be substituted for the word "fifty," in the 3rd line of the clause. That was the more moderate number, and it was with the object of assimilating their laws with the laws of the neighbouring colonies.

The PREMIER said he had already given reasons why he thought "fifty" in the Bill before them was just as severe as "one hundred" in the Acts of New South Wales and Victoria. The circumstances of the colonies were different. Here they were on the highway to those places. He must say that the hon. member for Townsville was not more sincere in his protestations or more earnest in his desire to restrict Chinese from coming into the colony than he (Mr. Griffith) was. The hon. gentleman protested too much. He believed the Bill before them would practically exclude Chinese altogether.

Mr. MACROSSAN: It will not.

The PREMIER said that if it did not they could make it stricter afterwards, but if 250 Chinese came into the colony in twelve months after the passage of the Bill he would be mightily mistaken, and if the Chinese population did not rapidly diminish year after year after the

Bill was passed he would be very much mistaken ; and that was the object they all had in view. He thought they had had a fair amount of discussion upon the clause, and he hoped they would soon come to a division upon it.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that when it was doubtful whether one of the competitors for the throne of Scotland was not properly assassinated, one Kirkpatrick returned to where the man was, in order, as he said, to "mak siccar." The hon. member for Townsville might be called the Kirkpatrick of the House. He wanted to "mak siccar." As the hon. the Premier seemed to be uncertain of the effect of the legislation he proposed, and as he (Mr. Morehead) was also uncertain of what its effects would be, he would vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Townsville.

Mr. MACROSSAN said the hon. gentleman was under the impression that the Bill passed by the Government of which he was Attorney-General was the means of stopping Chinese from coming to the colony. He was wrong in that impression. The stoppage of the Chinese was owing to the worked-out condition of the Palmer Gold Fields ; and had the Palmer Gold Fields continued or other goldfields been discovered since, that Bill would not have had any effect upon Chinese immigration. Now the danger was from a very different source—from an interested class of men who would bring them here as they had brought them elsewhere. The hon. gentleman, as he had said the other night, was leaning upon a margin of profit to the planters. It was the difference between £31 for kanakas and £28 for Chinamen—£20 poll-tax and £8, including cost of commission and brokerage—so that it was actually in favour of the planter to bring Chinamen ; and yet the hon. gentleman said that because Queensland was on the highway, the penalty should be only 50 per cent. of that in New South Wales and Victoria. If the hon. gentleman thought to pose as being as sincere on the Chinese question as he (Mr. Macrossan) was, nobody would believe him, either in the House or out of it. He knew some hon. members on the other side of the Committee were anxious to keep out the Chinese, but unfortunately their party ties were stronger than their inclinations.

Mr. BROOKES said hon. members on the opposite side must allow gentlemen on his side the full benefit of their opinions. He was quite sincere when he said he would endorse what the hon. member for Townsville had said the other night. But he could tell the hon. member for Townsville and other hon. gentlemen on that side that they lay in a shadow, and he for one told them plainly that he did not believe in their sincerity upon the question before them. They had fought desperately for coolies, and they had turned round too suddenly. It was nonsense for hon. members opposite to attempt to pose as the only people in the House who wished to oppose Chinese. They had got up their enthusiasm too suddenly. He said the hon. member for Port Curtis had made himself perfectly ridiculous. He said again that he did not believe in that sudden change on the part of hon. members opposite. They should remember that they bore a bad character ; they were too sincerely desirous for the welfare of the working man. But the working man was not a born idiot ; he could tell friend from foe ; and he and the public generally would know by the discussion that had taken place who were sincere and who were not. He (Mr. Brookes) was against a single Chinaman coming into the colony ; but he felt called upon to support the moderate, practical counsels of the Premier. He acknowledged the irresistible weight of the arguments that that hon. gentleman had used, and therefore he should again vote with him and against the amendment.

Mr. CHUBB said that the hon. member for North Brisbane had stated that the working man was not a born idiot. Well, the hon. member was not a working man ; he need say no more. In reply to hon. members opposite, he would just remind them that it was well known that the late Government when they last came down to the House had a Bill to amend the Chinese Immigration Act, and for this reason : that during the previous twelve or eighteen months, Chinese had been coming into the colony in great numbers. The Government endeavoured to enforce the law as far as they could, but they could not stop the introduction of Chinese, and therefore they determined to bring in a Bill increasing the penalties provided by the Act ; so that they were not now actuated by a new-born desire to keep out Chinese.

Mr. BLACK said that the hon. member for North Brisbane told them that he did not believe they were sincere ; and he also took credit for being a moderate man. Now, if there was one thing that the hon. member's best friend never accused him of, it was of being a moderate man. He (Mr. Black) had frequently pointed out in their debates on the Labour question that the hon. member had been the best advocate that the planters had in that House, because his views were so immoderate and so extreme that they carried their own refutation. With regard to the present Bill, no one would accuse the Premier of being a friend of the planters. He could tell the hon. gentleman that the planters did not want Chinese labour, but they had been compelled to get it owing to other sources of supply failing. He would also tell the Premier that the Bill would not keep Chinese out. He was desirous to see Chinese kept out of the colony ; but it would pay the planters better to get Chinese under the terms of that Bill than to get kanakas. The supply of kanakas was falling short ; and as the Premier had not yet told the House what was to be the future of the Labour question, that Bill would not exclude Chinamen if the planters desired to get them. The hon. member for Townsville had pointed out what would be the cost of introducing a Chinaman, and the Bill would not be prohibitive. He (Mr. Black) was decidedly in favour of making the Bill even more stringent than was proposed by the hon. member for Townsville ; but as they had lost the last division, he should vote for the increase to 100 tons, instead of 50 tons.

The PREMIER asked which they were to believe—the speech just delivered by the hon. member for Mackay or his speech the other evening ? He had just told the Committee that he did not believe the Bill would at all restrict the introduction of Chinese. Speaking on the second reading of the Bill, he said :—

"If the object of the Bill was simply to keep Chinamen from plantations, one passenger to fifty tons would be virtually prohibitive ; it would entirely prevent the planters from bringing them here."

What were they to believe ? He (the Premier) believed that what the hon. gentleman said the other evening was his real opinion ; what he had said just now he had said simply as a debater.

Mr. PERKINS said it was quite possible for the hon. member for Mackay to have reflected on the matter, and to have come to the conclusion that fifty tons was too low. Had the Premier never changed his mind in five or six days ? Why, he (Mr. Perkins) had seen him wheel round before tea-time came. The hon. gentleman was very handy at picking out extracts from newspapers, and his memory was either very defective or inactive. He had said that he believed the statement of the hon. member for Mackay the other night. Yet a few

days before, he had said that the hon. member was not a person to be trusted. It was no use for the Premier to try and wriggle out of his statement—he had a partiality for Chinamen, and he expressed it. The hon. gentleman had surveyed the question from several points of view, and had said at last that he was inclined to favour the Chinamen, and now he tried to deny that, but he (Mr. Perkins) had read the statement—

The PREMIER: You never read that in any paper.

Mr. PERKINS said he had. The hon. gentleman's statements at the time were so scandalous and false that he did not take the trouble to keep a list of them. It was when the hon. gentleman was going round the country corrupting, demoralising, misleading, and betraying the people, that he made the statement that had been repeated that night. The hon. gentleman changed his mind half-a-dozen times a week; he had one speech for one place and another for another. For a squatting constituency he had one speech, and he had another for the North, so that his opinions in the South were totally opposite to those expressed up North. It was on the occasion when the Premier was junketing about the country, procuring invitations to dinners in a not very creditable manner, that he indulged in that celebrated song at Aramac one Sunday morning in order to please the people up there, and it was shortly after that at Roma that the hon. member said he had rather a leaning towards the Chinaman; but he had probably imbibed too much when he made that statement. It was very easy for the Premier when he was hobnobbing with people at dinner, and when he was a private member, to say things which he would not stand by afterwards; but now that he had got into office the country wanted something more from him. He repeated once more, and defied the Premier to contradict him, that the hon. member expressed a liking to the Chinaman, and said he had a kind of leaning towards him.

Mr. BLACK said he did not think there was any inconsistency between what he had said that night and what he had said on the second reading of the Bill. In glancing through the Bill on the second reading, he had expressed an opinion that the fifty-tons provision would have the effect of keeping the Chinese out of the country; but it was perfectly fair for him to say now that he thought the 100-tons provision would be still more effective. He thought that a man who wished to do his best for the welfare of the country should not be tied down to every word he said. If he showed good reason for altering his opinion, he was perfectly justified in doing so. There was no hon. member in that House who needed that consideration shown him more than the Premier himself, for there was no member in the House whom it was so difficult to understand, who was so often misunderstood, and particularly badly reported.

Mr. MACROSSAN said he had been making a calculation to see how many Chinamen could come into the country under the proposed Bill within a year by the British-India steamers alone, and it must be remembered that there were three or four other companies running on the coast between China, Sydney, and Melbourne. The British-India Company were bound to supply them with twelve boats a year; but instead of that they were supplying twenty-four—

The PREMIER: Not after next month.

Mr. MACROSSAN said there would be cargo boats, if not immigrants. Those ships averaged more than 1,500 tons; and twenty-four ships with thirty Chinamen in each ship would bring the number up to 720 Chinese in the

year. The hon. the Premier had said that he did not believe that 250 would come in the year. He (Mr. Macrossan) could prove that 2,000 Chinamen could be landed in Queensland every year, if the planters required them.

Mr. MOREHEAD said it had been shown that 720 Chinamen could come to the colony by one single line, and if the Premier was in earnest he would accept the amendment, which could do no harm, but would most likely do good.

The PREMIER said the Bill was not brought in to prevent the introduction of Chinese by immigrant ships from Great Britain; and the number of ships trading between Queensland and China was so small that the number of Chinese who could come to the colony would be infinitesimal.

Mr. PERKINS asked whether the Premier intended to convey the impression that the Chinese could evade the poll-tax by going to England, Scotland, or Ireland, and then coming to the colony from those places?

The PREMIER said the Bill would apply to them wherever they came from.

Mr. HAMILTON said that the ships which came to Queensland from England called at Batavia, where they could get any number of Chinamen.

Question—That the word proposed to be omitted stand part of the clause—put.

The Committee divided:—

AYES, 19.

Messrs Rutledge, Miles, Griffith, Dickson, Dutton, Sheridan, Bailey, Macdonald-Paterson, Beattie, Bale, White, Buckland, Foxton, Jordan, Isambert, Mellor, Aland, Brookes, and Higson.

NOES, 12.

Messrs. Norton, Archer, Morehead, Chubb, Perkins, Nelson, Lalor, Ferguson, Jessop, Black, Hamilton, and Macrossan.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. CHUBB asked why the word "ship" had been substituted for the word "vessel," of which there was a definition in the principal Act?

On the motion of the PREMIER, the clause was amended by the substitution of the word "vessel" for the word "ship" in the 3rd and 6th lines of the clause.

Mr. CHUBB said that, in order to make the penalty absolute, he would move that the words "a penalty not exceeding" be omitted, with a view of inserting the words "a penalty of."

The PREMIER said the clause applied to all ships trading along the coast. A ship might call at Cooktown to land a few cases of tea, or might put into Moreton Bay for water, with Chinese passengers not for Queensland, but for Sydney and Melbourne, and it would be absurd to impose the maximum penalty in such cases. It was to meet such cases that the penalty was made flexible.

Mr. MACROSSAN said the Premier's tenderness to Chinese shipowners was too excessive, and he was confident that working men who were not born idiots would see through it. Cases of that kind could be easily met by a special provision.

Mr. CHUBB said that, in cases where ships called into Queensland ports for water or to land cargo, and without passengers for the colony, instructions would be given by the Government to the Collector of Customs not to prosecute.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the clause—put and passed.

Mr. KATES said he thought the maximum penalty of £20 was much too low, and for his part he should prefer to see it £50.

Mr. PERKINS moved that the words "twenty pounds" be omitted, with the view of inserting the words "fifty pounds."

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the clause—put.

The House divided :—

AYES, 19.

Messrs. Miles, Griffith, Dickson, Rutledge, Dutton, Sheridan, Bale, Foxton, Macdonald-Paterson, Beattie, Bale, White, Buckland, Jordan, Isambert, Mellor, Aland, Brookes, and Higson.

NOES, 14.

Messrs. Norton, Archer, Morehead, Chubb, Perkins, Hamilton, Palmer, Nelson, Lalor, Ferguson, Jessop, Black, Macrossan, and Kates.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the House resumed, the CHAIRMAN reported progress and obtained leave to sit again to-morrow.

PETITION OF CHARLES FRANCIS CUMMING.

Mr. BEATTIE laid on the table of the House the report of the select committee appointed to inquire into the petition of Charles Francis Cumming, and moved that it be printed.

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

In moving the adjournment of the House, the PREMIER said that there were only two private motions on the paper for to-morrow, and after they had been disposed of he proposed to go on with the consideration of the Bill they had been discussing, and he trusted that they would be able to make some progress with Supply.

Mr. HAMILTON said he would take advantage of the motion for adjournment to read a telegram he had just received from two prominent business men in Cairns. It was as follows :—

“Bridge over Upper Barron partly washed away, cutting near Macgregor’s. 1,200 horses on road. All traffic suspended. Great loss. Packers and townspeople ask Government to assist; urgently wanted.”

The bridge was between Herberton and Cairns, and unless steps were taken immediately to repair it, not only would the trade between Herberton and Cairns be seriously affected, but the packers on the road would suffer very great loss and privation. He wished to impress upon the Government the necessity of some steps being taken to relieve the men in extremity; and he had every reason to believe they would. The rainy season had only just set in, and would continue for two or three months, and if some steps were not taken at once, the whole of the bridge would be probably washed away.

The PREMIER said that the Government would get all the information they could to-morrow, and take what steps were necessary.

The House adjourned at ten minutes past 12 o’clock.