

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

MONDAY, 15 DECEMBER 1884

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Monday, 15 December, 1884.

Formal Motions.—Defence Bill—consideration of Legislative Council's amendments.—Supply.—Loan Estimates.—Officials in Parliament Bill—committee.—Supply—resumption of committee.—Adjournment.

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

FORMAL MOTIONS.

The following formal motions were agreed to :—

By Mr. BLACK—

That there be laid upon the table of the House, copies of correspondence, during the last three months, between R. J. Jeffray and the Government, referring to labour from British India and the condition of the sugar industry of Queensland.

By Mr. BEATTIE—

That there be laid upon the table of the House, all papers showing the extra expenditure on the Sandgate Railway, and the authority by which incurred and paid.

DEFENCE BILL—CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

On the Order of the Day being read for the consideration in committee of the amendments made by the Legislative Council in this Bill,

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said : Mr. Speaker.—When the Land Bill was returned to the House the other evening, you read to us a ruling, the result of your judgment on certain amendments that had been made in it by the Upper House. That was a very interesting document ; but you will remember that you did not give us time to study it to the extent we should have done had we had notice that such objections were going to be made. I have read it since, and I cannot say that it has impressed me very much with regard to the position that this House has always held in reference to the other Chamber. We have, however, an opportunity of deciding the question, in my opinion, in a much more crucial form by the Bill brought before us to-day. You, sir, in general terms, held this position—and I go a long way with you, although I do not believe thoroughly in all your arguments for the defence of the privileges of this House—but you laid down as a general rule that we are entitled to object to everything coming to us from the Upper House which in its consequences brings a charge on the people ; that any Bill or amendment coming from the Upper House which directly or indirectly founds a charge on the people should be objected to by this House. That principle is laid down in what I suppose you intended to be a quotation, as it is a quotation from Hatsell, and you endorsed his opinion. Well, take an example from the Land Bill, of the principle on which we differ from the Upper House. Take the amendment—one of the most important ones, contained in the 20th clause : there the other Chamber has altered the principle laid down by us, that the fixing of the rent of the pastoral tenants of the colony should be entrusted entirely to two men without any appeal to some higher court. They have differed from us, and have made an alteration that allows an appeal to a higher court named arbitrators. Now, it cannot be said, in any way, that that is a charge upon the people, because the appeal to another court may possibly—may just as probably—result in there being a gain to the country, so that there may be no charge on the people. It does not necessarily follow, from the other Chamber having introduced a fresh principle of this sort, that there is a fresh charge upon the people. That does not follow at all ; because it may happen

that the rent may be increased instead of lowered, although, of course, it may be lowered just as well as increased. The result is problematical. The clause is simply the machinery by which the ordinary arrangements for the purpose of working the business of the Government are carried out. That, sir, was held by you to be an interference with the privileges of the House. Of course you considered it your duty to call attention to it. I have studied it and the other points you enumerated in the memo. you read, and I do not find that I could have illustrated the matter more plainly from my point of view ; because I find no interference more direct than there is here. Well, I cannot see where the interference comes in. But we have got before us now another Bill which has not attracted your attention ; at any rate we have had no memo. from you on it. You have not directed the attention of the House to a breach of the privileges of this House by the direct interference with the principles of finance that we claim as the exclusive privilege of this House. We will take new clause 27. The other Chamber have obliterated a clause in which we made a modest provision for manning and arming ships, and they have substituted a provision for a permanent naval force. Now, if that is not a direct charge on the people, I should like to know what is. Our arrangement was modest enough ; but they have clearly made provision for a permanent naval force. If anyone goes back to the history of the disputes between the House of Lords and the House of Commons, long ago, it will be seen that they always originated in this particular way—that is, where the King had the assistance of the House of Lords, and wished to force the country to find him provision both in ships and men to carry on his own wars. Here is a case exactly in point, which seems to have escaped your attention altogether. Nothing could really go further. Take also clause 29. We in our economy decided that we would have a commandant for the defence force. It was altered somewhat in committee, but we certainly did not provide for an admiral of the fleet. But clause 29, taken in conjunction with clause 2—the interpretation clause—clearly and distinctly institutes an entirely new office. It seems to have been cunningly devised so as to escape that conclusion ; but anyone who reads the clause could come to no other conclusion than that a new office has been created. That has been put in by the other Chamber, and, according to your ruling, undoubtedly against the privileges of this House. Now, I should like to have your ruling on that point before we go into committee. I draw your attention also to the amendments in clause 52, which, on the principles you have laid down, and on the principles which have always been advocated in this House, are a distinct infringement of the privileges of this House :—

“The regulations may prescribe that the members of any such rifle corps, club, or association shall be sworn in, be called out for active service, be subject to discipline, and liable to punishment for breach of discipline, or of the regulations applicable to them, and be entitled to exemption from tolls, in the same manner as members of the defence force.”

Now, there is a distinct tax imposed on the people of the colony in the words “entitled to exemption from tolls.” The only parties entitled to collect tolls in the colonies are the divisional boards ; and the Upper House in giving any class of men the privilege of exemption from those tolls infringes on the right that this House claims of dealing with money Bills, and imposes a direct tax on the people. I direct your attention also to the amendments in clauses 76 and 79, and to new clause 83, as infringing the same privilege. Then, sir, I would lastly direct your attention to clause 29, containing the

provision for making use of the Police Force. There is nothing said here about payments, but there is no question that we cannot expect the Police Force to perform the duties enforced by this Bill, when called upon, without being paid in the same way as all other members of the defence force. It is a new element introduced into the Bill, by which the whole of the police are drafted bodily into the defence force. Now, that is an infringement of our rights. It is imposing taxation on the people of the colony. Now, sir, in all the cases that I have pointed out, a clear and distinct charge has been made upon the people of the colony. You went a great deal further in your objections to the amendments made by the Upper House in the Land Bill, because you laid down and enforced the principle that their interference was quite enough, even if it had the effect of reducing instead of increasing the charge upon the people of the colony. Your objection does not lie simply because the Upper House have made amendments by which the charges on the people are increased; you have made the objection because by the amendments the charges on the people may possibly be altered either to more or less. Now, all the cases which I have pointed out in this Bill are cases in which the charges on the people have been directly increased—increased, too, in the most objectionable way, and in a way which, in my opinion, we ought to take notice of. If we allow these to pass as precedents I do not see what we can possibly assume for the future to be objectionable; we shall have to give them what they claim, and have always claimed—the right of acting *pari passu* with us, with equal powers in all money Bills, and in the taxation of the people. I call your attention to this, and ask your ruling, if you are prepared to give it now, on the points I have raised.

The PREMIER said: The hon. member, I think, has not read all this Bill through. If he will read the 90th clause—the 88th clause of the Bill as it passed this House—he will find it provides that—

“All sums of money required to defray any expense authorised by this Act may be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund; but no sum of money shall be so paid unless it be included in some appropriation made by Parliament.”

So that this Bill absolutely imposes no charge whatever on the people. No charge whatever can be imposed under the Bill without a previous vote on the Estimates.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: That wipes out all the Speaker's arguments.

The PREMIER: No, not at all. The case of the Land Bill that the hon. gentleman referred to is different in every particular. The cases mentioned there were cases in which the burden would be imposed directly and immediately by the operation of the Bill itself. In this case there is no burden whatever imposed by the operation of the Bill. But, besides that, the amendments the hon. member referred to are merely verbal. He referred particularly to one which he thought a very great one. He called attention to an important change made by the Legislative Council in substituting for the modest provision we had made for armed ships a provision for a permanent naval force. Now, that is an alteration of a marginal note, and I think we do not object to the Legislative Council suggesting an alteration in a marginal note. There is no alteration in the clause at all.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: That is not so.

The PREMIER: If the hon. gentleman will look at it he will see that it is so. The Legislative Council have proposed to make the 4th paragraph of the 26th clause into a separate

clause. The words are exactly the same for the first two sentences, and then follow some words which had clearly been omitted by error, and which were necessary to make the clause have the effect it was intended to have. Surely we will allow them to suggest the division of one clause into two! That does not affect the privileges of this House. The privileges of this House, I take it, are something substantial, and not merely verbal. The words of the clause are identical with those proposed by us, except that they have added—

“All such officers and seamen shall, for purposes of discipline, be deemed to be called out for active service, and be subject to the laws and regulations which, under the provisions of this Act apply to officers, non-commissioned officers, and men of the marine force, called out for such service.”

That provision is perhaps contained in the previous clause, and perhaps not. The next amendment the hon. member referred to is in clause 29, giving the senior naval officer the command of the marine force. That is no change in anything but the name. The Bill provided for naval officers in the marine force, and it also provided that they should all be subject to the commandant. The Legislative Council suggest, instead of that, that the senior naval officer for the time being should be in charge of the marine force. There is no new office created, and there can be no additional charge imposed by the amendment. I could not follow the hon. member in his objection to new clause 83, which provides a penalty for the wearing of uniform by persons other than members of the defence force. There does not seem to be anything in that. Then the hon. gentleman referred to the clause providing that—

“All men for the time being serving in the Police Force shall be members of the defence force.”

That is the one amendment that is not verbal. How that can be said to impose any burden on the people I confess I cannot see. It does not propose to give any extra pay to the police. However, the clause I call your attention to, Mr. Speaker, entirely covers the clauses mentioned by the hon. member, and no expenses can possibly be incurred under this Bill without the authority of an appropriation of this House.

The SPEAKER: In dealing with the point raised by the hon. member for Mulgrave, I wish first to say that in giving my ruling upon the Land Bill I expressed simply my own opinion, and it was for the House either to assent or dissent to the ruling. I expressed it as my opinion that the Land Bill was a revenue Bill; and the power of the Legislative Council in dealing with measures of that nature has been expressly laid down in all authorities on parliamentary government, and particularly so in the work of Sir S. Erskine May and the other eminent authority that I quoted. I do not see, however, that this Bill can in any way be construed into being a revenue Bill. It is a Defence Bill, and our 268th Standing Order says:—

“With respect to any Bill brought to this House from the Legislative Council, or returned by the Legislative Council to this House, with amendments, whereby any pecuniary penalty, forfeiture, or fee shall be authorised, imposed, appropriated, regulated, varied, or extinguished, this House will not insist on its privileges in the following cases:—

“1. When the object of such pecuniary penalty or forfeiture is to secure the execution of the Act, or the punishment or prevention of offences.”

That would particularly apply to the present case, and, I think, particularly to the 77th clause to which the hon. gentleman drew my attention.

“Where such fees are imposed in respect of benefit taken or service rendered under the Act, and in order to the execution of the Act, and are not made payable into the Treasury, or in aid of the public revenue, and do not form the ground or public accounting by the parties receiving the same, either in respect of deficit or surplus.”

The principal clause to which the hon. member referred was the 52nd as it passed this House, but now the 53rd, which read as follows:—

"The Governor may sanction the organisation of rifle corps or clubs, and of associations for purposes of drill, under such conditions as may be prescribed, and may provide arms and ammunition for them.

"The regulations may prescribe that the members of any such rifle corps, club, or association shall be sworn in, be called out for active service, be subject to discipline, and liable to punishment for breach of discipline, or of the regulations applicable to them, and be entitled to exemption from tolls, in the same manner as members of the defence force.

"Officers and non-commissioned officers thereof shall be appointed, and be subject to removal in the same manner, and shall pass the same examination, and have the same relative rank, as officers and non-commissioned officers of the defence force; but shall always be reckoned as junior to officers of the defence force of the same rank, whatever may be the dates of their respective commissions or appointments.

"The regulations may prescribe a standard of efficiency for the members of any such rifle corps, club, or association, and efficient members thereof shall be exempt from enrolment in the defence force.

"The management of the civil affairs of any such rifle corps, club, or association may be regulated by rules adopted on the formation thereof, or subsequently amended in the prescribed manner. Such rules, or any amendments thereof, shall not have force unless or until approved by the Government."

I do not see in what way the ruling given in the case of the Land Bill can be made to apply here. In that case in my opinion a direct interference with the revenue was attempted, but here we have simply an authority which exempts members of rifle clubs in the same way as members of the regular force, from the payment of tolls. I think that can hardly be construed—at least it would require a very long strain of the law in such cases if that could be construed into constituting a tax upon the people. With regard to the 28th clause, I cannot see that there is any very great alteration in it from what it was as it finally passed this House. The Police Force, I take it, would only be called out in a case of emergency, and this House will then be called upon to grant the necessary appropriation. Therefore, as far as that amendment is concerned, it cannot be construed into imposing a tax upon the people in the manner mentioned by the hon. gentleman. Without wishing to be egotistical, I must inform the House that no amendments which are made by the other Chamber escape my attention. It is my duty to read these Bills very carefully through, in order to see how they are altered and how far the privileges of this House are curtailed; and if I saw that any of our privileges were infringed I should not be slow in bringing the matter under the attention of hon. members.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: I rise again to a point of order, to have it laid down clearly whether clause 76 does not distinctly and clearly interfere with the arrangements of the Bill. I have pointed out that clauses have been so altered as to interfere with the taxation of the people of the colony. That was met by the Premier, who pointed out clause 88, and said, granted that they did, the money will still have to be appropriated by the passing of a Bill through this House. I wish to understand if that is your ruling: That, granted additional taxation has been imposed, the Upper House have not broken the privileges of this House, because by clause 88 all moneys that have to be paid and have to be taken out of the consolidated revenue and voted by this House. I hope you understand the point I raise, and I wish to have the point very distinctly laid down.

The SPEAKER: I should be very sorry to lay down such a ruling as the hon. member wishes me to; because if I thought the amendments in the Bill increased the burdens of the

people I should not have the least hesitation in saying so. This does not, in my opinion, in any way interfere with taxation, but I would draw the attention of the House to it if it did. As I said before, I differ with the hon. gentleman in the construction he puts on some of the clauses of this Bill, inasmuch as they are entirely covered by the 88th section of the Bill as passed by this House.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: I take then clause 29 to which I objected. That clause in providing for a senior naval officer distinctly makes a new appointment. We made no provision for a senior naval officer, or for a naval officer at all, in command of the naval force. This is distinctly a new appointment. It is an additional taxation on the people, and it is an infringement of the privileges of this House. I shall therefore ask your ruling upon that point.

The PREMIER: Before you give your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I must remind the House that the 26th clause of the Bill provides that—

"The Governor may also raise and maintain such and so many officers and seamen as may from time to time be required to man any armed ships or vessels belonging to Her Majesty's Colonial Government. The officers of such ships shall be appointed during pleasure, and the seamen shall be enlisted in the prescribed manner and for the prescribed period of service."

The clause the hon. member refers to merely provides that the senior officer shall have command of the force. It is no new appointment at all.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: That is not so, because it is distinctly stated that the commandant is not to have charge of the naval forces of the colony. A new appointment has been made; in fact, they have created an admiral.

The SPEAKER: I certainly think there is something in the contention of the hon. member for Mulgrave in that particular matter, because the interpretation clause, as it left this House, provided for a commandant only. It now appears with a new definition, that of "senior naval officer"; and in section 30 a new subsection has been added, providing that—

"The senior naval officer shall be charged under the orders of the Governor with the command and discipline of the marine force."

It would appear from those two alterations that a new office had been created.

The PREMIER: Let me point out that it is only the creation of a new name, not of a new office. If there are several officers, one will be the senior, and the Bill has carefully provided for the appointment of officers in the marine force. Instead of the marine force being under charge of the commandant it will be under charge of one officer of the marine force who happens to be senior for the time being. It may be called a new appointment in one sense, but it is neither a new man nor new pay. It is only conferring additional duties on an officer whose creation is already provided for. There can be no doubt about that.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: The hon. gentleman has forgotten the fact that he had provided purely and entirely for a land force, and for nothing else.

The PREMIER: Not when the Bill left this House.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: I am referring to the Bill when it first came before the House. Afterwards, when through our efforts he had been induced to provide for a naval force, he committed the absurdity of making the commandant the admiral. He says this is neither a new man nor new pay. I say it is both. There is not the slightest doubt that the Upper House saw the absurdity of that arrangement, and

they made a new arrangement by which a separate individual should have command of the naval force. In doing that, they have infringed on the privileges of this House. If it was originally intended to have this senior naval officer, why was he not provided for on the Estimates? We have a commandant, a brigade major, an artillery staff-officer, and others, but there is nothing about an admiral or a senior naval officer.

The PREMIER: Wait till you see the Supplementary Estimates.

The SPEAKER: In addition to section 29, the senior naval officer is referred to in section 30, and, indeed, all through the Bill. An amendment in section 30 goes so far as to provide that—

“Petty officers in the marine force shall be appointed by the senior naval officer.”

I certainly think that a new office has been created—a creation which does not come within the province of the other branch of the Legislature, but which is within the province of this House alone.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: I have another point to raise affecting the privileges of this House, and that is as to what the other Chamber have done with regard to the Police Force. I desire your ruling on that point, sir. When the clause relating to the police left this House, it provided that those who hereafter entered the service should belong to the defence force. The Upper House have altered that, and made it apply to all police who are at present in the service. I hold that, by that, the Upper Chamber have actually called into the service of the country, in the shape of a defence force, a body of men who will have to be paid for their services, and have thereby increased the burdens of the people.

The SPEAKER: I cannot agree with the hon. member's contention with regard to that clause. Several verbal amendments have been made in it, the only material change being that it now applies to men “for the time being” serving in the force, instead of to those “who are hereafter engaged.” But they are only to be called out in cases of emergency, and the appropriation for their services then is directly under the control of this House. Hon. members will observe that in this case the pay has not been altered.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: They are constituted members of the defence force.

The SPEAKER: Yes; but they are only to be called out in cases of emergency, and the appropriation is then provided, over which this House has control.

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

The PREMIER said his attention had been called to the fact that the Bill did not deal in a very satisfactory manner with the naval branch of the defence force, and certain amendments were inserted in order to make it more effective in that particular. He admitted freely that in some respects the naval force was the most important part of the defence force of the colony; and he also called attention to the fact that two vessels of war were on their way out, and that it would be necessary to deal with them. On reconsidering the Bill, after it had passed through the Assembly, it occurred to him that it was still capable of improvement in that direction, by making more distinct reference to the naval force in different clauses. He therefore suggested to his hon. colleague, the Postmaster-General, to propose in the Legislative Council the necessary amendments. One objection pointed out was that it was undesirable that the marine force should be even nominally

under command of the commandant. He pointed out at the time that the control would be only nominal, although he was curiously enough reported to have said the very opposite. On further inquiry he found that it would be better to make a separation between the officer in charge of one branch, and the officer in charge of the other branch of the force, and it was proposed, therefore, to put the marine force in charge of the senior naval officer for the time being, whatever his rank might be. That was carried out by inserting in the interpretation clause the term “senior naval officer,” meaning no particular officer, but the officer who for the time being happened to be senior. It might be one, one day; and another, another day. There was no creation of any office. If it happened to be the captain of the “Gayundah” who was senior, he would be the senior naval officer; and if he did not happen to be senior, but the commander of some other vessel in the force, holding a captain's commission, he would be the senior naval officer. There was no new office in any way. He therefore proposed that the first amendment of the Legislative Council be agreed to. All the amendments with the exception of the one relating to the Police Force and the one as to rifle corps were verbal amendments giving effect to what he had stated.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he did not know how the hon. member could move an amendment of that kind in the face of the decision that had been given by the Speaker—namely, that that new appointment was an infringement of the privileges of the House. The Speaker had ruled that it was a new appointment and that it was an infringement of the privileges of the House. He (Sir T. McIlwraith) did not think anything more was actually wanted to show that that was a new appointment than the speech just made by the Premier. He had said, what of course they all knew, that the Bill when it passed through the House was a Defence Bill for a land force. He was shown how inadequate it was for the purpose, and he commenced to manipulate it so as to serve both purposes, and to make it apply by a few amendments to a marine as well as to a land force. But, thinking over it, he had since come to the conclusion that the amended Bill did not meet the desired end thoroughly, and he got amendments made and passed them through the other Chamber. Now, if that sort of rough-hewing work was to be done by the Lower House—if the hon. Premier meant them to rough-hew Bills and have them dressed by the other House, and if they were to be told when the Bills came down to their House again for consideration that the amendments were formal amendments—he (Sir T. McIlwraith) thought they would be very guarded as to the kind of Bills they passed through the House. The Premier had told them before of formal amendments, and when he failed to accomplish what he desired in the way of amendment of the Bill in the Lower House he made arrangements for having them introduced in the Upper House, so that actually amendments were made in the Bill in the Upper House dealing with money matters of the colony with which that Chamber had nothing to do. They were asked to accept those amendments as purely formal amendments, and to part with privileges of their own House. He (Sir T. McIlwraith) did not see how the Premier could move an amendment of that sort without the Speaker's ruling being asked on the question. At any rate he would ask the Speaker's ruling as soon as they got him into the chair. The Speaker had ruled that by the amendment a new office had been created, and that that was an infringement of the privileges of that House.

The PREMIER said the hon. member had misquoted all he had said just now, and also all he had said before. If the Legislative Council had created a new appointment, that would have been a matter which it would have been necessary to take into consideration. But that was the matter of construction, upon the whole Bill. He had pointed out that of the officers of the naval defence force one must be senior.

The HON. SIR. T. MCILWRAITH: No, no!

The PREMIER said if the hon. member did not want to argue, very well; he would address hon. members who would attend to the matter on its merits. He said that the Bill provided that there would be officers of the marine force, one of whom would necessarily be the senior one. The Bill, as it left that House, had provided that certain duties would be performed by the commandant of the land force. By the amendments made in the Legislative Council it was provided that those duties, instead of being performed by the commandant of the land force, would be performed by the senior officer of the marine force.

Mr. ARCHER said that was a new appointment.

The PREMIER said it was not a new appointment. Suppose that some measure were to say that certain duties now performed by the Clerk of the Assembly would in future be performed by the Clerk Assistant, that would not be a new appointment. The Bill provided for two officers—the commandant and an officer who was the senior officer of the marine force. As the Bill left that House certain duties were to be performed by the former, but the Legislative Council said they should be performed by the latter. Where was the new appointment there? He was unable to see it. Surely it was a dry question of fact! The Bill provided for the appointment of two officers. The Legislative Council suggested that certain duties should be performed by one of those officers and certain other duties by the other officer. The “senior naval officer” was not a name like “commandant.” It was a short definition used to avoid repetition throughout the Bill that the naval officer who for the time being happened to be the senior naval officer holding a commission in the colony should be the one to perform the duties. Where was the new officer there? He said again there was not a new officer.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said the hon. gentleman had commenced his speech, as he had commenced a dozen others, by telling him that he had misquoted and misunderstood everything he had said that day, and in all times past. All that sort of thing had not the slightest effect on him. Whenever the hon. gentleman was hard up for an argument he resorted to those angry ejaculations. To hear a man standing up and deliberately arguing as the Premier did that two men were one was rather a curiosity. He (Sir T. McIlwraith) would take an example. Supposing in the Land Bill of the Government the Upper House had put in a commissioner for scrub lands—it was not unlikely that they would—and supposing that they decided that that commissioner should be the senior clerk in the Lands Office—did the hon. gentleman mean to tell him that there would not be any new appointment made simply from the fact that the office would be filled by a particular officer already in the Lands Department? They found that the Defence Bill left the House an absurdity because the second officer had not been created, and that the naval branch of the defence force was to be put under the head of the land force. He had pointed that out, and the Upper House had put the naval branch of the defence force under

the senior naval officer. And yet the hon. member came there and said that that was not an addition to the Bill; that it had been actually provided for before. And why? Because there had been a general clause providing for naval officers. That was a subterfuge. There must have been a reason for putting in the new clause. The reason was that the Bill would have been unworkable—at least, an absurdity—if that office had not been created. The office had been created. The hon. member said it had not been created at all; but if it had not been created the Bill would have been nonsense.

The PREMIER said there was no use arguing with the hon. gentleman when he took up the position he did. He would take an illustration. Suppose the Legislative Council had provided for certain duties to be performed by the senior land commissioner. In order to find who was the senior land commissioner, they would inquire who was the land commissioner with the largest pay, or who had been the longest number of years in the service, or who most merited the post. And suppose the interpretation clause were altered to say what was meant by “senior land commissioner.” Would that have been creating a new office? If the Bill had not provided for naval officers at all, their calling one man “senior naval officer” would have been creating a new office, for there would have been no officers of which one would have been senior. The hon. gentleman was confusing names with things. The words “senior naval officer” in the Bill might mean anything. It might mean the senior naval officer in the Atlantic Squadron, in the British Fleet, or anything else. Putting the words in the interpretation clause did not make it a new appointment. The hon. gentleman could not point out any clause which created a new appointment. Clause 29 provided that there should be an officer appointed to be called the “commandant.” If the Legislative Council wanted to appoint a new officer, they would have said, “There shall be an officer appointed to be called the senior naval officer,” or “the naval commandant,” as the case might be; but they had carefully avoided doing anything of the kind. They simply said that one of the officers of the marine force, who was the senior for the time being, should perform certain duties. They were simply duties transferred from the commandant to the senior officer of the marine force. It was nothing more than a transfer of duty. There was no creation of any new office whatever. If the hon. gentleman was anxious to protect the privileges of the House, he (the Premier) had no objection to add to the message to the Council that the amendments were agreed to because they were in furtherance of the intentions of the Legislative Assembly.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said the hon. gentleman had stated that the Legislative Council had carefully avoided making any new appointment, but he (Sir T. McIlwraith) contended that, although they had not done so in words, they had done so clearly in effect. There was no question that a new appointment had been made. There was no senior naval officer, or any officer in charge of the naval branch, with equal powers to the commandant of the land forces in the Bill when it left that House; and the Legislative Council had amended the Bill so that there should be such an officer. He knew perfectly well that the hon. gentleman tried to guard against the objection he had raised in the best possible way he could; but it was not simply a difference of words, because in effect the appointment had been made. The hon. gentleman said a case analogous to that would happen if the Upper House defined certain duties that an officer in the Lands Office was to perform. Very well. If the Upper

House had put into the Land Bill a clause to the effect that a certain clerk in the Lands Office should perform the duties of commissioner of scrub lands, the objection would have applied that they were appointing a new office; and there could not be the slightest doubt that it would be a new office—distinctly and clearly a new office, involving new pay.

Question put.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said nothing could more clearly show that it was a new appointment than the proposition of the Government. The hon. the Premier need not be getting crusty, because they had all their work to do, and if he wanted to get the Bill through he had better keep his temper. He did not care whether the hon. gentleman got in a "scot" over the matter or not. He repeated that nothing pointed out better his contention than the motion before the Committee. Before they had an officer commanding the defence force; now that officer was to be the officer commanding "the land force," and by indirect means they had actually constituted an officer commanding the naval force.

The PREMIER said the Bill provided that one of the officers who, as it was originally drafted, would have been subordinate to the commandant, should not be so any longer; and that certain duties that would have been performed by the commandant should be performed by that officer.

Question put and passed.

The PREMIER moved that the Legislative Council's amendment in clause 2, line 2, to insert the words—

"Senior naval officer"—The senior combatant commissioned officer of the marine force for the time being."—be agreed to.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said he desired to take the opinion of the Speaker on the amendment. It was a part of the proof, along with clause 29, that a new appointment had been made; and he thought they ought to refer it to the Speaker, to ascertain whether it did not infringe the privileges of the House.

The PREMIER said the matter was clearly not one to be referred to the Speaker, but one in which, as the Speaker had pointed out on another occasion recently, the House itself should decide what action should be taken. But even if it were such a case—which the Government maintained it was not, and as everyone who understood the subject thoroughly must agree it was not—then the proper course to adopt was—as had been done in numerous cases of the same kind—to agree to the amendment, and intimate to the other House that it was agreed to because it was in furtherance of the intentions of the Legislative Assembly. That had frequently been done, as had been pointed out by the hon. the Speaker in the ruling he gave last Thursday. In deference to the Speaker's ruling he would take that course. Otherwise he should not do so.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said they had already taken the opinion of the Speaker on the question, and it would be waste of time to refer it to him again. He would therefore allow his objection to drop, so far as that particular amendment was concerned.

Question put and passed.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the other amendments of the Legislative Council in clause 2 were agreed to.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the Legislative Council's amendment in clause 7 was agreed to.

The PREMIER moved that the Legislative Council's amendments in clause 8 be agreed to. The amendments made merely formed a transposition.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH asked what was the object in the amendment of reproducing the amendment in clause 2, and taking out naval "volunteers," and substituting "seamen"?

The PREMIER: It is the more convenient form.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH asked why should not naval volunteers be included too? He hoped they would get naval volunteers yet. He had no objection to the word "seamen"; but why "naval volunteers" should be struck out he did not know.

The PREMIER said he did not think it was anticipated in that House that there would be a body of men absolutely and entirely volunteer seamen. "Volunteers" was a term intended to be applied to men who served entirely without pay. He did not suppose they would have a body of seamen serving entirely without pay.

Mr. ARCHER said that, even though they might not be able to get naval volunteers now it was no reason why they should exclude them by the Bill. The hon. member was probably aware that there were naval volunteers in England.

The PREMIER: Not absolutely volunteers.

Mr. ARCHER said there were. His nephew had not only served as a naval volunteer, but had gone to sea for several weeks in a gunboat. They were subject to drill as strict as any of the land forces. They had to attend drill after office-hours, and were put through the same drill as sailors on the gunboats. The time might come when there might be men willing to become naval volunteers here, and they would require a new Bill for them.

The PREMIER said the 52nd section was one which dealt specially with volunteers, and there was nothing in it that would render it inapplicable to naval volunteers, and the word "seamen" would refer strictly to men forming a part of the defence force.

Question put and passed.

The PREMIER moved that the Legislative Council's amendment in clause 12, omitting the words "regimental or company," be agreed to.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: What is the object of this?

The PREMIER said he did not see the object of the words that had been left out. There was no reason why they should be called "regimental or company divisions."

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said there must be some qualification of the divisions, or they would get into confusion. There were separate divisions under the Divisional Boards Act, and now if they got military divisions they should have a distinctive name for them. If there were no other reason than that, the amendment should not be agreed to.

The PREMIER: They would be called divisions of military districts.

Question put and passed.

The PREMIER, in moving that the Legislative Council's amendment in clause 21, providing that a man who is over the age of fifty-five years shall be allowed to remain in the active force by the special permission of the commandant or naval officer, be agreed to, said there might be special cases in which men of that age might be allowed to remain in the service. There were men in the force now who were over fifty-five years of age, and it might perhaps be a pity to turn them out.

Question put and passed.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the Committee agreed to the Legislative Council's amendments in clauses 22 and 26, and to the new clause, to follow clause 26, inserted by the

Council providing for a permanent naval force, as follows:—

"The Governor may also raise and maintain such and so many officers and seamen as may from time to time be required to man any armed ships or vessels belonging to Her Majesty's Colonial Government. The officers of such ships shall be appointed during pleasure, and the seamen shall be enlisted in the prescribed manner and for the prescribed period of service. All such officers and seamen shall, for purposes of discipline, be deemed to be called out for active service, and be subject to the laws and regulations which under the provisions of this Act apply to officers, non-commissioned officers, and men of the marine force, called out for such service."

On the motion of the PREMIER, the Legislative Council's amendments in clause 27 were agreed to.

The PREMIER moved that the Legislative Council's amendment in clause 28, providing for making use of the police as a military force, be agreed to. He did not know any reason why the members of the Police Force should not be members of the defence force. The amendment had been proposed by the hon. President of the Legislative Council. He thought the amendment should be agreed to.

Question put and passed.

The PREMIER moved that the other amendments made by the Legislative Council in the same clause be agreed to.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said his objection was not to the clause as it stood, but to the Upper House putting it there.

Question put and passed.

The PREMIER moved that the Legislative Council's amendments in clause 29 be agreed to.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said the objection he urged in reference to the amendment in clause 2 as to the right of the other House to make a fresh appointment applied more appropriately to that clause. He would not, however, further discuss the subject.

Question put and passed.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the Legislative Council's amendments in clause 30 were agreed to.

The PREMIER moved that the amendments of the Legislative Council in clause 31 be agreed to.

Mr. BEATTIE said the clause required some little alteration. The Legislative Council had not gone far enough. The clause as it now stood provided that "commissions of officers in the defence force shall be granted by the Governor."

The PREMIER: That is in clause 30. We are going by the old numbers.

Mr. BEATTIE said he had not noticed that. What he wished to point out was that the commandant had the appointment of all non-commissioned officers.

The PREMIER: Only sergeants.

Mr. BEATTIE said the provision was that "sergeants in the land force shall be appointed by the commandant, and all other non-commissioned officers shall be appointed by the commanding officer of the corps to which they belong." But in the case of the marine force it was provided that all petty officers should be appointed by the senior naval officer. He thought that arrangement would not work well. For instance, supposing there were two or three vessels at different places, and the senior naval officer were at Cooktown while one of the ships was stationed in Moreton Bay, if the captain of the latter vessel wanted a boatswain's mate he could not appoint anyone to the position; it would have to be done by the senior naval officer. In his opinion, it was very desirable that the captain of a vessel should have authority to appoint all ordinary petty officers, otherwise there might be

some trouble in the matter. The captain of a ship would be in a much better position than the senior naval officer to know who were the most trustworthy men to appoint as officers in connection with the working of his vessel.

Mr. FOXTON said he thought the clause as it was might be made to work very well by adopting the same plan as that adopted in the Volunteer Force with respect to the appointment of non-commissioned officers at the present time. It was usual when a vacancy of that kind occurred for the captain commanding the corps to temporarily appoint someone in the corps to the acting rank until arrangements could be made at headquarters for permanently filling the vacancy. That plan had been found to work very well, and he thought it would meet the objection raised by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley in respect to the appointment of petty officers in the marine force.

Mr. BEATTIE said that would certainly meet the objection. He thought it was a very good idea to allow officers in charge of volunteer corps to appoint their own petty officers, as they would know who were the best men to appoint, and the men would thus be led to emulate one another in order to bring themselves under the notice of the commanding officer.

Question put and passed.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the Legislative Council's amendments in clauses 33, 34, 35, and 38 were agreed to.

The PREMIER moved that the Legislative Council's amendment in clause 45 be agreed to, and said it merely carried out the intention of the Assembly. As the clause left that House, the force or any corps thereof might be called out for continuous drill and training for an unlimited period. The Assembly, of course, meant that the period should not be more than eight days in each year.

Question put and passed.

The PREMIER said the amendment in clause 52 dealt rather more fully with the constitution of rifle corps. He thought all that there was in it might have been assumed by the clause without the amendment. He could not, however, see any objection to it, and would move that the amendment be agreed to, but that it be amended by adding the words "while actually serving therein" after the word "shall" in the 3rd paragraph. It would be a great pity to provide that the mere fact of a man becoming competent should exempt him from serving in case of emergency.

Amendment agreed to as amended.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the Committee agreed to the Legislative Council's amendments in clauses 56 and 57.

The PREMIER moved that the amendments of the Legislative Council in clause 59 be agreed to.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that, when the clause was under discussion before, it gave the Premier and the Commandant great trouble to convince the Committee that it would be possible to put the marine force under army regulations. After several consultations they seemed to consider that it would be possible, but they found after further consideration that it would not do; so they had introduced a clause whereby the marine force "shall be subject to the Queen's regulations and Admiralty instructions for the government of Her Majesty's naval service." That was very much in accordance with the advice given by the Opposition side.

Question put and passed.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the Committee agreed to the Legislative Council's amendments in clauses 60, 76, 79, 83, and 85; also to a new clause to follow clause 81,

The House resumed; the CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had agreed to one of the Legislative Council's amendments with an amendment, and had agreed to the other amendments.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the report was adopted; and the Bill was ordered to be returned to the Legislative Council with a message intimating—

That the Legislative Assembly have agreed to one of the Legislative Council's amendments with an amendment, in which they invite the concurrence of the Legislative Council, and have agreed to the other amendments.

That the Legislative Assembly do not insist on their privileges in respect to certain amendments of the Legislative Council with regard to the office of senior naval officer, such amendments being in furtherance of the intentions of the Legislative Assembly.

SUPPLY—LOAN ESTIMATES.

On the Order of the Day being read for the House to go into Committee of Supply,

The COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. J. R. Dickson) said :—

MR. SPEAKER,—

In moving the resolution to go into Committee of Supply, I purpose to make a few remarks on the Loan Estimates for 1884-5, which I have the gratification to submit to the House. These Estimates embrace an amount surpassing in magnitude any previous Loan proposal; but which is, I confidently assert, such as the circumstances of the colony demand and its financial position and credit enable it to sustain. This colony may be likened unto a man commencing business with small means, who has inherited large sources of material wealth, undeveloped through lack of capital, mistrust of investors, or want of a market, having but a small amount of ready money, and equally restricted credit, has at length surmounted preliminary difficulties, and having wisely conserved his credit and duly discharged, as they matured, his obligations, finds himself in a position to make unwonted use of his good name, and with such extended credit to afford unprecedented encouragement to the further and fuller development of his great natural sources of wealth. That the present time is opportune for availing ourselves of the credit of the colony to an unprecedentedly large extent is not only judicious, but I contend, absolutely necessary. Unfortunately, through abnormally severe seasons which have prevailed throughout Australia, one at least of our great national and producing industries has been severely smitten. The great pastoral industry of Australia continuously demands and receives the support of a large proportion of the capital possessed by our financial institutions; and although I have no doubt that, with a return of favourable seasons, the pastoral industry must speedily assume largely increased extent and prosperity, yet it is not too much to opine that, owing to the cause aforesaid, financial nurture may for the present be slightly retarded. In addition it may be pointed out that the expenditure of our several pastoral establishments in the employment of labour, supplies of stores, and construction of improvements, all of which contribute to a large and permanent circulation of money among the wage-earning and business community, may from similar cause be considerably restricted. The important agricultural interest has also had to contend with a season of unparalleled severity, and although the drought has happily now broken up in the coast and adjacent districts, and an abundant wheat harvest has rewarded the care of the farmers in the fertile lands of the Darling Downs, while the condition of general crops on the coast lands is reported to be highly encouraging, still the absence of pro-

duction in the immediate past, and the enforced purchase outside the colony for a considerable time of large quantities of produce which we have been hitherto accustomed to see grown within, cannot wholly pass away without creating some apprehension of financial pressure. To relieve this feeling is, I contend, among the functions of sound administration, and if any such feeling should have found admission into the guidance of our large financial institutions, Government should now by bold vigorous action speedily extirpate such nervousness, and restore full confidence in the soundness and elasticity of our great industries, while suffering recovery from a natural temporary depression. In the face of these contingencies unfortunately too probable, and to prevent as far as possible any derangement of the commercial and financial interests of the country, Government desire to push on with vigour the prosecution of important public works, to open up approach to the great interior resources of the colony, to stimulate pastoral and predial settlement under the encouraging conditions of present land legislation, to afford greater facilities of communication between the centres of population, to introduce a large accession to our population by whom industries will be promoted and employment for labour be likewise extended, to aid local bodies in their efforts to introduce sanitary and municipal reforms and improvements within their respective jurisdictions, to extend the benefits of communication by the electric telegraph to the remoter parts of our large territory, to improve our numerous harbours and rivers so that they may receive in safety the commercial navies of the world; in short, sir, to provide for such extended public services as are embraced in the Loan Estimates—services which, while they will immediately contribute to the prosperity of the people of the colony throughout its full extent, are such as the country not only demands, but being largely of a reproductive character will, in time, assuredly relieve and largely assist the revenue, and thereby become important items in the country's national assets. And I have yet further to add that, as with the impetus to grazing settlement which is afforded under the new Land Bill, the financial institutions of the colony may, in all probability, be largely applied to for pecuniary assistance, with which the present condition of pastoral enterprise might interfere, the maintenance by the Government of considerable balances of funds within the colony may enable these requirements to obtain fuller and more favourable attention than they would otherwise receive, especially were money to become stringent.

I think I have given general reasons why the loan is opportune at the present time, and I will now proceed to consider the character of the loan, and will then deal with the financial ability of the country to sustain such an additional increase to our present indebtedness.

The proposed loan represents a total of £9,980,000, being anticipated provision for the great public works and services of the colony, to cover a period of from three to five years. Of this sum £750,000, or 7 per cent. of the whole loan, is appropriated for purposes of immigration; railways obtain £6,917,000, or 69 per cent.; harbours and rivers £593,000, or 6 per cent.; water supply £250,000, or 3 per cent.; buildings £485,000, or 5 per cent.; electric telegraph extension £250,000, or 3 per cent.; and miscellaneous services £735,000, or 7 per cent. of the total loan. I have prepared a table showing the percentage of appropriation for each service on the several Loan Estimates since 1863, which may prove interesting to hon. members. It represents as follows :—

THE PUBLIC DEBT OF THE COLONY.

—	1866.	1870.	1872.	1875.	1876	1877.	1878.	1879.	1881.	1882.	* 884.	New Loan.	Total.
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Immigration	200,000	50,000	150,000	325,000	...	150,000	50,000	100,000	...	350,000	400,000	750,000	2,525,000
Railways	890,950	346,568	686,000	766,600	126,100	751,600	820,000	2,024,100	336,400	1,822,000	847,000	6,917,000	16,334,318
Harbours and Rivers	60,000	...	42,000	125,400	85,000	100,000	100,000	249,000	115,000	184,000	10,000	593,000	1,663,400
Water Supply	15,000	78,500	25,000	54,500	20,000	18,250	87,800	50,000	...	250,000	599,050
Buildings	34,455	44,500	60,000	77,300	86,300	47,800	80,000	38,400	18,000	37,000	485,000	1,008,755
Electric Telegraphs	34,600	60,000	80,800	47,200	25,000	...	70,000	33,000	135,500	10,000	250,000	746,100
Miscellaneous	5,000	299,977	484,000	259,000	380,100	154,600	147,000	511,650	478,900	84,000	135,000	735,000	3,674,227
	£ 1,170,950	765,600	1,466,500	1,695,300	740,700	1,322,000	1,184,800	3,053,000	1,089,500	2,643,500	1,439,000	9,980,000	26,550,850
PERCENTAGE OF EACH ITEM TO TOTAL OF EACH LOAN.													
Immigration	17	7	10	19	...	10	4	3	...	14	28	7	9
Railways	76	45	46	45	17	57	69	67	31	69	58	69	62
Harbours and Rivers	5	...	3	8	11	8	9	8	11	7	1	6	6
Water Supply	2	5	4	4	2	...	8	2	...	3	2
Buildings	4	4	4	11	7	4	3	3	...	3	5	4
Electric Telegraphs	4	4	4	6	2	...	2	3	5	1	3	3
Miscellaneous	40	33	15	51	12	12	17	44	3	9	7	14
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

* The Loan of 1882 includes the sum of £707,500 to retire the Loan of 1863, and the Loan of 1894 includes the sum of £1,019,000 to retire the Loan of 1864, the items of these Loans in both cases being classified under the same heads of appropriation as in the original Loans :—

—	1863.	1864.
	£	£
Immigration	100,000	100,000
Railways	250,000	847,000
Electric Telegraphs	85,500	10,000
Roads and Bridges	84,000	...
Public Buildings	18,000	37,000
Harbours and Rivers	120,000	10,000
Water Supply	50,000	...
Loans to Local Bodies	15,000
	£ 707,500	1,019,000

Supply.

[15 DECEMBER.]

Supply.

1875

Hon. members will see that the average of total appropriations for the services granted out of Loan, including the proposed new loan, compare with the present Estimates as follows:—

Under the head of Railways, provision is made in the present Estimates to the extent of 69 per cent., as against an average of 62 per cent.; Water Supply 3 per cent., as against an average of 2 per cent.; Harbours and Rivers and Electric Telegraphs obtain an appropriation of 6 per cent. and 3 per cent. respectively, being the average provision on our total loan for these services; while the item of Immigration represents 7 per cent., as against an average of 9 per cent.; and Miscellaneous Services, principally consisting of non-reproductive works, are reduced from an average provision of 14 per cent. to 7 per cent. on the present Loan Estimates. It will be observed from the foregoing that the desire of Government to confine, as far as practicable, the credit of the colony to the borrowing of loan moneys for construction of reproductive works has been carefully considered in framing the present Estimates, and forms one of their most prominent features.

I do not intend, sir, to enter fully upon the merits of the respective services, retaining for the Committee of Supply detailed information concerning their several requirements; but I may briefly state that the appropriation for immigration made from former loans, and from the Special Surplus Revenue vote of 1884-5, has been exhausted, owing to the abnormally large expenditure which was incurred during that year. The expenditure for this service has been as follows, since 1st July, 1882:—

	£	s.	d.
Balance of loan vote unexpended for immigration on that date	1,648	0	8
Loan vote 1882-3	250,000	0	0
Repayments during year	78	5	1
	251,726	5	9
Expenditure for 1882-3	258,292	11	6
	6,566	5	9
Debit balance	294,289	15	7
Expenditure for year 1883-4	300,856	1	4
	300,000	0	0
Loan vote, 1883	915	17	6
Repayment during the year	300,915	17	6
	59	16	2
Credit loan balance on 30th June, 1884			

While the Special Supplementary Appropriation vote of 1883-4 on account of Immigration, amounting to £150,000, has been drawn against up to 31st October, 1884, to the extent of £137,519, leaving a balance available on that date of £12,481.

Government anticipate that, with the increase in public works which the present loan proposals must effect, a large accession to our population will spontaneously accrue through the encouragement and opportunities afforded thereby to the labouring classes, and thus tend to relieve the expenditure of the State in this direction.

The Railway votes, including provision for the extension westward of the three trunk lines, will commend themselves to the approval of hon. members. The requirements of the colony have been carefully studied, and the construction of lines of the most pressing character has been included in the present Estimates. It would be impossible to make provision at the present time for the construction of every railway required in the colony, the necessity for which could doubtless be ably demonstrated by each hon. member.

Government desire to proceed with such as have been most urgently demanded by the people, and such as will form part of a complete future railway system.

Provision is asked to complete extension of the main line of the Western Railway to Charleville. £390,000 has been previously voted to complete the line 130 miles west of Roma; to extend to Charleville, the additional amount of £62,000 is required under the Engineer's estimate. From Charleville, 120 miles of further extension is estimated to be constructed for £3,000 per mile. The extension of the Southern Railway to the junction on the border of New South Wales requires provision for the construction of 25½ miles from Stanthorpe, extending to within 11 miles of Tenterfield. The balance available of the present vote, amounting to £45,000, requires further provision to the extent of £32,000 for this object.

The necessity of a double line between Brisbane and Ipswich must be readily admitted by hon. members, who will reflect on the large amount of traffic which at the present this single line has to sustain. A new line from Brisbane to Gympie *via* Caboolture is submitted on the Estimates. This railway, in itself of great importance in connecting the capital with Gympie and Maryborough, forms a connecting line in the policy of a coastal system of railways which Government desire to see in time bind the important towns of the coast in closer communication. Another new railway from Brisbane to Cleveland will facilitate a large extent of suburban settlement, and, like the Sandgate line, become an excellent paying investment. Provision for this service is asked to the extent of £80,000. The remoteness of the Roma-street station, in Brisbane, has long been felt a great inconvenience by railway travellers. Provision is asked for the extension of the line into the city, adjacent to the Normal Schools, Edward street, and for the further extension to Fortitude Valley. Provision is required to complete the South Brisbane Branch, for which £44,000 was previously voted. The estimated cost of the works was £59,000, in addition to which resumption of land has cost about £12,000; and to construct additional station works, alterations in grade, fencing, lengthening of tunnel, diversion of Collins street, new roads and surveys, etc., not provided for in original estimate, a further amount of £45,000 is required. The necessity of increasing wharfage accommodation for the shipment of coal, etc., at South Brisbane, has decided the Government to ask for £25,000 to extend the railway wharves there a further length of 700 feet; and £50,000 is further required to carry the line into a more central and convenient position in South Brisbane than is afforded by the site of the present station.

Provision is also required to complete the Logan line to Beenleigh and to proceed with extension to Southport and the border. This will also form part of the coastal system of railways. £70,000 is asked for the construction of the Upper Logan Branch to Beaudesert, a distance of twenty miles.

The Sandgate line, which was constructed for £86,000—the amount originally voted—requires £25,000 additional; to cover expenditure on resumption of land, £11,000; and for rolling-stock, extra works, double line at Lutwyche, interlocking signals, level crossings, platforms, sidings, telegraph lines, etc., not included in estimate—£14,000. The traffic on this line necessitates the construction of a double line throughout from Brisbane to the Junction, for which £15,000 is further requested.

The Brisbane River Valley Branch, extended to Mount Esk—a further distance of twenty-two miles to construct—requires £45,000 in addition to a balance from last vote of £46,000 remaining unexpended.

The Fassifern line, to be extended to Coochin—an additional length of seventeen miles to construct—requires further provision to the extent of £34,000; the balance of last loan vote unexpended amounting to £30,000.

A new branch line—the Laidley Creek Branch—is intended to provide railway communication to the farmers of that district, for a present distance of ten miles from the Southern and Western Railway.

The extension of the Highfields Railway to Crow's Nest requires an additional sum of £24,000. The balance of the vote unexpended represents £47,000, and the additional distance to be constructed is eighteen miles. Authorisation is also asked for the construction of the Beauaraba branch line, sixteen miles, at a cost of £48,000, and for the construction of the Drayton deviation, on the Southern and Western Railway, whereby a saving of eight or nine miles will be made in the journey between Toowoomba and Warwick, at an estimated cost of £44,000.

A further appropriation of £65,000 to complete the line from Warwick to Killarney is required, in addition to the original vote on account, £50,000. In connection with these supplementary votes to complete, I would observe that they have been framed so as to provide for cost of permanent-way material, for which transfers have yet to be made on the following lines—namely, South Brisbane, Sandgate, Brisbane River Valley, Fassifern, Highfields, and Killarney branch lines.

Provision to the extent of £500,000 is asked for the extension of the Southern and Western line from Ipswich to Warwick direct, whereby a saving in distance of fifty-four miles on the line *via* Toowoomba will be effected. The proposed line is estimated as seventy-seven miles in length, and will bring the southern border of the colony into direct communication with the seaboard.

A southern border line from Warwick towards St. George is also placed on these Estimates, and £250,000 is asked on account. This is a line which is highly desirable, not only in the interests of the communities provided thereby with railway communication, but also to protect the revenue and maintain the trade of the colony within our own territory, inasmuch as our southern neighbours, from the extension of their railways to within comparatively short distances of our southern and south-western frontiers, are rapidly acquiring a monopoly of our inland trade to the prejudice of our own merchants and importers, and to the loss of traffic on our own inland lines of railway.

In the Wide Bay and Burnett district provision to the extent of £250,000 is asked for the Maryborough and Gayndah Railway. The estimated distance is 100 miles, of which 87 miles will have to be constructed.

Additional provision of £35,000 is required to complete the Maryborough and Gympie line. The total expenditure of this railway has amounted to £400,346, the previous votes representing £365,500. The additional amount required is due to construction of Wharf Branch and extension, wharf, including cranes, turntables, Kent-street culvert, Yengarie Branch siding, and new station works, etc. Further provision for the Maryborough Wharf Branch Extension is also required to the extent of £8,000, to provide for Kent-street Extension, for coal stages, and additional buildings, Maryborough

station. A further sum of £25,000 is also asked on account of the line, Maryborough to Burrum. The amount of previous vote was £54,000, the total expenditure being £70,680. The amount now to be voted is to meet cost of Burrum Bridge, extension to Howard, fork line, cost of land and rolling-stock, etc., not included in original estimate. An additional sum of £100,000 is requested to complete the railway from Howard to Bundaberg, for which £85,000 has been previously voted. Hon. members will observe a new service provided—namely, a line from Bundaberg towards Gladstone for which £150,000 is asked on account. This line, most important in itself, will open up a large extent of country valuable for settlement, and will form an important section of the coastal system of railways, which, if the present Loan proposals are sanctioned, will then extend from the Tweed to Gladstone.

A branch line to the Isis Scrub, estimated to cost £20,000, is also provided. The distance to be built is 11½ miles, leaving the Maryborough and Bundaberg line at 30 miles from Maryborough and terminating at the Isis Scrub. The line Bundaberg to Mount Perry requires additional provision to the extent of £30,000 to supplement the amount previously voted, £308,000. This additional amount is to meet expenditure not provided in original estimate on station works, workshops, forming Perry street, surveys, supervision, etc., etc.

Provision for the Central Railway to complete the 130-mile extension from Retreat, demands £110,000 additional; this provision covers the completion of section 6 to Pine Hill, section 7 to Jericho; and for the further completion of the line from 305 to 327 miles, being balance of 130 miles for which partial provision had already been made by Parliament on Loan Estimates of 1879. A further extension of 120 miles west is submitted, estimated to cost £360,000. A new bridge over the Dawson River requires £25,000; and the Clermont Branch to complete asks for £35,000, in addition to £135,000 previously voted. £10,000 is required for railway wharf, Rockhampton; and provision is also made for a new service, the Emu Park Railway, at an estimated cost of £64,000. This line will be a great boon to the residents of Rockhampton, and when constructed is confidently anticipated to equal in remunerativeness the Sandgate and other suburban lines of railway.

Provision to the extent of £1,625,000 is asked for the Northern Railways. The extension westward from Hughenden of the Northern line 100 miles is proposed, at an estimate, to cost £300,000.

Between Townsville and Charters Towers further provision, amounting to £30,000, is required to complete; the extension to Townsville jetty and wharves demands £20,000; a new bridge over the Burdekin River is estimated at £40,000; and deviation over the Range at £30,000.

A sum of £400,000, in addition to the present vote of £200,000, is asked for the construction of the Herberton and Cairns railway. The line, Cooktown towards Maytown, for which £180,000 has been previously voted, requires a further vote on account of £150,000. The commencement of a new service to open up the Gulf country is submitted. Provision for a line of railway from Cloncurry to the Gulf of Carpentaria is proposed, and a vote of £500,000 on account is asked. Government have had a survey and report on the character of the Gulf ports and rivers recently prepared; but are not yet in a position to definitely state which will be the better terminus in the Gulf for this most important line.

A provision of £100,000 to construct a line from Bowen to the coalfields is submitted in these Estimates, towards which service the previous loan vote for Bowen and Haughton Gap Railway, amounting to £150,000 and remaining unexpended, will, with sanction of Parliament, be transferred.

Provision for surveys of these and other lines of railway is also required, and an amount of £90,000 for this service is proposed for the Southern, Central, and Northern Divisions. A large vote for rolling-stock, amounting to £737,000, appears on these Estimates. A considerable portion of this vote has been anticipated in the construction and importation of engines, rolling-stock, and plant absolutely required in the past to keep our railways properly equipped to meet the growing traffic on the respective lines.

Provision is also made for the continued improvement of the harbours and rivers of the colony, working of the dredges wheresoever located, new dredge plant, jetties and harbour works generally. Provision is also made for lighthouses, £10,000; various important public buildings, £485,000; bridges on main roads, £100,000; electric telegraph extension, £250,000; loans to local bodies, £500,000; water supply and storage, £250,000; defences of the colony, £100,000; and deficit on the loans of 1881, 1882, and 1883-4, which, being realised in a most favourable market, only suffered a depreciation of £35,000; on a gross total of over £5,172,000.

I have now briefly explained the character of the loan, and shall proceed to deal with the financial ability of the country to sustain such further indebtedness.

I desire to remind hon. members who have expressed surprise at the magnitude of the loan—which, as I have already stated, is assumed to make provision for services for a period of from three to five years hence—that between August, 1879, and January, 1884, a period of four and a-half years, the sum of £8,225,000 was authorised to be borrowed by this House; or, to put the position more clearly, between April, 1880, and May, 1883, inclusive, an interval of thirty-seven months, Queensland loans have been sold in the London market to the extent of £8,250,000; our present loan, therefore, is but slightly in excess of a sum which has been freely obtained within a space of little over three years in the past.

I think it is almost superfluous for me, after this, to remind hon. members of the growing favour of Australian bonds with the home investor. Indeed, exceptionally favourable circumstances have of late combined to produce this result.

Not only has money been abundant, but a financial experiment by the Imperial Government to convert a portion of the 3 per cent. consols into stock bearing a reduced rate of interest has met with small encouragement, and has elicited the following opinion from the leading financial brokers of the London Stock Exchange:—"It is now generally known that the amount of British 3 per cents. converted into 2½ or 2¾ per cents. is very small, and that the whole scheme has practically failed. Whatever further steps the Imperial Government may deem necessary to take towards effecting a conversion either voluntary or compulsory, a great mass of proprietors now holding British consols will gradually accept the better terms offered by our Colonial Governments, and an improvement in the value of these securities may with confidence be anticipated, provided the loan issues are regulated in such a manner as to prevent large accumulations of stocks in the market."

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH: What authority are you quoting?

The COLONIAL TREASURER:

From Westgarth's Financial Circular for September. In estimating the ability of the colony to bear this additional loan, we have before us the knowledge of its past progress, from which we may find the strongest encouragement to our present action.

In 1866 the population of the colony numbered 96,000; the indebtedness under loan amounted to £3,021,250, of which sum £1,325,000 had been actually expended in railway construction. The net annual earnings from our railways amounted to £18,210 or under 1½ per cent. on cost of construction.

In 1876-7, ten years later, with a population of over 203,000, and a total indebtedness of £7,689,000, of which sum £3,526,720 had been expended in railway construction, the net annual earnings of the Queensland railways attained to £78,620, or about 2¼ per cent.

In 1883-4, with a population of 288,000 and a loan indebtedness of £16,570,850, of which sum £8,009,000 had been expended in railway construction, the net earnings from such railways amounted to £273,331, or nearly 3½ per cent. on the whole of the capital sum so employed; and it must be remembered that a considerable portion of this sum has been expended on construction not yet open to traffic. During the year last mentioned the Treasury also received £96,106 for interest on the unexpended portion of our loan balances; so that in 1883-4 the net earnings of our railways, together with the interest accruing on our loan balances, contributed £369,437, or an amount sufficient to discharge the annual interest on a portion of our loan indebtedness to the extent of £9,235,000, leaving the consolidated revenue to provide interest on a sum of £7,235,000 only, the balance of our loan indebtedness apparently not directly reproductive.

It has been contended that the Administration of the day should not fetter the hands of its possible successors by committing the country to large loan obligations at one time, and thereby preclude a successive Government from operating in the London market to carry out its own policy.

I attach no value whatever to this objection. As well might it be urged that no Government should commit the country to any national domestic policy which would survive the tenure of office of its creators.

Government hold to the opinion that the true financial policy for this country to pursue is to proceed with public works of a reproductive character with the aid of moneys obtained on loan from the public creditor. And this view, which has never yet been practically departed from by any previous Administration, which is considered throughout our sister colonies as a prudent course of action, will undoubtedly be adhered to in the future so long as we require financial assistance. And the present being an exceptionally favourable time for financial operations of an extensive scale, justifies Government in formulating a comprehensive policy at the present, rather than distribute our loans in indefinite applications to the public creditor from year to year.

It is satisfactory for me to state that up to the present time the revenue for the year 1884-5 has fully maintained and even exceeded the estimate for the year. In certain services, such as Customs, the anticipated revenue is being largely exceeded indeed,

It may therefore be freely admitted that the rapid progress made by the country in the past will be largely augmented and stimulated by the present Loan policy, and as with the encouragement of immigration and land settlement population and production must largely and rapidly increase, the augmented charge for interest distributed over four or five years hence, will, I am assured, be provided without any appreciable pressure.

If hon. members will but reflect on the immense territorial area to be opened up for closer pastoral settlement and occupation under the present Land Bill, and will remember that in the unsettled districts alone the area of land included in the schedule represents 173,299 square miles—42,540 square miles being classified as unavailable, so that 130,759 square miles are now held at an average rental under 17s. 11d. per square mile. If only one-third of the available area were resumed, and but £2 per square mile paid on the other two-thirds, the increase to revenue from these pastoral rents alone would amount to over £62,000, while from the remaining one-third and the so-called unavailable 42,540 square miles to be occupied under grazing farms a very large additional amount must annually accrue.

I have not, sir, referred here to the intention of the Government in disposing of the loan when authorised. It perhaps might be premature to make any definite statement concerning the intention of the Government in that direction. They will, of course, be guided by the condition of the London money market, and by the facilities given for placing the loan. It has been stated by the outside public, without any authority, that it was the intention of the Government to sell the whole of the loan simultaneously. They have never decided on any such action, and I think such a course would be exceedingly undesirable, as it would commit the country to the payment of a large amount of interest annually upon money that is not actually required at the present time for public works. The proper policy for the Government to pursue will be to sell such portion of the loan annually as they may deem necessary, and as the favourable condition of the money market presents. My desire is that, if any large instalments be sold, the money accruing therefrom should be introduced into the colony. While the banking account of the Government should be fully maintained, I think that the other banking corporations should also be invited to become custodians of part of our public funds, and I believe that a satisfactory agreement can be made with them on the condition that these deposits so made should be withdrawn from them ratably, and with due notice beforehand. This position has afforded me a large amount of consideration, and I think it my duty to mention at this time that the Government have no intention whatever of selling this large loan in one sum, and introduce an unprecedentedly large extent of English capital into the colony, which would doubtless as prejudicially affect the financial condition of the colony in the future as the want of funds would at the present time. I have deemed it necessary to make these remarks concerning the character of our loan proposals, and I think, sir, I may conclude my remarks by referring to what I said at the beginning of this year in connection with the loan proposals of the Government, and the position of our loan indebtedness; and these views, I may say, have been fortified in my mind by the fullest consideration:—

"I am of opinion that the loan indebtedness of the colony is a matter of congratulation instead of apprehension. With the assistance of sixteen millions of English capital, we have within twenty-three years built

up a prosperous nation. Starting in 1860 with a revenue of £178,000, and a population of 23,056, we are to-day in receipt of an annual revenue of over £2,500,000, with a population of about 285,000, whose individual average accumulations and industrial prosperity will contrast most favourably with any other portion of the British Empire. Will any hon. member say that equal progress would have been accomplished had we refrained from borrowing? Our indebtedness to the public creditor is generally represented to be secured by our great and valuable territorial estate; but, sir, I think I may truly urge that the great national works which, through our borrowing powers, we have been enabled to construct, are of themselves tangible assets as against our liabilities, and are rapidly and largely contributing to the liquidation of the annual interest accruing on moneys employed in their construction. Take, for example, our railways. The receipts for the year ending 31st December, 1883, from the Southern and Western, Maryborough and Wide Bay, Central and Northern lines, amounted to £541,616, while the working expenses for the same period amounted to £284,463, showing a net annual earning of £255,153; being at the rate of £3 1s. 11d. per cent. upon the sum of £8,240,544, the amount actually expended up to the same date in the construction of these railways. It will be seen, therefore, that the profit from these services during 1883 furnished a contribution sufficient to cover the interest accruing on £6,400,000 of our Public Debt, thereby virtually extinguishing that amount of our indebtedness and relieving the Treasury of an annual pressure to the extent of the interest on that sum.

"And I think I may further point out that, while our total authorised debt amounts to £16,150,850, our debentures yet unsold, amounting to £1,233,000, reduce the debt to £14,917,850; while our expended Loan Funds on 31st December, 1883, amounting to £924,690, still further diminish our actual loan indebtedness at that date to £13,993,160; which, if distributed over our present estimated population—285,000—would show a ratio of under £50 per inhabitant; or, if we take the full amount of our authorised indebtedness—namely, £16,150,850—we find that the net earnings from our railways furnish a set-off against £6,400,000 of this obligation; while the interest accruing on this unexpended loan balances further provides for the annual charge on an additional £2,000,000. The Consolidated Revenue Fund is therefore burdened only to the extent of the annual interest on a loan capital under £8,000,000, being the amount invested in not directly reproductive works, but which sum has nevertheless been expended on, and is represented by, permanent and substantial assets, in the shape of various public works and buildings. The amount of such not directly productive loan expenditure—being under £8,000,000—gives a ratio of £28 per head of population; while the annual interest chargeable against the consolidated revenue on this unproductive portion of our debt amounts to about £400,000, allowing one-half of such unproductive portion of loan to be represented by the outstanding 6 per cent. debentures. And in addition to our successful railway investments, let it be remembered that we have further spent out of loan £500,000 in electric telegraphs, which transmit communication throughout the length and breadth of the colony and over an extent of territory at a rate relatively lower than in any other country. We have improved the interior condition of the country by the expenditure of £693,000 on our public roads, and have erected public buildings to the extent of £532,000. Our numerous harbours and rivers have been improved by the expenditure of £932,000, while local government has been encouraged by the timely loan aid of £367,000; and, in addition to all this, we have been continuously adding to our population by the expenditure of one and a-half millions for immigration purposes. Surely, Mr. Fraser, when objection is taken to our loan indebtedness, critics must deliberately shut their eyes to the magnitude of the benefits which the colony has derived as well as to the character of the investments which have been built up through such indebtedness. And as has been the case with the parent country so will it be with Queensland, especially if we borrow for reproductive works—the larger the indebtedness the greater will be the prosperity of the country, and greater still its ability not only to pay the interest but to contract, if necessary, fresh obligations."

To those views I still adhere, and I am convinced that the loan proposals of the Government at the present time will do more to float the country over any present financial pressure that might be felt—will do more to float it into a fuller tide of prosperity than by the dribblets of loans which we have been accustomed to deal with in the past. Apprehension is always felt, doubtless,

when a country borrows to a larger extent than it has formerly been accustomed to do; but I should like to dispel that apprehension, and the feeling that a large amount of capital will not be administered with a due regard to economy. I see no reason to anticipate any such result, nor do I believe that any apprehension will be felt on that score. I did intend, Mr. Speaker, to move that you do now leave the chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply; but I believe it will be more convenient that the consideration of the Estimates be taken at a later period of the evening, and I will therefore move that the consideration of this Order of the Day be postponed until after the consideration of Order of the Day No. 2.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: The object of the motion made by the hon. gentleman is that we may take Supply later in the evening?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Yes.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: I suppose the hon. gentleman's intention in moving his motion is that we shall have an opportunity of digesting his speech and go on with the Loan Estimates early to-morrow?

The PREMIER: Yes, the first thing to-morrow.

Question put and passed.

OFFICIALS IN PARLIAMENT BILL— COMMITTEE.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the Speaker left the chair, and the House went into Committee of the Whole to consider this Bill in detail.

Preamble postponed.

On clause 1, as follows:—

"The Governor may from time to time by proclamation declare any officers of the Crown, not exceeding seven in all, and being officers liable to retire from office on political grounds, to be capable of being elected members of the Legislative Assembly, and of sitting and voting therein.

"Any six of the officers so declared shall be capable of being so elected and of sitting and voting in the Legislative Assembly at the same time.

"Provided that not more than six of such officers shall at any one time be members of the Legislative Assembly, and if at the time of the election of any one of such officers to be a member of the Legislative Assembly six of such officers are already members thereof, his election shall be null and void, and a writ shall forthwith issue for the election of a member in his stead."

The PREMIER said that, as some time had elapsed since the second reading of the Bill, it might be advisable to explain in a few words the objects aimed at by it. One object, of course, was to provide for an additional Minister, and the other to make the arrangement as to what Ministers should sit in that Chamber more flexible. As the law at present stood, the Colonial Secretary, the Attorney-General, and the Colonial Treasurer could sit in the Legislative Assembly with any other two Ministers named by the Governor. Under the present system, those two Ministers were the Minister for Works and the Minister for Lands, and the result was that the Postmaster-General must sit in the Legislative Council; no other Minister could sit there. No very great inconvenience had arisen yet. It was quite clear that the Minister for Lands and the Minister for Works must, under almost all circumstances, sit in the Assembly. But with regard to the Legislative Council it was desirable to make the arrangement more flexible. In New South Wales, Tasmania, South Australia, and New Zealand, the Colonial Secretary had sat in the Council; and at the present time the Attorney-General represented the Government in the Legislative Council of New South Wales. With respect to the appointment of an

additional Minister, he did not know that anything could be urged against it. Whether an additional Minister was appointed or not, he did not intend to continue to hold two portfolios much longer. It was impossible to perform the duties of two departments satisfactorily. He did not do it to his own satisfaction by any means. Possibly other people did not know as much about it as he did. It was high time there was another Minister. The gentleman at the head of a Government ought not to be burdened with so much departmental work as was necessary under the present arrangements. There was practically no change in the constitution of the law, excepting that it would be made more flexible. The 5th and 6th sections of the Legislative Assembly Act provided for what he had before referred to, as to the Ministers who might have seats in the Assembly. It was proposed to repeal those sections, so that the Governor might at any time declare that there should be seven members of the Government, any six of whom should be capable of sitting in the Assembly. The other one, of course, would have to sit in the Council. With respect to the seven Ministers it would be for the Government for the time being to determine what portfolios should be held. There might, for instance, be a Minister for Railways entirely separate from the Minister for Works, or there might be any number of combinations of offices. That was all there was in the Bill except an alteration of the provision that the Vice-President of the Executive Council should receive £300 a year. It was now absolutely necessary that the Vice-President of the Council should have a portfolio. It had happened sometimes in the other colonies that that official did not hold a portfolio. As the law stood at present, such an official would be incapable of being elected to the Assembly, because there was a salary of £300 attached to the office. That also was proposed to be made flexible. The original intention when that salary was passed—it was proposed by him in committee in 1874—was that the Premier should have an extra allowance for obvious reasons.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said when the Bill was under discussion on the second reading he took strong exception to its being passed.

The PREMIER: No.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: He was very much mistaken if he did not. He believed that he pointed out then what he should point out now to the Committee. He quite admitted the contention of the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government that he had too much work to do—far more than the leader of any Government ought to have to do. But a large portion of that work the hon. gentleman himself had selected—that was the administration of the Department of Public Instruction. But even laying that department aside: Supposing that he had not that department, the work in the office of Colonial Secretary was more than the gentleman at the head of the Government should have to do, considering that he was responsible for the measures of the Government and many other things, and had more responsibilities than any other member of the Government. Therefore he admitted that the hon. gentleman had more work than any one man should be asked to do. He admitted also that the Minister for Works had quite as much work as an active man could do. A man who had no private work of his own to do could find work enough in the Works Department. The Lands Department probably had not so much as the Works Department; in fact, he was sure, from his experience as a Minister and from his knowledge

of what his colleagues had to do, that the Lands Department had not so much work to do. That disposed of three Ministers whom he admitted had enough work to do, or more than they ought to be called upon to do. But then there were three other Ministers. There was his hon. friend the Colonial Treasurer; he was sure that if that hon. gentleman would tell the Committee the truth he would say that two hours in one day would more than do the work that he had to do.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Four hours would not do it—continuously.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: Seeing that he himself had acted occasionally as Colonial Treasurer, as Minister for Works and Mines, and as Minister for Lands, at the same time, he thought he ought to have some knowledge of the matter. On one occasion he had acted as Minister for all the departments except one, and therefore he ought to know something about the amount of work that had to be done. Of course he knew that when the Treasurer was framing a ten-million Loan Bill he had a little more work than usual; but ten-million loans were not framed very often. In fact, there had been only one during the existence of the colony. Then there was the Attorney-General. Although he had no knowledge of his work from actual experience, he could speak from another kind of experience—that was, the amount of work which the Attorney-General generally had to bring before the Executive Council, and also from the difficulty of getting the Attorney-General or his subordinates to do any kind of work whatever.

The PREMIER: That was your own Attorney-General.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he admitted that the hon. the Premier when Attorney-General did his work as it ought to be done. He did not think that his work was ever one day behind; he would give him credit for that; but he was sure that other Attorneys-General, having so little work to do, really did not do what they had to do. Then there was the Postmaster-General. He was sure that if his hon. friend the member for Balonne, who was an ex-Postmaster-General, were present, he would laugh at the idea of the Postmaster-General having any work at all to do. He had heard that gentleman say in the House that one hour a week was quite sufficient to do all the work the Postmaster-General had to do, and he (Hon. J. M. Macrossan) believed it was so. He himself had acted as Postmaster-General also, so that he had some little knowledge of that position as well as that of other Ministers; and knowing, as he did from experience, the work of all the Ministers, with the exception of the Attorney-General, he really could not see how he could be expected to vote for the passing of the clause under discussion, giving the Governor power to nominate another Minister. That the work required rearranging, he admitted at once, and he believed the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government might throw some of the work he at present did upon the shoulders of his colleagues. The hon. gentleman knew best how to arrange that; but he could easily throw some of the work he now had to do on to the shoulders of the members of the Ministry who had so little work to do, one of them being the Treasurer, and the other the Postmaster-General. And at the same time he thought that the Department of Public Instruction might very well be shifted on to the Attorney-General.

The PREMIER: No.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: The hon. gentleman was a lawyer, and, of course, would

stick to his class; but he had no doubt that there was a very small amount of work done in the Attorney-General's office.

The PREMIER: A tremendous amount of work to be done when it is done.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: There had no doubt been a little more lately, because there were some prosecutions for kidnapping and so forth going on, but that was not going to occur again he hoped—at least it was not likely to occur very often. He would admit, for the sake of argument, that the hon. gentleman at the head of the Law Department had had more work to do during the last six weeks or three months than he had had for the previous twelve months, but that was not likely to continue; and even if he had a little more work in his department it should not prevent him from earning his salary by doing sufficient work. He did not think that the hon. gentleman earned his salary as Attorney-General, and he might very well take the Department of Public Instruction; or there were matters now dealt with in the Colonial Secretary's Department which might very properly be put under his charge. There was a great deal of the administration of justice conducted in the office of the Colonial Secretary that might be put on the shoulders of the Attorney-General, if the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government thought he was not competent of doing the work of the Department of Public Instruction. All the work of the administration of the benches of magistrates all over the colony, which was at present conducted in the office of the Colonial Secretary, might very properly come under the administration of the Attorney-General, or any other portion of the work that the hon. the Premier himself thought he should get rid of. He certainly could not agree to the passing of the clause. Then as to making the procedure more flexible by giving the Governor, or rather the Ministers themselves, the power of saying which Minister should sit in the Upper House, and which should sit in that Chamber, he thought it should not be so. There were certain Ministers of the Crown who ought to sit upon that bench and be subject to the criticism of the representatives of the people. He did not know of a single Minister they could dispense with sitting upon that bench. No doubt they could dispense with the Postmaster-General, because if any serious question arose it was answered for him by the head of the Government. He did not see how they could possibly dispense with the Minister for Lands, the Minister for Works, the Colonial Treasurer, or the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government. The hon. gentleman said they would be only following the example of other colonies, where it was held that the Colonial Secretary, or the head of the Government, might very reasonably sit in the Upper House. That was a proposition which he thought members of the Committee would never agree to. It did not matter to them what they did in the other colonies. They had determined those things by their own experience and convenience, and their own experience was a better guide for them than the practice of the other colonies. He did not agree with anything the hon. gentleman had said in connection with the clause, nor did he believe that it should be allowed to pass.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the hon. gentleman laboured under a hallucination concerning the amount of work to be done in the different departments. Ministers ought not to be slaves. They ought not to have to work like under clerks. They ought not to have to supervise all the details and drudgery of the office, yet it appeared to him that was what the Ministers had to do now. He could not say how

it had arisen, but in order to properly manage a department now it demanded from the Ministerial head an attendance to minute details wholly inconsistent with the character of a Minister. By those who knew him he was considered a man who was not afraid of work. In his walk in life he was not at all afraid of hard work nor was he afraid of it now.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: Hear, hear!

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Yet he felt that, were it not from patriotic motives and the honour attached to the position of a Minister, he would not accept the position of manager of the Treasury, in which the hon. member for Townsville considered there was so little work to be done. He could assure the hon. gentleman that he was mistaken—that was to say, if the work was to be done thoroughly. The Minister had to make himself conversant with the details of his department, and he could say that in the Treasury there was certainly four hours' work a day to be done continuously, and that was entirely apart from the work of receiving deputations, to whom a Minister should be always accessible. The Colonial Secretary was perfectly overladen with work, and how he managed to do it without sacrificing his health was a mystery to him. He must sacrifice his health or his business, and everything of that sort, for the benefit of the public. Seriously speaking, from his knowledge of the work done by his colleagues and himself their duties at the present time were surrounded by a lot of hard work, necessitating constant attention; and no man of business would care at all to accept office as a Minister of the Crown unless he was induced to do so from patriotic considerations and a desire to promote the welfare of the colony, or in the interests of the department. He was sure that measure was one that was much required at the present time, because a redistribution of the work was undoubtedly necessary. It came to this: that unless additional departments were created, presided over by Ministers, the health of Ministers would certainly be affected, and no man could be expected to devote so much of his time as was now necessary to the work of a department, simply for the sake of the Ministerial office. The work of the departments had grown very much of late. He spoke of what, from his own knowledge, he knew had occurred during the last twelve months, at any rate; and he said distinctly the work in the different departments had extended, and Ministers at the present day had to do drudgery of the kind which subordinate clerical officers might be expected to have to undergo at the commencement of their career. He trusted the Bill would pass, and the departments would be so arranged that the public business might receive more attention than it could possibly receive at the present time.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he admitted at once that the Colonial Secretary was overworked. He did not deny that, and it was a wonder to him how he got through the work he did, considering that he had his own business to do as well. He therefore thought he should be relieved of a good deal of the work he had to do, but not by the means proposed in the Bill. He had not charged the Colonial Treasurer with being backward in doing the work he had to do.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I will not take any more.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said that what he had said was, that the hon. gentleman had not enough to do. He believed that if the hon. gentleman had more work to do he would do it. But he had not got it to do. He knew the hon. gentleman had a heavy private business

to attend to; and he (Hon. J. M. Macrossan) knew that when he was the Minister for Works he did not swear as the heathens did; but he solemnly said he would never do so much work again. That was a good many years ago, and it interfered with his own business. The hon. member said that Ministers must attend to details; that the practice had arisen in the departments in Queensland that Ministers had to attend to details, and that, therefore, an additional Minister was required. He believed it was one of the charges made against himself (Hon. J. M. Macrossan) that he attended too much to details when he was in office. He should therefore know something of the details of the department of which he was Minister. He might say that when he was administering a department in which he acted as *locum tenens* for one of his colleagues he had gone quite as much into the details of that department as he did in his own. So that he ought to know something of the details of the different departments he had administered. A Minister should go into details, but not into professional details. He had looked into the details of the hon. gentleman's department, and if the hon. gentleman looked back for a few years he would find a great many of his minutes referring to details. The argument which the hon. member used with respect to details would not hold so far as the Bill was concerned, because he did not think that Ministers attended more to details now than they did some years ago. The work of the departments must of necessity have increased as the population increased, but the increase of population during the last few years had not been so extremely great as to demand the services of an additional Minister. The hon. gentleman's argument, therefore, fell to the ground. As to the Ministers being slaves, nobody expected them to be slaves; but there was a vast difference between being slaves and having very little to do. A man who had to work some two or three hours in the week could not be considered in the position of a slave, and he knew that that was the position which some of the Ministers at present in office occupied, as well as it was the position which some of the members of the late Ministry had been in.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the Minister for Works said "No"; but he was not talking about that hon. member's work at all. He knew that hon. gentleman had a great deal more than he could do, and that he could not enter into details. It was quite sufficient for him to do his work in a general way; but he was talking about offices of which that hon. gentleman probably knew very little. He said again, that the work of the departments could be rearranged in such a way that no Minister need be overladen with work; and, while each one would have enough to do, an additional Minister would not be required. He hoped the Committee would not agree to the clause. Hon. members must bear in mind that it was not merely the salary of an additional Minister that would be required, but it was a new department that was to be created, and hon. members should know what that meant. If there was a Minister of a department having only £2,000 or £3,000 a year to spend, he would look upon himself as unworthy of the position of a Minister unless he had more than that to spend, and he would take very good care that he had more to spend, or else his colleagues would learn the reason why. He would spend enough, and it was not only £1,000 a year that would be required for the salary of an additional Minister, but in the course of a few years there would be another

£15,000 or £20,000 expended in the service of the State. That was one of the reasons for which he objected to the clause and to the proposal made by the Government. If it only meant the voting of an additional £1,000 a year for an additional Minister he would not object to it at all; but he knew that it was going to cost the country very much more than that, and therefore he protested against it.

The PREMIER said he must say a few words in reference to the remarks that had just fallen from the member for Townsville. That hon. gentleman stated that the Attorney-General might well do the work of the Minister of Public Instruction. Well, he (the Premier), when Attorney-General, did that work for three years a good many years ago, and he knew that the work of the Attorney-General's Department and the Department of Public Instruction was a great deal heavier than that of the Colonial Secretary's Department at that time. It was quite impossible now for any man to perform the work of the Attorney-General and Minister for Public Instruction as it ought to be performed. The hon. gentleman also stated that he had administered different departments during the absence of Ministers, and knew what the work was like; but he would remind the hon. member that the work brought before an interim Minister was very different from the work to be done by Ministers in the ordinary course of things. He (the Premier) had administered the Colonial Secretary's Department under those circumstances, and he knew that the work then brought before him was only what was required to be done immediately. He had had no experience of the Postmaster-General's Department, and could not, therefore, say anything about it. But he was quite certain that it was absolutely necessary, if the work of the Government was to be done as it should be done, to have another Minister. In fact, that was admitted more than a year ago by members on the other side of the Committee.

Mr. PALMER said it was scarcely necessary for the Colonial Secretary to tell them that he had a good share of work to do; they were all well aware of that. A good many members were also aware that, in addition to doing work that came to his hand, the hon. gentleman went about looking for work—that he appropriated work to himself. When the second reading of the Bill was under discussion there was a good deal of opposition to it. He (Mr. Palmer) spoke against it then, and he had not changed his opinions since. There were six Ministers in that House, and one in the Council, which made seven.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: And one at home.

Mr. PALMER: It was proposed to create an additional Minister, and thus bring the number up to nine. In New South Wales there were nine Ministers, but there the Parliament consisted of 113 members; in New Zealand the number of Ministers was eight, and of members ninety-five; and in Victoria there were nine Ministers in a House of eighty-six members. He believed that when there were ten or twelve members added to their own House there might be an opening for an additional Minister. Of course, his experience was limited, and he was not qualified to speak with the same knowledge as the member for Townsville; but so far as he could see, it was a redistribution of the work that was required rather than additional men to do the work. Perhaps some of the trips in the "Kate," about which they had heard, might account for some of the heavy work that fell on Ministers. The Committee

ought, at any rate, to consider the extra expense that would be involved in establishing a fresh department. If an additional Minister were appointed, an under secretary and clerk would be required—

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. PALMER: And all the paraphernalia necessary for a separate department. Hon. members should, he thought, consider that expense. He noticed that the Premier did not advocate the measure with the same force that he did questions he was very serious about. He (Mr. Palmer) knew that when he went to the Postmaster-General's Office he scarcely ever had the honour of meeting the Minister. The business of his district necessitated his calling at the Post Office repeatedly, and he always had to deal with the Under Secretary. He had been to the office dozens and dozens of times, and had never spent five minutes in the company of the Postmaster-General. No doubt the whole of the Colonial Secretary's time was taken up, and he dared say that Ministers had their private business to attend to; but he failed to see that any case had been made out for the appointment of an additional Minister.

The PREMIER said he wished to point out that the Bill did not propose to establish a new department. There were seven departments already and seven under secretaries. The Bill simply proposed to appoint another Minister, so that instead of having one Minister to manage two departments, as at present, there should be one Minister to each department.

Mr. BLACK said he was inclined to think, from what he had seen of the working of the public departments, that an additional Minister was required. He did not often trouble the departments, but he must say, from what opportunities he had had of observing the work to be done, and from what had come to his knowledge, he could not help remarking that the work was something enormous in some of the departments. The Minister for Lands had a great deal to do. The Colonial Secretary was enormously overworked. It was astonishing that the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government should even attempt to do the work he got through. He (Mr. Black) did not think the electors of such a colony as this wished that the Ministers, who had the management and control of the affairs of the colony, should be overworked. They could not expect good legislation if Ministers were overworked; and hon. members must bear in mind that Ministers had a very severe ordeal to go through during the sitting of Parliament. They had to be prepared on all points in order to sustain the attacks of the Opposition, and very frequently, he was happy to say, of the supporters of the Government. He would like to see some different redistribution of the work than was proposed by the Bill. He would suggest another arrangement. He thought the Railway and Works Department might be divided with advantage to the country. With a gigantic system of railways such as they had in this colony, where the lines were spread over an extensive seaboard, and not concentrated round the capital as railways were in the other colonies, there would be ample work for a Minister for Railways. He was of opinion that the Works should be separated from that department, and that the work in connection with mines, agriculture, and water supply should be placed under another Minister. When they had got a producing industry such as that of agriculture, he thought they might have a Minister to whose department the agricultural welfare of the colony could be safely entrusted. As to the Attorney-General being also Minister for Public Instruction, that might appear a very

good arrangement, theoretically, but he was afraid it would not be a good one. Members of the legal profession were always looking after their own business, and were not likely to sacrifice their professional practice in order to perform the heavy duties of the Department of Public Instruction. It was a department every year increasing, and he thought it required a separate Minister. He was sure from the correspondence he had seen at the office, and the readiness with which it was always procured, that there was ample work for a separate Minister. The Attorney-General—he did not wish to say anything against the present Attorney-General—he felt perfectly certain would not undertake the duties of any department not specially appertaining to the profession which he practised. The Colonial Treasurer, in addition to his duties at the Treasury, had charge of the Harbours and Rivers Department, which entailed a large expenditure annually. If the hon. gentleman's Loan Estimates were carried and the colony was going to have an expenditure of £5,000,000 for the next three years as proposed, the present ministerial staff was hardly sufficient to carry it out satisfactorily, and it would be for the welfare of the colony that a subdivision or redistribution of departments should be made. He regretted that more prominence was not given to agriculture and water supply than they held at present; but he hoped the time was not far distant when the Government would see the necessity of apportioning those matters more satisfactorily. He would rather have two additional Ministers than one; but as the Government seemed to be satisfied with one at present he should support the Bill as it stood.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the hon. gentleman who had just sat down was of opinion that there should be a Minister for Railways; but surely 1,201 miles of railway did not entail such an enormous amount of work as to require one man's constant superintendence, considering the staff of experienced subordinates in the department. There were two chief engineers, two staffs, three or four traffic managers, and a commissioner for railways. In America one traffic manager would manage more than five times the quantity of traffic, and he thought it would be absurd to subdivide the departments presided over by the Minister for Works. No one doubted that the Premier was overworked. To use a slang term, that hon. gentleman was a perfect "glutton" for work—the more he had to do the more he seemed to like it. The suggestion he made before was a very reasonable one, that the Attorney-General should take the Department of Public Instruction in addition to his present work; but as the Premier said the work would be too much, he would forego that suggestion. But supposing the hon. gentleman gave the Department of Public Instruction to the Postmaster-General, he could hardly say the Postmaster-General would have too much to do.

The PREMIER: He could not manage the two departments and lead the Upper House.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said it might be physically impossible for the Postmaster-General to do so on account of his health, but it would be by no means impossible on account of his mental incapacity, because he had enough mental capacity to do three times the work. He did not know what the extent of that hon. gentleman's private business might be, but if he could take charge of the department he had named, that would greatly relieve the Colonial Secretary. But perhaps the Colonial Secretary was so fond of the Department for Public Instruction that he would not give it up to any-

body else. He might also give up the Administration of Justice, as regarded magistrates and the Commission of the Peace, to the Attorney-General. The hon. gentleman would then be relieved of half the work he did at present, and would still have enough to do, though he would not then be overworked. It was not likely that he would take the suggestion, but it was quite feasible, and would not impose upon Ministers any additional work which they could not perform. He did not believe Ministers should have very much work to do. They should be able to do their ministerial work easily so as to be better able to attend to their legislative work. Of course Ministers were very much assisted by their subordinates—under secretaries and so forth. Almost every point of detail was brought before them in such a way as to be mastered at a glance; it was only in exceptional cases that Ministers had to exercise their own judgment, and a great deal of the work brought before them simply involved signing their names. Unless the hon. gentleman wanted to exercise patronage, there was no necessity for the additional appointment, and he should say no more on the subject. He had done his duty by explaining how the different departments might be apportioned, and entering his protest against the appointment of an additional Minister.

Mr. NORTON said that the work of the Ministers might be rearranged, so that some might be taken off the shoulders of the Colonial Secretary and put upon someone else without anyone being overburdened. He did not think the Colonial Treasurer overworked—he looked as jolly as ever—and even the Minister for Works was not killing himself. He did not hold with putting too much on the Postmaster-General, because when the Upper House was sitting that gentleman had a great deal more work than he generally got credit for in managing that House. He must also have a pretty accurate knowledge of what went on in the Assembly to enable him to carry out his duties there. He did not intend to say very much on the subject; but he would ask whether the Premier had made up his mind as to any division of the work amongst the present Ministers, and what would be left for the new Minister?

The PREMIER said that, as he had already pointed out, there were a good many things in the Colonial Secretary's Department which might be handed over to the Minister for Public Instruction. He was not prepared to say exactly which they should be; or whether the administration of the benches should be handed over to the Department of Justice. That was a matter upon which his opinion had fluctuated a great deal. About ten years ago he remembered suggesting it to his then chief, Mr. Macalister, who did not see the fun of handing it over to him. He was Attorney-General at that time.

Mr. BLACK said the hon. member for Townsville had referred to the exaggerated idea he had in connection with the management of the Railway Department. What he wished to convey was, that, in consequence of the great extent of seaboard of the colony, and the number of main trunk lines going from the interior to the coast, the amount of ministerial responsibility must be very much increased, as compared with what it would be if the whole of their lines concentrated at Brisbane—at the capital—as they did in New South Wales and Victoria. In New South Wales, with the exception of the Newcastle line, they all concentrated in Sydney; consequently the Minister for Railways there was able to exercise a closer supervision and give greater satisfaction. In Victoria there were 1,800 miles of railway, and in New South Wales 1,600. The 1,800 miles in Victoria all

concentrated in Melbourne; therefore the conditions were not at all similar, and he maintained that there was far more work in the Railway Department in Queensland. In regard to the hon. gentleman's remarks about patronage, he did not see that the Government had any particular patronage at their disposal in the matter. He took it as a matter of necessity; and as to who the new Minister was to be, he considered that the Minister who had assisted the Government for so long, without portfolio, would be the recipient of the portfolio, whether it was as Minister for Instruction, or what, of course he did not know. He took it for granted that that hon. gentleman who had done such good service to the Ministry during the past session was naturally entitled to that vacant portfolio, and he failed to see how the question of patronage could arise.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said that was a view of the subject which had never struck him before—that the hon. member for Maryborough should be the additional Minister. He could see it now since the hon. member for Mackay had suggested it. It did not matter to him who the Minister was to be, whether it was to be the hon. member for Maryborough, or Ipswich, or Stanley, or anybody else. Really, after that, he thought it was only right that that hon. gentleman, who had done a good deal for the Ministry without holding a portfolio, should have it. It was quite possible that, as the Bill provided for the arrangement of Ministers, that the hon. member for Maryborough might have a seat in the Upper House, or he might be appointed Postmaster-General, and the present Postmaster-General might become Minister for Public Instruction, an office which he could fill admirably. So that if that were to be the case it would be a very happy family arrangement, and one which would suit both sides of the Committee.

Clause put and passed.

On clause 2, as follows:—

"Until any such proclamation as aforesaid has been made by the Governor, any six of the persons for the time being holding the offices of Colonial Secretary, Colonial Treasurer, Attorney-General or Minister of Justice, Secretary for Public Lands, Secretary for Public Works, Postmaster-General, and Secretary for Public Instruction, shall be so capable."

The PREMIER said it was intended to insert the words "and Mines" after the word "Works." He did not know how the words could have dropped out; it was quite accidental.

Amendment agreed to.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he would like the hon. gentleman to explain the meaning of the clause. The Colonial Secretary might sit in the Upper House, or any Minister whom the Governor chose to send there.

The PREMIER said the clause did not mean that; but the Bill did. The Bill meant that there should be seven Ministers, of whom six should sit in the Lower House. Under their Constitution the Governor might appoint a Ministry consisting of no members of Parliament at all; only he would get no Supply. The written Constitution did not require that there should be any Ministers in the Assembly; but the Bill proposed that there should be not more than six Ministers in the Lower House.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said it would be very inconvenient, to say the least of it, if either the Colonial Secretary or the Minister for Lands, or the Minister for Works, was in the Upper House.

The PREMIER: It would be very inconvenient, and the Lower House would probably not stand it.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he thought it was unwise to give the Ministry the power of sending the Colonial Secretary to the Upper House, or any of those Ministers he had mentioned. As for the Constitution not providing that Ministers should be members of Parliament, the unwritten Constitution provided for it. There was no Government who would dare to violate that unwritten Constitution, and select Ministers who were not members of that House. The time when that might be done had long since passed, and, in fact, he did not think it had existed for centuries. He could see no harm in the Postmaster-General or the Secretary for Public Instruction being sent to the Upper House; but the others should really be compelled to sit in the Lower House.

The PREMIER said that the Colonial Treasurer must, of course, be in the Assembly; but as for the Colonial Secretary he saw no reason why he should not be in the Upper House; in fact, in nearly all the colonies, except perhaps Victoria, he was frequently in the Upper House. It depended very much on what he had to do. In New Zealand at present the Colonial Secretary was in the Upper House; so also in Tasmania, where the Colonial Secretary was also Premier. In South Australia the Colonial Secretary was more frequently in the Upper House than in the Lower House. As for the Attorney-General, it might be very convenient to have him a member of the Upper House; but he saw some objection to the Minister for Lands being there. Sir John Robertson was once a member of the Upper House in New South Wales during the time he was Minister for Lands.

Mr. NORTON said he would like to know whether, if a member accepted office, and failed to be re-elected by his constituents, he would be entitled to take his seat as a Minister in the Upper House?

The PREMIER said that if appointed by the Governor he would. There was nothing to prevent all the Ministers being appointed to the Upper House, though he never knew a case of that being done.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

On clause 3, as follows:—

"Any person holding any office or place of profit under the Crown, or having a pension, from the Crown during pleasure or for a term of years, and not being one of the officers named in the last preceding section or in a proclamation made under this Act, shall be incapable of being elected, or of sitting or voting, as a member of the Legislative Assembly; and the election of any such person to be a member of the Legislative Assembly shall be null and void, and a writ shall forthwith issue for the election of a member in his stead."

"This section shall not apply to any person in receipt only of pay, half-pay, or a pension as an officer of Her Majesty's Navy or Army, or who shall receive any new or other commission in the navy or army respectively, or any increase of pay on any such commission, nor to any person who is in receipt only of daily pay as an officer or member of the defence or volunteer force of Queensland and is not employed permanently or at an annual salary."

Mr. CHUBB said he would like to ask the Premier whether there was any objection to inserting words to include a pensioner for life. He knew the clause was in the usual form, but he thought it ought to exclude pensioners for life.

The PREMIER: It never has been so.

Mr. CHUBB said he knew that, but he saw no reason why it should not be.

The PREMIER: Who are you striking at?

Mr. CHUBB: He was not striking at anybody; he wanted to make the clause general. The clause excluded persons having a pension

during pleasure or for a term of years, and he saw no reason why pensioners for life should not be dealt with in the same way. For that reason he moved that the words "or for life" be inserted after "years."

The PREMIER said the hon. member might just as well say that he proposed the amendment to exclude the senior hon. member for Maryborough from sitting in Parliament. That was what it meant, because if the Bill was passed with that amendment the hon. member for Maryborough would be incapable of holding a seat in Parliament. Why should that be done? Was there any reason why a pensioner for life, having earned his pension by long service, should be excluded from Parliament? The object of a clause of that kind was to exclude persons who held pensions for a time who were dependent for it on the Government for the time being, and who might have it taken away from them. But that was quite a different thing from a man who had earned an annuity for life, and who was just as much entitled to it as if he got the money as interest on debentures or inscribed stock. What did it matter to the country, if a man had £500 for life, whether he derived it from so many debentures or had earned it as an annuity under a statutory bargain of another kind? He knew of no country where such a provision was made.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he did not think any member of the Committee had the slightest intention of hitting at the hon. member for Maryborough; and if the amendment bore that interpretation he was certain the hon. member for Bowen did not mean it. There had been in the other colonies pensioners for life who had become Ministers of the Crown. He did not quite understand the amendment, but he did not think it meant what the Premier said it did.

The PREMIER: That will be the effect of it, at any rate.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: Sir Charles Gavan Duffy was a pensioner for life, and yet he not only was a Minister, but also became Speaker of the Victorian Assembly.

The PREMIER: Just so; he was allowed a seat in the House; but such an amendment as this will exclude the hon. member for Maryborough from this House.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: Of course, if that would be the effect of it, he did not wish it passed. He did not believe any hon. member intended to strike at the hon. member for Maryborough.

The PREMIER: But that is the amendment.

Mr. CHUBB said he had not the slightest idea of doing anything of the kind; but it seemed to him rather absurd that they should exclude pensioners for a term, and not pensioners for life. However, he had no desire to aim a blow at the hon. member for Maryborough, and he would, therefore, ask leave to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn; and clause put and passed.

On clause 4, as follows:—

"The salary of each of the officers by this Act declared capable of being elected members of the Legislative Assembly shall be one thousand pounds per annum: Provided that one of such officers, to be designated by the Governor in that behalf, shall receive a further salary of three hundred pounds per annum. For the payment of such salaries a sum, amounting in all to seven thousand three hundred pounds per annum, shall be charged upon and paid to Her Majesty out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the colony."

Mr. MACDONALD-PATERSON moved the substitution of the words "fifteen hundred" for the words "one thousand." He was not going to make a speech on the proposed amendment, as he had given his views on the subject on the second reading. He would draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that in Victoria the salary of one Minister—the Treasurer—was £2,400; the Chief Secretary, £2,000; and the rest £1,500 each. In New South Wales there were nine Ministers of the Crown—the Colonial Secretary with £2,000, and the rest with £1,500 each. He did not wish to make any observation as to the relative amount of work done by the Ministers as compared with those in other colonies; but he thought that in a rapidly advancing colony like this the Ministers should be paid as well as they were paid in New South Wales or Victoria. In the latter colony the positions of the Ministers were sinecures compared with those of the Ministers here; because that was a closely settled country, and they had no great questions to agitate the public mind. The lands were nearly all alienated, the railway policy was almost a completed one, and the work of the Ministers might be regarded as being confined to matters of routine and matters of public policy.

The PREMIER said it was quite clear that if the words proposed to be left out were left out it would stop their proceedings at once, as they could not go any further without a message from the Governor recommending the higher sum. No recommendation had been made during the present session for the purpose. He was not prepared to accept the amendment of the hon. gentleman; although he believed the salary now paid was quite inadequate for the work done; and he was not ashamed to say so. The salary was fixed ten years ago at £1,000, having been previously reduced for a year or two to £800. However, it was a matter that could wait a little longer.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said that as the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government had given his opinion that the amendment should not be adopted, he hoped it would not go to a division, because it might be carried, and the hon. gentlemen would have their salaries raised against their wishes. He quite agreed that the salaries were inadequate for the work done; but he did not think they should attempt to raise them by a sidewind in that way. If they were raised it should be by a Bill brought in in the proper way, and hon. members should have full notice of it. He did not suppose a single member of the Committee who was absent knew anything about the proposal. It would be certainly very unfair to hon. members, and it would be viewed in a very invidious light by the country, if it were carried in such a thin Committee.

The PREMIER said he thought it would decidedly be better that any attempt to raise the salaries of Ministers should be made by a substantive motion praying for a message from the Governor recommending the appropriation. The subject would then obtain full discussion. He thought himself that the proposed salary was too large at the present time in proportion to salaries paid for other services; but the present salary was, in his opinion, too small. He would not mind getting a larger salary for the work he did. However, it would be very much better to let it stand over till next session.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn; and clause, as read, put and passed.

On clause 5, as follows:—

"When a person has been elected a member of the Legislative Assembly after his acceptance of one of the offices aforesaid, the subsequent acceptance by

him from the Crown of another of such offices, whether both offices are held together or the one office is accepted in lieu of and in immediate succession to the other, shall not vacate his seat."

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN asked if that were not an alteration in the practice of the Assembly?

The PREMIER: No.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said that at present, when a man accepted office as a Minister, he lost his seat. The clause provided that he should not lose his seat.

The PREMIER said the clause only referred to a change of office. The Legislative Assembly Act made a similar provision, but in a rather confused way. It provided that the disqualification should not apply to members of the Government "who may accept any other office." That was somewhat obscure, and the clause put it in clearer language.

Mr. NORTON said it was possible a man might resign one office in the morning, and accept another in the afternoon—quite a separate act.

The PREMIER said the members of the Government held office from their acceptance of it and during the Governor's pleasure. If the Governor did not signify his pleasure that a Minister should be relieved of his office, he would continue to hold it, and while he held it he might change his position in the Government. In one of the Canadian States there was a provision that a member could accept a new office within seven days after his retirement from his former position without vacating his seat. On one occasion a Government resigned on a Monday; their successors were appointed on Tuesday, and the outgoing Government moved a vote of want of confidence the next day, and again came back into office, seven days not having elapsed since their retirement, and they came back without re-election. It was therefore necessary to use the words "immediate succession."

Mr. NORTON said of course it would be necessary that the *Gazette* announcing that a Minister had changed his office should also announce his acceptance of another.

The PREMIER: Yes.

On clause 6, as follows:—

"If any person accepts any two or more of the offices aforesaid, it shall not be competent for him to receive the full salary of more than one office, or to receive in addition thereto more than half of the salary of one other office."

The PREMIER said something was said on the second reading with reference to the clause just moved and he did not care much whether it stood as it was or not. He knew that it was the practice in England when a Minister held two offices for him to draw full salary for one and half-salary for the other. Mr. Gladstone received half-salary when he lately filled the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer. That had not been the practice in this colony, but unless the Act was made retrospective from the 1st January it would not do anyone any good. If it was made retrospective it would give him a sum of £500, but that was not proposed.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he did not think the clause should be allowed to remain as it was. He did not see that any inducements should be held out to a Minister to hold office with the expectation of drawing his own salary and half of another, especially seeing that the plea for the appointment of an additional Minister was the amount of work one man had to do. He really thought the clause should be altered.

The PREMIER: Strike out the word "full." I have no objection to that.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN moved the omission of the word "full" on the 2nd line of the clause.

Amendment put and passed.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN moved the omission of all the words after the word "office" on the 3rd line of the clause.

Amendment agreed to; and clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 7 and 8—"Schedule" and "Preamble"—passed as printed.

The House resumed; the CHAIRMAN reported the Bill with amendments; and the third reading was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

SUPPLY—RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

On the motion of the COLONIAL TREASURER, the Speaker left the chair, and the House went into Committee further to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Question—That £788 18s. be granted for the service of the year 1883-4 for Executive Council, Legislative Assembly and Legislative Council, and Assembly—put.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN asked whether the item for steamer fares of members visiting Northern ports, which last year amounted to £392 10s., appeared on the Supplementary Estimates for the first time?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. W. Griffith): It has appeared for several years.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: Has it always appeared on the Supplementary Estimates?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes. We can never tell the amount until the close of the financial year.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the amount appeared a large one considering how low steamer fares were. It was, of course, a very desirable thing that members should make themselves acquainted with other parts of the colony as far as they could, suiting their own convenience; but he scarcely thought so many of them had visited the Northern ports as that amount seemed to indicate. Did the item include any fares for Ministers going to the Northern ports?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: No; simply steamer passes for members.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it had been the practice, since the resolution on the subject was carried three or four years ago, to issue a pass each year to every member. Those passes were made use of as vouchers for payment of steamer fares, and they came in through the steamboat companies and were honoured; and the item referred to represented the amount so spent. For the previous year the sum was £230. Probably the increase was owing to the general election last year.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that £27,216 16s. 7d. be granted for additional expenditure on the Colonial Secretary's Department. The item for contingencies was rather a large one, owing chiefly to the general election. In the Registrar-General's Department, in addition to a sum for fees for district registrars, there was an item of £138 9s. 4d., law costs in the case of the Mutual Association of Victoria v. Registrar-General. Proceedings were taken by the Mutual Association of Victoria against the Registrar-General to compel him to register a company of a foreign country, and the court held that he should pay the costs. Under "Police," there were a number of small items amounting to £3,318. The item for

Agent-General included the salary of the Acting Agent-General from 14th January to 30th June, and travelling expenses for Mr. Garrick. After a small additional sum for wages for the Government Printer, there was an item of £200 as a gratuity to the widow of Mr. Larkin, steward at the lunatic asylum. The payment was made on the same footing as it would have been if the deceased officer had been under the Civil Service Act, he having been a great many years in the service. The amount of the gratuity represented one year's salary. The contingencies for Colonial Stores was a large item for which he was sorry, and he hoped the amount would not be exceeded during the present year. The next item to which he would refer was a sum of £3,474 for purchase money, refitting, and repairs of the schooner "Mavis." The "Pearl," as hon. members were aware, was "water-logged"; in consequence of being saturated with water she had become so sluggish as to be unfit for the work she had to do. The "Mavis" had cost more than was anticipated, but she was working very well. The maintenance of the police steam-launch "Vigilant" was an old item. After having been used as a police steam-launch—for which purpose she was bought—for some time, it was found to be a not very convenient arrangement, and she was discontinued in that capacity and handed over to the Harbour Department. The expenditure was incurred before she was so handed over, and before the present Government came into office. The contingencies for the Benevolent Asylum were unfortunately large, but the amount had to be expended for food and necessaries. In the matter of Charitable Allowances, the Brisbane Relief Board had to be assisted to the extent of £91, and the Maryborough Relief Board to the extent of £100. With regard to the sum of £100 granted to the Ida School of Arts, Maytown, he could offer no explanation except that the money was paid before the present Government came into office. The sum given to agricultural and horticultural societies had been paid according to the usual practice of £1 for £1 subscribed. The amount voted last year for European telegrams was far too small, and a large additional sum had been spent. The money for refurnishing Government House was expended before the present Government came into office; he presumed it was justified, or it would not have been authorised. An item—law costs, *Andrews v. Wallace*, appeal against decision of Warwick bench, £46—deserved a few words of explanation. A Mr. Andrews was violently assaulted by a man named Wallace, and preferred an information against him for the assault. The police magistrate ordered the defendant to pay £5 and costs, but he had no power to order more than £5 including costs. The defendant appealed to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court ordered the complainant—who had been severely assaulted—to pay the costs of the appeal. It appeared so singularly hard upon the complainant to be called upon to pay £46 through the mistake of the police magistrate that the Government thought they were justified in asking the Committee to sanction the payment of the amount.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he was not going to take exception to the item for travelling expenses for the Agent-General, £400; but it seemed a very large sum for steamer fare and expenses from Brisbane to London.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the amount had been arrived at after considering the allowances made to high officers of State. Of course it was not all that had actually been paid by the Agent-General. He did not think the amount was excessive.

Mr. NORTON asked if they were to understand that that was to be the recognised amount to be paid to every Agent-General going home, because Mr. Garrick's expenses would be much heavier than the expenses of a single man.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that sum had been put down with the idea that it might be accepted as the amount to be paid to all Agents-General, unless there were circumstances justifying a less amount being paid. He did not think it was too much, and it did not by any means pay Mr. Garrick's expenses.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN asked if they were to understand that it was for his family as well?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said, of course, and it did not cover his expenses.

Mr. NORTON said it appeared to him that if there were rapid changes in the Government that would become a very expensive item.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said there was an item for the maintenance of the steam launch "Vigilant," and he wanted to know something about the work in which it was engaged. The "Vigilant" had been employed by the Police Department for the purpose of protecting settlers on the Northern rivers who could not be reached by the land police, and it had been in command of an officer who had been in the Indian Navy. He wanted to know why the services of the launch had been discontinued? There was the same necessity for protecting the settlers on the Northern rivers now as at the time when the "Vigilant" was purchased. And if the necessity existed, had the means been found of protecting the settlers from the incursions of the blacks?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he could not give much information on the subject. The services of the "Vigilant" had been discontinued before he came to the department. For his own part he had always thought the arrangement an excellent one, and that he would have thought twice before he would have discontinued it.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said that, so far as his impression went, the feeling of the people on the Northern rivers was that they were satisfied with the services of the "Vigilant," for they thought that the Government wanted to protect them against the ravages of the blacks. He was at a loss to understand how the vessel had been withdrawn, and he did not see how the people—for instance, in the Cairns district, and even as far south as Cardwell—could really protect themselves. It was utterly impossible, for he did not see how they could be protected by the police going inland from the police stations. The country was very impenetrable at the back of those Northern rivers. He was sorry that the arrangement had been discontinued, and that the gentleman in charge of the vote could not give the reason why. No doubt, as he said, it had been discontinued before he came into office, but the papers in his office would show why. There was an item for the purchase of a building at Maryborough. What was that building for?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not know very much about it. It must be for a police station there, although he had no recollection of it. He remembered so much, that the negotiations had been pending for a long time.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said there were two items that seemed to him very large. £5,000 was a very large sum for refurnishing the Government House.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes, it is.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he really did not see how £5,000 could be spent for that. The house was hardly big enough to contain £5,000 worth of furniture. Of course the money had been spent and there was nothing more to be said about it, but it certainly looked a large sum to be placed on the Supplementary Estimates—he did not care what Government was responsible—whether the present or the last. Then there was the item “European telegrams and other miscellaneous services, £2,589 15s. 0d.” He really did not know what “other miscellaneous services” might mean. It also appeared to be a very large vote. He was free to admit that the telegrams between the Colonial Secretary's Department and the Agent-General must be very numerous and increasing daily. He would like to ask the hon. gentleman in charge of the vote if the item included telegraphing the Colonial Treasurer's Financial Statement to London. He was quite justified in asking the question, as such a thing had been done in a neighbouring colony. Would the financial statement the hon. gentleman had made that afternoon be telegraphed home to assist him in floating his ten-million loan?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said, with regard to the item “Refurnishing Government House,” he agreed that it did seem an extraordinarily large amount for furnishing so small a house. All he knew about it was that it was authorised by the Government of the day, on the 18th May, 1883, the words authorising it being, “as much as may be necessary.” Perhaps the hon. member for Port Curtis could give some information about it. That mode of authorising the expenditure was, he thought, highly objectionable—authorising somebody to go and spend as much as he liked. With regard to European telegrams, of course if the statement made by his hon. colleague that afternoon were sent home it would come out of a similar vote. A telegram had been sent home respecting a previous statement; a short one—not a £1,200 telegram like the one sent from New South Wales. The item “other miscellaneous services” covered an infinite variety of things. It was a kind of vote that covered everything, and the items were wonderfully multifarious sometimes.

Question put and passed.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. A. Rutledge), in moving £7,438 18s. 8d. for the Administration of Justice, said the first item—Civil Business Account, £473 18s.—had all been spent during the tenure of office of his predecessor. Fees to coroners, £249 3s. 5d., had also all been spent. That was an amount payable under statute, and must be paid; it happened to be rather large during last year. Fees to counsel, £322 8s. 6d., was an amount in excess of the annual vote, and a considerable part of it also had been spent during his predecessor's term of office. The item—Acting Chief Justice, extra salary, 1st July to 14th March, £350 16s. 2d.—had also been spent during his predecessor's tenure of office. Allowance to witnesses, £1,679 13s. 7d., was a large amount, but during last year, he was sorry to say, there was a larger number of criminal trials all over the colony than there had been for years past, and the witnesses in many cases had had to travel very long distances; some from Normanton to Cooktown, and others from far away in the interior into Townsville; and the expenses they had been put to from one cause or another made the average for the year very large indeed. Part of the next item—Travelling Expenses of their Honours the Judges, £232 9s. 10d.—was for the previous year, and part for last year. They had already had some discussion

1884—5 y

about part of that vote. Postage and incidentals, £64 8s. 8d., was an amount that had been incurred in excess of the annual vote. Gratuity to W. Cahill, clerk of the Supreme Court, £33 6s. 8d.—arose in this way: During the time there was no Deputy Registrar of the Supreme Court the officer referred to performed his duties, working long after hours, and he was given a gratuity of one month's salary for the two months' work.

Mr. NORTON: Did anyone else get the salary?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: No. The amount for other bailiffs in the Northern district—£123 5s. 9d.—was an amount paid to high bailiffs. There had been a large number of executions levied in the North, and that amount had been paid to the bailiffs, who received a commission of 5 per cent. up to the first £100, and 2½ per cent. beyond that, on the amount realised by the execution. Incidental expenses amounted to £56 7s. 3d. Allowance to jurors—£831—was an additional amount paid to jurors in consequence of the largely increased business, which necessitated subpoenaing a larger number of jurors than usual. The item of £35 4s. 2d.—premium on fidelity guarantee policies—was in excess of the amount voted for the year, and was also necessitated by statute. The next item—£1,000, Acting Judge Mansfield, 1st July to 30th June—was an amount that had arisen in pursuance of an arrangement made by his predecessor in office, by which his Honour Judge Paul was granted twelve months' leave of absence on full pay, and that was the salary for his *locum tenens*. The next item—£26 5s., Acting Crown Prosecutor, Southern District—was an amount paid to Mr. Byrne for acting as Crown Prosecutor when the Crown Prosecutor was employed in another case on behalf of the Government. The amount, £1,914 15s. 2d.—payments to witnesses and jurors—seemed a large amount in excess of the annual vote, but the same remark applied to that as to the same item in the Supreme Court. There had been a great amount of work done in connection with the district courts all over the colony during the year. That, he hoped, would not be the case during the present year. It was a fluctuating vote, and it was impossible to say what amount would be required from one year to another under that head. If it was found correspondingly large this year, there would be no alternative but to ask the House for a much larger amount to cover the expenses under that head. The next item, £45 16s. 6d.—payment to bailiffs for service of jury summonses—was a sum which had been paid to bailiffs for serving the summonses mentioned. In many cases they had been obliged to pay much more than they were allowed for the service of summonses, and, in order that they should not suffer loss, the amount had in some special cases been made up.

Mr. BEATTIE said he saw the item for jurors was a very large one. The Attorney-General had told them it was caused by the large number of cases that had been heard in the Supreme Court and district court. He wished to point out to the Committee that the amount paid to jurors was certainly very small, and he would give an instance of it. During the last three or four weeks there had been a very large attendance of jurors at the Supreme Court, and his attention had been called particularly to the case of one of them. He was a man ordinarily receiving wages at the rate of 8s. or 9s. a day. He had to attend the Supreme Court; and in order to keep his situation he was obliged to pay a man to fill his place while he was at the court, so that he lost the difference between 8s. or 9s. and 5s. He had actually, therefore, to pay a

man 3s. or 4s. a day to keep his situation for him whilst he attended the court. Of course it was the man's duty, as a good citizen, to attend the court when called upon as a juror; but when a man had to leave his employment for the benefit of the country he should not be allowed to suffer a pecuniary loss by doing so. The case he spoke of was a hard case, but it was not the only one of the kind. Some alteration should be made in the law to enable the Government to give a little more to men taken away from their ordinary employment. Again, persons living, say, fourteen or fifteen miles out in the country received travelling expenses; but they only got their travelling expenses once—when coming in to attend the court; and if a man had to go home and travel those fourteen or fifteen miles half-a-dozen times he would only be paid his travelling expenses for the one journey. That was also a hard case. People in town in business might easily attend the Supreme Court; but where a man had to pay someone to act for him, and suffer a pecuniary loss of 3s. or 4s. a day while he attended the court, it was very hard.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said no doubt it was very hard, and such cases occasionally happened; and unfortunately they were not confined to jurymen. As a case in point, he could state that during the present sitting of the court, a prosecutor in a case of larceny, who had the whole of his money stolen out of his room, amounting to nearly £14, and some other valuables, comprising the whole of his worldly possessions, had to wait in town now for three weeks, in consequence of many important cases occupying the attention of the criminal court during the previous three weeks. He had to wait for three weeks before his case came on, and during that time the man had been obliged to pawn his watch to obtain the means of keeping himself while waiting for his case to be called on. He could not in the meantime accept a situation, though he had a situation offered him in Sydney and had to forego his chance of obtaining it. The Government had no means of providing for hard cases like that. It was an unfortunate circumstance. He thought the circumstances of the present criminal sittings in Brisbane were to a great extent unprecedented. They were now in the fourth week of the sitting, and that had not happened for a very long time. The case of the juror to which the hon. member for Fortitude Valley had referred was a very exceptional case, and as the law stood there was no alternative.

Mr. NORTON said he would like to ask the Attorney-General if the law costs set down were incurred by the late Government?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL asked if the hon. gentleman wished him to go into the items in detail of fees paid to counsel? He could do so if the hon. gentleman wished.

Mr. NORTON: You may do so if you have them with you.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that in 1883 there was paid to Mr. Virgil Power, in July, the sum of £52 10s., and in August, £46 17s., and in March of this year, since the present Government came into office, £52 10s. and £36 15s.; making a total paid to Mr. Virgil Power of £188 12s. In August, 1883, Mr. Chubb was paid £26 9s. and £26 4s.; on October 26th, £21, and in July of this year, since the present Government came into office, £31 16s. 6d.; making a total of £105 9s. 6d. Mr. Real was paid in September, 1883, £5 15s. 6d. and £2 4s. 6d.; in April, 1884, £63, £57 15s. 6d., and £32 12s. 6d.—that last amount was incurred during the tenure of office of his predecessor—

making a total of £161 8s. Mr. F. B. Sheridan received in December £15 15s., and in March last £26 5s.; April 9th, £33 12s.; May 9th, £26 5s.; and June 17th, £5 5s.; making a total of £107 2s. Mr. F. W. Dickson received £12 12s.; Mr. Murray-Prior received during this year £26 5s.; and Mr. C. F. Chubb, solicitor, of Ipswich, £5 5s.; Mr. J. G. Drake received £5 5s.; and Mr. G. R. Byrne £10 10s. Those were the amounts paid as fees to counsel. The amounts paid for civil business had been given before.

Mr. BLACK said the Supplementary Estimates were always very unsatisfactory, because the money had been paid and the Committee could not help voting it. He would point out, however, that the Supplementary Estimates were gradually increasing year by year. For the past year the amount required reached £107,000. He could not help noticing also that under the administration of justice there was a greater percentage than under any other department.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Most of it was incurred before I came into office.

Mr. BLACK said he did not care who was responsible for it. He was of opinion that barristers were not very good accountants as a rule, as he had seen them very much nonplussed in the courts over not very considerable sums. He, however, had no doubt that they always looked after their fees pretty well. He wished to point out to the Committee that, whereas the total Estimates for the Law Department for 1883-4 were £26,725, the Supplementary Estimates amounted to £7,438, or rather more than 25 per cent. of what was considered sufficient for the department when the Estimates were before the Committee. He would also point out that the sum already voted for the present year for the administration of justice was £28,375, and if the expenses were to be as much as they were the previous twelve months, that £28,375 would be insufficient, and the amount would be brought up to £35,000. He thought that all the departments ought to put a bold face on the matter and not under-estimate the amount they required for the year when they came down to the Committee. If they did not, the time would come when the Supplementary Estimates, over which the House had no control, would be severely criticised. He hoped the Attorney-General would look a little more closely into the economy of his department in future than he had done in the past.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said he did not think the department was likely to require a salary of £1,000 during the present year for an acting district court judge, or £350 extra salary for an acting chief justice. Sometimes the department might go on for a year or two and have very little civil business, and at other times there would be a large amount of civil business to be done for the Crown. But, as he had explained, the chief items necessitating an increase last year were the salary for a *locum tenens* for a district court judge, extra salary to the Acting Chief Justice, and allowances to jurors and witnesses. If it was again found that the amount for witnesses and jurors was larger than was anticipated, then the amount would be put right in the ordinary Estimates next year.

Mr. HIGSON said he wished to bring before the Committee a case he had previously brought under the notice of the Attorney-General, who had stated that he was unable to do anything in the matter. Two gentlemen, one of whom was a clerk or traveller in his employ, and the other a commercial traveller for Mr. Feez, of Rockhampton, were summoned to attend in a case against

a man charged with forging a cheque. Both gentlemen had large families, and were required to attend the court twice at Rockhampton, and once or twice, he believed, at a place called Pine Hill. He applied to the Attorney-General to see whether they could not get the expenses of their attendance, and was informed that nothing could be done for them.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Was I the Attorney-General?

Mr. HIGSON said the application was made to the hon. gentleman. He now called attention to that matter to show that the case mentioned by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley was not an isolated one, and because he thought some provision should be made for such cases by the Committee.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said there had been so many applications of the kind referred to by the hon. member made to him by persons who had been required to attend preliminary hearings in criminal cases that he might be pardoned for not recollecting particular instances. There were cases of hardship, he admitted. He had known instances where persons had been obliged to go hundreds of miles in order to give attendance at the preliminary hearing on a charge against a man for a criminal offence, and then, after the preliminary hearing and the committal of the prisoner for trial, they had to travel the distance a second time to give evidence at the trial. Witnesses' expenses were not allowed when a person attended the preliminary examination before a magistrate, but he received the usual travelling allowance when he attended a trial either at the district court or circuit court. If all the applications for expenses made to him, or even if a considerable proportion of them, were allowed it would require three or four times the amount put down on the Estimates. By the multiplication of district courts in the colony, the establishing of courts at Normanton, Cunnamulla, Charleville, and other places, it was believed that those hardships would be diminished in the future, but there would always be individual cases of hardship for which they could not make provision. Under the circumstances, he had declined to make any advance on behalf of the traveller in the employ of the hon. member for Rockhampton.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he thought it was a great injustice for men to be obliged to attend preliminary investigations and give their services to the country for nothing. He thought that if the same rule which was followed in the case of witnesses was applied to officers of court and the gentlemen who prosecuted and defended prisoners a remedy would have been found long since. Justice ought to be done to those persons who had done what the hon. gentleman had told them he knew one man had to do. The hon. member for Fortitude Valley had mentioned a hard case, and he (Hon. J. M. Macrossan) did not believe it was an exceptional one—in which a man received 5s. a day as a juror, and had to pay 8s. a day for a man to go and work in his place. It was too bad; it was time the Attorney-General altered the law. If the hon. gentleman brought in a Bill providing that a fair sum should be allowed to jurors so that they should not be put to unnecessary expense, it would be very readily agreed to by that House. Of course, as the hon. gentleman had stated, the multiplication of district courts would lessen the evil complained of, but it would not do away with it. In the northern and western parts of the colony, many cases of injuries were allowed to go unpunished because men were unwilling to prosecute or attend as witnesses. For one case tried, there were, on the average, three or four never brought

into court at all, because of the expenses and trouble—for which people got nothing, not even thanks. They were sometimes told they were fools for their pains. Therefore people sometimes shut their eyes or turned their backs, so that they should not witness crimes and be called as witnesses; and he thought it was high time, even if it should cost £2,000 or £3,000 a year, that the Attorney-General found a remedy. A number of cases of hardship could be mentioned; and the hardship generally fell upon the working men, who were not able to bear the expenses to which they were put.

Mr. BEATTIE said he could endorse all that had fallen from the hon. member for Townsville. He had heard of cases even in Brisbane where people refused to prosecute or attend as witnesses on account of the trouble and expense. He remembered a case of petty larceny, in which the sufferer refused to prosecute for that reason. He (Mr. Beattie) told him that he was not doing his duty to the State in not prosecuting; but he could scarcely blame the man. As was pointed out by the Attorney-General, a man who lost £14 had to pawn his watch in order to pay his expenses while the case was being tried. No doubt if he had known the trouble to which he would be put, he would have "slithered" out of the colony instead of prosecuting the man who robbed him. If the Attorney-General brought the matter before his colleagues in Cabinet assembled, they would no doubt find some way out of the difficulty.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said there was one matter he intended to bring before his colleagues. He had been obtaining information from New South Wales with regard to a readjustment of the scale on which witnesses were paid. With regard to jurors, an alteration in the present scale could only be effected by a change in the law. He had received the information he required with respect to the mitigation of the hardships suffered by witnesses, and he intended to lay the matter before his colleagues.

Mr. KATES said he would take the present opportunity of bringing the case of Horace Charles Ransome before the Committee. The hon. member for Mackay had remarked that the Supplementary Estimates were increasing annually; but the general taxpayer would not begrudge an increase if they could always get justice. In April last Mr. Ransome sent 24,000 feet of cedar to Brydon, Jones, and Company, with instructions to sell it, the custom being that cedar under one inch should be calculated as one inch. Brydon, Jones, and Company wrote to say that they could sell the cedar according to the exact thickness; but Ransome told them not to sell, saying that he would come to Brisbane himself. Brydon, Jones, and Company sold the cedar according to short measurement, and sent Ransome a cheque for £100 19s. 6d. Ransome came to Brisbane, returned the cheque, and told them that he had bought the cedar according to usual measurement, and could not accept the sale. They could not come to terms and the matter was taken to the district court, Toowoomba, where Ransome obtained a verdict from a special jury of four. Brydon, Jones, and Company appealed to the Supreme Court; and Mr. Justice Harding, considering that there had not been sufficient evidence given at the Toowoomba trial to prove it was the custom to reckon cedar under an inch thick as one inch in thickness, reversed the decision of the jury. The consequence was that Mr. Ransome not only lost what he would have gained by the verdict at Toowoomba, but £500 or £600 costs into the bargain, so that he was brought nearly to the verge of ruin. Ransome was one of his

constituents—a respectable old colonist—and, he had no doubt, had been hardly dealt with by the court.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: No.

Mr. KATES said he would read the names of some timber merchants and sawmill proprietors of long standing in the colony, who said that in measurements it was the rule to calculate cedar under one inch as being one inch thick. Those names were:—E. W. Pechey, R. A. Dakers, Rosenstengel and Kleinmeyer, C. T. Edwards, John Cobb, A. and D. Munro, J. B. Henderson, P. Keogh, Cameron and Hebbel, R. Godsall, William Broadfoot, N. Williamson; Filshie, Broadfoot, and Company; Wallace and Gibson, McIntosh and Dunnigan, Charles Colas, W. Gaisford, J. Fenwick, Arthur Morgan, Francis Grayson, John Thompson, Henry Williams, W. Fliteroft, Russell Wilkins and Company, F. E. Meyer, J. G. Bremner, R. Howell, John Carr, Fred. Hudson, G. P. Burnes and Company, Michael T. O'Brien, John Keleher, James McKeachie, Richard Noyes, Brown and Wilson, Peter Reid, Frank Wright, J. Burnes, Alexander Hall, John Sterne, Stewart and Company, James Wilson, E. Devlin, C. Baker, P. Russell, R. Williams, S. P. Cutmore, Saul Nunn, Ken. Hutchison, John Affleck, J. Francis, P. Connolly, James McAra, Peter Affleck, T. Mogridge, George Wright, H. S. Watts, George S. Backhouse, W. Magarry, and William Milward. He really thought he was justified in bringing the matter before the Committee, in order that it might go before the country, so that if a similar case came before the judges they would know how to act. The case was so distressing for Ransome, and had agitated the minds of so many other people, that he took that opportunity of bringing it before the Committee.

The PREMIER said the hon. gentleman had again brought forward the grievance of Mr. Ransome; and he might now state for the benefit of Mr. Ransome and others what the facts of the case really were. Mr. Ransome had some timber which he wanted to sell, and which he sent to his agents in Brisbane with instructions to sell. They sold it at so much per foot, and they got full value for it. Full value was received for it after trying every purchaser. It had been offered at so much per foot, taking the timber at the average thickness of one inch, and in fixing the price it was the price at so much per foot and one inch thick. All the witnesses in creation would not satisfy him that when a man was buying timber he did not want to know how thick it was. Nothing would convince him that the purchasers would be such fools. The contract was to sell the timber at so much per foot, and both purchaser and seller understood that to mean one inch thick. Mr. Ransome received his money, and then he complained that the contract ought to have been read as if it meant no matter what the thickness was, and he tried to make out that that was the custom. If the contract had been made upon those terms the result would have been that Ransome would not have received less per foot, but exactly the same amount. He received full value for his timber. Then he went to court in Toowoomba and failed to produce evidence that such was the custom in Brisbane. He said there was a custom; perhaps there was, but he should hesitate to believe it. In his own mind he might have thought there was such a custom, but he did not produce evidence of it in court. A verdict was given for the plaintiff, and then there was an appeal to the Full Court, and the Full Court, finding there was no evidence of such a custom, gave a verdict for the defendant. If the contract had been made upon the basis of such a custom, of course he would have received less per foot.

Mr. KATES said that the jury were asked by the court, "Was there a usage in wholesale transactions in Brisbane that boards under one inch should be taken as an inch?" The answer was "Yes." One witness said, "I have been in the timber trade for thirty years, during which time I never sold anything under an inch except as an inch." Another witness said, "I am a timber dealer; have been so for about twenty-five years; have sold thousands of feet of cedar; have had large transactions with the defendants; have never sold a board under an inch except as an inch." Besides that, one of the defendant's witnesses was asked by the court, "What is the Brisbane measurement of a board ten feet in length, twelve inches wide, and three-quarters of an inch in thickness?" The witness answered "Ten feet." That was sufficient evidence he was sure.

Mr. FERGUSON said there seemed to be a great deal of difference of opinion on the matter. He had bought thousands of boards himself, and had never paid the same for half-inch as for inch. One inch was the standard measurement of timber, and what was under an inch was counted as less; there was a scale of prices in proportion to the thickness. But if a sawyer took a contract he charged the same rate for sawing a half-inch board as for sawing an inch board; there was the same amount of labour. An inch board was much more valuable than a half-inch board or three-eighths-inch board; that was his experience in buying timber all his life. He did not see what the matter had to do with the subject under discussion, and such a question ought not to be allowed to be discussed in connection with the vote before them.

Mr. SMYTH said he had been in the sawmill business himself, and his experience had been, as the hon. member for Darling Downs said, that under half-an-inch meant an inch. If they took weatherboards three-quarters of an inch thick on one edge and one-quarter on the other it was charged an inch. That had always been the custom in the timber trade, and Mr. Ransome was justified in charging an inch for anything under an inch. Of course the sawmill proprietors did not expect to cut an inch board into two half-inch boards; there was the dust to be paid for. Five-eighths timber was cheaper than seven-eighths timber, because a great deal more could be carted and shipped.

Mr. T. CAMPBELL said he did not pretend to know very much about timber matters, and it was very unfortunate that such a matter should have come before the Committee. The question had been decided by the highest court in the land, and he did not for a moment suppose that there was a single person in that court who would be biased. They simply went upon the terms of the contract. He did not wish to say anything more except that Mr. Ransome had received full justice. Under the heading of "Supreme Court" he saw travelling expenses of their Honours the Judges £232 9s. 10d., and the Attorney-General had given no explanation of it. He wished to know if the sum that had been under debate in that Committee had received the Attorney-General's attention; that was, the expenses of Mr. Justice Cooper. Was any portion of that amount under the present heading? It was very necessary that the matter should be explained, and if he remembered rightly, the hon. the Premier said that he would communicate with Mr. Justice Cooper and ascertain how that excessive expenditure was incurred.

Mr. HORWITZ said he would not have risen to take any notice of Mr. Ransome's case, but he wished to say that Mr. Ransome was not yet

satisfied and the case would appear again. The hon. member for Cook had said that the case had been decided by the highest authority in the land. It had appeared before the judge in the Toowoomba, and his Honour said, "Gentlemen of the jury, you know more about timber than I do; I shall leave the matter in your hands." It was decided in favour of Mr. Ransome. Then it came before the judge in Brisbane, and the verdict was reversed. He considered that Mr. Ransome would have a very good case to bring before the House.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that he agreed with what had fallen from the hon. member for Rockhampton, that the introduction of that subject on such an occasion was to be deprecated. He did not know why they should attack the decision of the Supreme Court, when it gave its decision, not on Mr. Ransome's version of what took place, but on the evidence taken at the trial. Mr. Ransome might have a grievance, but until that House was in a position to justify it in coming to the conclusion that he had a grievance, the matter should not be discussed. With regard to what had fallen from the hon. member for Cook, his colleague the Premier had, he understood, written to Mr. Justice Cooper, but whether he had received any reply or not he did not know.

Mr. T. CAMPBELL said that any member of the House who had a grievance had a perfect right to bring it before the House, whether that grievance was caused or supposed to have been caused by the Premier or a judge of the Supreme Court; and that House had a perfect right to consider it. The hon. member for Warwick had asked him to speak on the matter; and though he did not believe the matter had been decided unjustly as regarded Mr. Ransome, yet he thought there were features in the case which might commend themselves to the consideration of the House.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the discussion is irregular. I ought to have checked hon. members before.

Question put and passed.

The PREMIER, in moving that £14,185 3s. 9d. be granted for Public Instruction, said the only item he would call attention to was £10,000 for buildings. He had pointed out in the Estimates-in-Chief that the sum voted last year—£18,000—had been entirely insufficient; but additional school accommodation was absolutely required, and large liabilities had already been incurred when he assumed office. He was rather alarmed to see the expenditure increasing so rapidly, but he did not see how he could stop it.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved that £26,204 2s. 7d. be granted for the Colonial Treasurer's Department. Hon. members would observe that there was a large amount—£4,096—for refundments. The explanation of that was that up to the end of 1883-4 it was the practice to keep a large sum in suspense, to which all the refundments of the various departments were charged. That practice had been discontinued. Now, at the end of each month, the refundments were deducted from the revenue account. The proportion of telegraph receipts due to other colonies was £1,539. The total amount of refundments under that head last year was £4,998. The alteration in the charges had considerably affected that. The amount of commission, exchange, etc., £2,527, was accounted for by the retirement of debentures in London, and the charges made by the bankers for the operation. The payment of coupons attached to debentures, about £1,025, was on the retirement of the debentures for the loan of 1863, on which $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. was charged. He must admit that

£4,844 was a large additional amount for the Customs Department for tide-waiters, messengers, etc.; but there was a great deal of extra labour required last year. He regretted to have to say that the amount put down for that service on the present year's Estimates would, he was apprehensive, be insufficient. Had he been acquainted with the fact that an additional sum would be required on the Supplementary Estimates for 1883-4, he would certainly have provided for a larger amount in the Estimates for 1884-5 just passed. However, it was an indication of the activity of the department and of the amount of work that was performed. The contingencies for distillation, £596, were occasioned by the number of prosecutions and convictions which had been carried out in connection with sly grog-selling throughout the colony, and the activity of the Revenue Department in endeavouring to suppress that offence. For the fees to the members of the Marine Board an additional sum of £186 was required, the sum on the Estimates-in-Chief having been insufficient for the year's expenditure. Hon. members would observe a large increase in the Harbours and Rivers Department. It was made up of expenditure on buoys, beacons, etc.; expenses, steamer, Fitzroy River; purchase of steamer "Pippo"—that was a vessel required for the Mary River; a new vessel to replace the "Day Dawn," which was wrecked during the cyclone at Bowen; floating beacons, Moreton Bay; cottage for pilot, Pioneer River. There was also an item of £584 for the steam-launch "Vigilant," which was taken over in September, 1883, from the Police Department before the present Government came into office. It was a very handy vessel, and had been purchased, so far as he could learn, because the Police Department had no further use for it. There were items besides for pile-driving punt and beacons, Mary River and Great Sandy Straits; steam-launches for Pioneer River and Moreton Bay; repairs to buildings damaged by cyclone, Bowen; repairs to steamer "Fitzroy"; repairs, etc., pilot building, Bowen; and repairs—wharves, boatshed, etc., Mackay. Most of these had been passed under the authority of the late Government. The Dry Dock required £318 additional beyond the sum appropriated for 1884; but hon. members were aware that the Dry Dock was paying working expenses fully, and leaving a considerable profit to go towards the payment of interest.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he had been under the impression that the guarantee policy for the Civil Service was under one heading; but he saw there was one item in the Treasurer's Department, and another under the head of "Administration of Justice."

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the officers of the Civil Service were all included in one policy; but the Sheriff took a guarantee policy for the fidelity of the bailiffs, who did not rank as permanent officers of the Civil Service.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the hon. member had told them the Dry Dock was paying expenses. He supposed he did not mean it was paying the interest on the cost of construction?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: No.

Mr. T. CAMPBELL said he did not exactly understand the explanation of the Colonial Treasurer with regard to the guarantee policy. He presumed that when a gentleman took a responsible position in the Civil Service his fidelity was guaranteed for a certain amount by a society; and in case of defalcations the society was liable to the extent of the guarantee. He did not understand the hon. gentleman when he said the whole of the Civil Service were lumped together, and all paid the same premium.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said all the Civil servants were insured according to the character of their respective offices for a certain amount, and the premium was very much less than it would be for any private individual. He thought it cost the State about 7s. per cent. In case of default the insurance company made good the amount up to the extent fixed for the particular officer concerned. The premiums were all paid in one amount; it was a great saving of trouble.

Mr. NORTON asked whether the expenditure under the head of "Distillation" was made up by the fines for sly grog-selling?

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he was informed that the amount of fines received would cover the expenditure twice over.

Mr. NORTON asked what became of the spirits in cases of conviction for sly grog-selling or illicit distillation?

The COLONIAL TREASURER said it was confiscated and sold. There had been no large seizure of spirits since he had been in office. The prosecutions had chiefly been for sly grog-selling at shanties where no large stock was kept.

Mr. NORTON said he thought that when a seizure was made of spirits from an illicit still they should be destroyed. A great deal of it was vile stuff. He once had the curiosity to taste some, and it nearly cut his throat.

Mr. T. CAMPBELL asked why the item for repairs to wharves, boatsheds, etc., at Mackay was so large. £200 was down for the purpose, and he was sure the Colonial Treasurer could explain the reason. There were much more important places than Mackay. Bowen, for instance, was a more important harbour, and yet only £150 was put down for that place.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the hon. gentleman would be aware that those votes were not appropriations asked for by the Government. The money was actually required for repairs, and Bowen had had a large sum spent upon it since the recent cyclone.

Question put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. B. Dutton) moved that a sum of £12,444 19s. 10d. be granted for the Public Lands Department. It would be observed that there were two items for surveys; one item was for the survey of runs and the other for fees to licensed surveyors. During the last year the survey of runs had been going on as well as possible, considering the unfavourable seasons, and the amount appropriated was not quite adequate to meet the increased work. The office of inspector of State forests had been abolished, but the sum on the Estimates was provision for his salary for either three or six months. "Refund to J. S. Crate and W. R. Brown, £252 4s. 5d." That arose in this way: Those men were acting as trustees for some young children, and one of them invested some money in the purchase of rich land. The other trustee would not consent to the purchase being made, and application was afterwards made for a refund of the money, which was granted. The land had been since sold at an advance of £50. £200 was put down for the improvement of lands resumed at Ipswich, and £272 12s. 6d. was applied to the destruction of Bathurst burr on Crown lands. Four divisional boards had taken advantage of the vote—namely, Jondaryan, Glengallan, Ayr, and Gowrie.

Mr. NORTON asked if the fees for survey of runs was not refunded by the lessees?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes,

Mr. NORTON said he should like to know why only four divisional boards reaped advantage from the vote for the destruction of Bathurst burr?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: They made application, and no others did.

Mr. NELSON said the division he represented got a verdict against the Surveyor-General in connection with the destruction of burr, but they never got any money.

Mr. T. CAMPBELL said he would ask the Minister for Lands for information as to the item "Inquiry into runs, Cook district." In the absence of his hon. friend, Mr. Stevenson, he would ask what that meant.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said an inquiry was instituted by the late Government into the condition of runs in the Cook district, and £700 was placed on the Estimates to carry on that inquiry. The sum now on the Estimates was for expenditure in excess of that amount.

Mr. NELSON said he would like to know more about the Bathurst burr. How were the boards to get the money if they cut the burr on Crown lands? Four boards out of sixty had got money for doing that; but other boards which were doing the same work did not get a penny. That seemed very unfair, and there ought to be some system adopted in the distribution of the money. Those boards which were very clamorous, or which had a friend at court, appeared to get all the money.

Mr. FOOTE said the hon. member must have had a friend at court when he got a verdict against the Government, but it would have been much easier if he had made application for money instead of going to law.

Mr. NELSON: You might do both and get nothing then.

Mr. FOOTE said the hon. member could not have tried the second course. He was sure he got nothing from adopting the first. He (Mr. Foote) would suggest that if the Government were going to give money to divisional boards they would distribute it to all alike. They should not give assistance to one district and object to give the same assistance to other boards. If the Government granted money to one board they should grant it to all, and he would recommend all boards whose districts were infested with those noxious weeds to apply to the Government for help in destroying them.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said the hon. member for Northern Downs wanted to know why his division had not been assisted in that way. The answer was, for the very simple reason that he had never asked for it. He had dealt with all the applications that had been sent in. He hardly thought the sum voted for the purpose on the Estimates-in-Chief, after what had been said, would meet the requirements of the coming year.

Mr. NELSON said his board had been refused once, and he took it for granted that that was to be the rule. They had even gone to law, and got a verdict against the Surveyor-General, and yet they had not got a single farthing. If money was available for the purpose it ought to be made known to the boards.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said it was not his duty to ask the boards if they wanted money.

Mr. NELSON said the application of his board was in the office, and they could not be expected to go on repeating it.

Mr. KATES said the board of his district got a verdict against the Surveyor-General, and on making another application they got the money,

Mr. NELSON said one application, especially after the verdict was on record, ought to be sufficient. It appeared that only those boards which were clamorous and worried the Minister were likely to get money.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he objected to the system, and if he were Minister for Lands he would take care that the divisional boards did not get a shilling of the money. The proper plan was, where the Bathurst burr existed, to instruct the Crown Lands Commissioner to get it cut down by contract.

Mr. NELSON said he quite agreed with that. What he complained of was, that money was given to three or four favoured boards and refused to others.

Mr. NORTON said it seemed rather hard that some boards should be paid and others not. The proper thing for the neglected boards to do would be to send in applications.

Mr. NELSON: And for arrears as well?

Mr. NORTON said they would not get the arrears. With regard to the item for improvements on land resumed from the Ipswich and West Moreton Agricultural Society, he would ask the Minister if that was for land resumed for railway purposes?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No.

Mr. NORTON: What was it resumed for?

Mr. FOXTON said he thought he knew something about the matter. The money was probably paid as compensation for the sum which had been spent in fencing the land which was set apart for that society. The land had since been cut up into allotments by the Government, sold, and built upon.

Mr. NORTON: Did the Government make anything out of it?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes.

Mr. FOOTE: They must have made £1,000 or £2,000 out of it.

Question put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS moved that £19,552 17s. 3d. be granted for the Department of Public Works and Mines. A large portion of the vote was for money expended on buildings by the late Government.

Mr. NORTON: Not the whole of it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said that the present Government had erected buildings for the accommodation of the Colonial Architect and the Engineer of Bridges. With those two exceptions nearly the whole of the other items were incurred by the previous Government. There was a sum of £100 for a warden at Gladstone which was omitted from the Estimates last year. The previous Government were responsible for £100, reward for discovery of gold at Nebo, and also for £227 6s. 8d., Museum and Geological Collector and assistant; £372 for Acting Commissioner for Railways, and £375 for Acting Traffic Auditor; £513 10s. for Railway Commission, fees and expenses. There was a gratuity of £200 to the widow of a man named Friedlin, who was killed at Toowoomba. The allowance of £132 18s. 10d. for telegraph operators was due to additional lines being opened and additional operators being required. They were partly paid by the Telegraph Department and partly by the Railway Department. There was also £333 6s. 8d. for the Engineer of Existing Lines, and £674 5s. 1d. for maintenance of the Maryborough and Gympie Rail

way; a small sum for the traffic station-masters on the Bundaberg and Mount Perry Railway, and the considerable sum of £2,775 for the Central Railway, which was owing to additional length of line being opened requiring additional traffic, station-masters, locomotive wages, fuel, and contingencies. The Northern Railway required £1,686 for locomotive, fuel, and contingencies.

Mr. NORTON asked what was the increase of salary under "Mines" for a draftsman?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said that the hon. member should remember. It was his doing.

Mr. J. CAMPBELL said he would like to have from the Minister for Works an explanation of the item "Reward for discovery of Nebo Gold Fields." He did not know that it was a goldfield at all. He believed that the population was ten or fifteen, and for the last year or two it had been no more than twenty or thirty. He knew that when discussing the other evening the subject of a reward for the discovery of a much more important goldfield a number of gentlemen on the other side of the Committee threw cold water on it. He would therefore like an explanation why that sum appeared on the Estimates as a reward for the discovery of the Nebo Gold Field.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said that the sum had been paid by the previous Government; he knew it had not been paid by him.

Mr. NORTON said the application for the reward had been made when the Hon. J. M. Macrossan was in office. There had been a great deal of communication in connection with it, and it had only been settled after a considerable amount of inquiry. He could not profess to remember all the particulars; but if the hon. member would apply to Mr. Moore, in the Mines Office, he would show him all the documents.

Mr. FOOTE said he wished to call the attention of the Minister for Works to a much more important matter. He saw an allowance to the widow of the man Friedlin, killed at Toowoomba; but nothing to the widow of James Griffiths, who was killed at Darra.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that the Estimates under discussion were for last year. There was another Supplementary Estimate to come.

Mr. FOOTE said he was glad to hear it, for he thought Mrs. Griffiths had been forgotten. He hoped to see a respectable sum put down for her.

Mr. NORTON said he would like to ask if Friedlin, for whose widow £200 was put down, was a guard, and how he was killed?

Mr. GROOM said he could explain the circumstances. Friedlin was the fireman of one of the engines at Toowoomba. The engine had been run into the coal-siding and was taking in coal, when somehow or other the engine was set in motion; Friedlin was thrown against the machine, and before he could recover himself he was struck on the shoulder; the shoulder blade was broken in two, and a portion penetrated considerably into his body.

Mr. NORTON asked how long ago that was?

Mr. GROOM said it was twelve or fifteen months ago. Friedlin was taken on a stretcher to his house, and he died in forty-eight hours from internal hæmorrhage. A suggestion had been made by himself (Mr. Groom) to the Minister for Works that some consideration should be given to his widow, who had been left with five children; and the hon. gentleman had

consented to place a sum on the Estimates. The unfortunate man had really been killed in the execution of his duty and through no fault of his own whatever.

Mr. T. CAMPBELL said he did not think the explanation of the Minister for Mines was at all satisfactory respecting the £100 put down for the discovery of the Nebo Gold Fields. If the Nebo Gold Fields were worth anything to the colony they ought to be worth £1,000, or £5,000. The Minister for Mines was asked a little time ago to vote a certain sum for the discovery of another goldfield infinitely more important than the Nebo Gold Field—the two were not to be compared at all—one was infinitely small and the other infinitely great—but he refused to do so. He could not see why they had put down £100 for the discovery of the Nebo Gold Fields, which, so far as he could understand, were of no value at all to the colony. He thought they ought to have some further explanation respecting the item.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he did not know whether the hon. member was aware of the fact, but the money had all been paid; and no matter whether he was satisfied or not, they could not get it back. The reward was for the discovery of a goldfield at Nebo, and the money was paid by the previous Government. He knew no more about it than the hon. member; but if he waited until to-morrow he would look up the papers and give the hon. member all the information he required.

Mr. T. CAMPBELL said he would ask the hon. member to give him the name of the gentleman to whom the money was to be paid, or to whom it had been paid? He insisted upon an answer. Of course if the Government could not give the information he would not insist upon an answer, but he would like to know the name of the gentleman who discovered that great goldfield.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said if the hon. member would only wait until to-morrow he would furnish him with the information. He did not at present know the name of the person to whom the reward had been paid. He had told the hon. member, over and over again, that the money had been paid by the previous Government; and he would like to know how it was possible for him to know the name of the person to whom it was paid? When the hon. member had been a few years in the House he would know a good deal more about Supplementary Estimates—that the money had been paid long ago. He had better allow the vote to go under protest.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER, in moving £134 15s. 8d.—travelling expenses of inspectors in the Auditor General's Department—said the item had arisen from the high cost of forage and other travelling expenses necessary to carry out the inspections during last year.

Question put and passed.

On the motion of the COLONIAL TREASURER, the CHAIRMAN left the chair, reported progress, and obtained leave to sit again to-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER, in moving the adjournment of the House, said the Government proposed to take the Loan Estimates to-morrow, and the Minister for Works would ask the House to agree to the plans and specifications for certain railways on Wednesday.

The House adjourned at twenty-five minutes to 11 o'clock.