

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

FRIDAY, 23 OCTOBER 1885

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Friday, 23 October, 1885.

Townsville Election.—Questions.—Separation of Northern Queensland.—Formal Motion.—Gratuity to the Widow of the late Denis Murphy.—Grant to the Widow of the late Daniel Crichton.—Gratuity to Mrs Pring.—Adjournment.

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

TOWNSVILLE ELECTION.

The SPEAKER said: I have to inform the House that, pursuant to the provisions in that behalf of the 8th section of the Additional Members Act of 1885, the returning officer for the electoral district of Townsville has furnished me with a copy, certified under his hand, of the electoral roll for that district, and that upon its receipt, pursuant to the provisions of the 9th section of the said Act, I have issued my writ for the election of a second member to represent such district in the Legislative Assembly.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. BAILEY asked the Minister for Works—

1. Has any application been made by the Maryborough and Urangan Railway Company for an extension of time for the construction of the line beyond the three years fixed by the Act, from 23rd December, 1884?

2. What amount of money has been deposited as security that the line shall be constructed within the time fixed by the Act?

3. Have the Government any information as to the progress or otherwise of the construction of this line?

4. If any correspondence has taken place with the department relative to delay, will the Minister lay such correspondence on the table of the House?

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

1. No.

2. £2,200.

3. No.

4. There has been no correspondence relative to delay.

Mr. HAMILTON asked the Colonial Secretary—

If the Hunpybong and Sandgate committee have been allowed the use of the "Otter"?—and, if so, are they allowed to charge for admission to that vessel?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. W. Griffith) replied: I am sorry I have not the answer to the hon. member's question. I made inquiries on the subject this morning, and I expected to have received the answer this afternoon.

Mr. HAMILTON: Perhaps the Colonial Secretary will give me an answer on Monday next?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Certainly, or very likely this afternoon.

SEPARATION OF NORTHERN QUEENSLAND.

The PREMIER, in laying on the table of the House a return to an order relative to the separation of Northern Queensland, said: I may mention that this return includes the paper I laid on the table this day week. I propose to move that the order for the printing of that document be rescinded. I beg to move that this return be printed.

Question put and passed.

The PREMIER: I will ask permission to move that the order for the printing of correspondence on the subject of separation of Northern Queensland, as laid on the table last Friday, be rescinded.

Question put and passed.

FORMAL MOTION.

The following formal motion was agreed to:—

By Mr. CHUBB—

1. That the South Brisbane Gas and Light Company (Limited) Bill be referred for the consideration and report of a select committee.

2. That such committee have power to send for persons and papers, and leave to sit during any adjournment of the House, and that it consist of the following members, namely:—Mr. Jordan, Mr. Palmer, Mr. Mellor, Mr. Bailey, and the Mover.

GRATUITY TO THE WIDOW OF THE LATE DENIS MURPHY.

On the Order of the Day being called, the Speaker left the chair, and the House went into Committee to further consider an address to the Governor praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be placed on the Supplementary Estimates the sum of £200, to be granted to the widow of the late Denis Murphy, who was killed at the new railway station, Ipswich.

Mr. MACFARLANE said there was scarcely any need for further considering the motion, as it had been well discussed already. It was no use taking up the time of the Committee for the whole of the afternoon with the matter, and he therefore hoped a division would be taken as soon as possible.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said that hon. members had heard nothing further in favour of that grant than was advanced in the arguments used when it was before the Committee on a previous occasion. He did not think they would be doing justice to the community at large by allowing the vote to pass, and he would therefore suggest to the hon. member that he should withdraw the motion. It would save a great deal of time and trouble if that was done. If that was not done, then the only course open was to resort to obstruction by using the forms of the Committee to oppose it; and he (Mr. Lumley Hill) was perfectly well able to do it. He knew how to do it as well as anybody, and could sit there all night and talk on that one subject. He could assure the hon. member that there was very little chance of taking the matter to a vote.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said the hon. member for Ipswich should have given the Committee some information as to the position of the family of the late Mr. Murphy. Any hon. member asking the Committee for a vote of £200 should give some good and substantial reasons why the amount should be granted, but the hon. member had given them no reason at all except that the man unfortunately met his death while in the employ of the Government. He (the Minister for Works) had seen it stated in the papers that Mrs. Murphy and her family were remarkably well off, and that they had a considerable sum of money in the savings bank. The hon. member should be in a position to tell the Committee whether that was the case or not, or whether they were in at all embarrassed circumstances. He (the Minister for Works) hoped the hon. member would endeavour to give the Committee some further information.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he was astonished at the remarks of the Minister for Works. The hon. gentleman either must have a very bad memory or was not in the House when he (Mr. Macfarlane) spoke on the subject before, as he had, he thought, given quite sufficient information to show that the widow of Denis Murphy was not left in very good circumstances, although he did say she was not left altogether destitute. Since the matter had been under consideration before he had seen by the papers that the will of Denis Murphy had been proved and the

personalty was sworn to be under £50. The only other property he had left was a small four-roomed cottage which was built a short time before he met his death. If the trustees of the will were honest and faithful in their trust, and had given the correct value of the personalty in the estate, there could not be much to support a widow and four children. He thought that the very fact that the man was killed while at his work in the service of the department ought to be quite sufficient without his going into a long story about the case. But he knew the question raised by the Minister for Works was only intended to provoke discussion. He hoped, however, that hon. members would not be led astray to discuss the matter any further.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he had not the slightest intention of taking up the time of the Committee in discussing that matter, but even now he was not satisfied with the explanation given by the hon. member. However, he was prepared to go to a division, and on principle he should vote against the motion.

The COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. J. R. Dickson) said he thought it was right that hon. members should recognise the fact that whoever voted for the motion could not deny the same relief or assistance to hundreds—he might even say thousands—of people in the colony, and he would ask hon. members if additional taxation was to be levied on the taxpayers of the colony at the present time for the purposes of private benevolence? He contended that that claim should be met by the friends or the persons interested in the parties concerned. He believed that if the hon. gentleman in charge of the motion sent round a subscription list amongst those who knew the family the amount asked for would be obtained in a much shorter time than they had been engaged in discussing the motion, and that would also prevent the country from establishing a most dangerous precedent. It was not the mere £200 he looked at—the Treasury could afford that—but it was the principle he looked at, and all cases of that class should be summarily dismissed, and unanimously, without a dissentient voice, in that Chamber. He put it again to hon. members that at the present time, when they were laying additional taxation on the taxpayers, they had no right to be asked to deal with matters which were purely matters for private benevolence, and under those circumstances he raised his voice against the motion. His hon. colleague did not think it wise to waste the time of the Committee by discussing the matter at length, and he likewise was prepared to go to a division.

Mr. SALKELD said he was surprised to hear the Minister for Works asking for more information before he consented to go to a division. He believed that last session the hon. gentleman stood up there and asked hon. members to vote thousands—scores of thousands—of pounds on far less information than had been given by his hon. colleague (Mr. Macfarlane) about that case. The Minister for Works asked the House to vote money for certain lines and had nothing at all to say about them. Seeing that the Minister for Works now recognised the fact that the Committee should have full information before voting money, he hoped the hon. gentleman would in future come down prepared to give full information with regard to the Estimates he brought forward.

Mr. MIDGLEY said that if the Colonial Treasurer and the other members of the Government would take the same stand and say the same thing with regard to the proposed grant to Mrs. Pring as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dickson) had said with regard to the motion before the

Committee it would greatly assist hon. members in deciding what to do. He did not know what stand the Treasurer took with regard to the larger vote—he did not believe that the hon. gentleman stood at all, but walked out of the House.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I am opposed to all of them!

Mr. MIDGLEY said if the Government took that stand with regard to all the proposed grants he should be one with them; but the action of some members of the Government with regard to the greatest of the three somewhat embarrassed some hon. members on his side as to their action in regard to the motion before the Committee. They would be doing an act of favouritism, and making a class distinction altogether unworthy of the colony, if they gave the greater sum to the widow of a man who had occupied a high, honourable, and well-paid position, and now refused to give a smaller sum to the widow of a man who was killed in the service of the country—even though he was working in a low capacity.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he had a word or two to say in reply to the hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Salkeld. That hon. gentleman accused him of bringing forward a motion last night involving the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of pounds without giving the Committee any information.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH: He did not refer to last night; he was speaking of last year.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said the hon. gentleman was not entitled to draw a comparison between the motion he proposed last night and the motion before the Committee. His motion was in the interest of the whole community of Queensland, and he had not the slightest hesitation in saying that a greater blunder was never committed than was committed last night by the Committee when they decided to reject that motion. That was his opinion.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH: That is not worth much.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said it was all very well for the leader of the Opposition to say that; but it was very well known that the hon. gentleman was interested in the Tramway Company and lots of other things that came in contact with the interests of the public. The motion was rejected last night by means of a system of wire-pulling, but he was quite prepared to accept the decision of the Committee. He was sure, however, that even if that railway cost double the money it would have to be made at some future time.

Mr. SALKELD said he thought the Minister for Works went too far in what he said. He (Mr. Salkeld) did not refer, in the remarks he had just made, to what took place last night, but to the motions brought forward by the hon. gentleman last session.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he was sure the hon. member for Fassifern did not wish to mislead the Committee when he said that he (the Colonial Treasurer) walked out of the House when the larger vote was under consideration. The fact was that before the motion was under consideration he had occasion to attend to some urgent private business, and left the House for half-an-hour for that purpose. When he returned the question had been disposed of, or he should certainly have voted against the motion.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH said he was not astonished at the mistake made by the hon. member for Fassifern, because the position of the Treasurer with regard to widows generally

was one of grave doubt. During the first session the hon. gentleman was a member of Parliament, the only thing he did was to attempt to enforce the principle he now condemned. In 1874, one of the printers in the Government Printing Office named Guilfoyle, after being sick for about six months, rose one night and took inwardly some medicine intended for external application. The result was that the man died, and the hon. member brought the case before Parliament, on account of the man having been a printer in the Government Service, and asked for the same consideration with respect to the widow Guilfoyle as was now asked with respect to the widow Murphy. That was the whole work of the session so far as the hon. member was concerned; and he now told the Committee, not that he did not sympathise with the case, but that he objected to the principle. If, instead of making a paltry defence of the Treasury when attacked on behalf of three widows, the hon. gentleman would give a little consideration to the extravagant motion of the Minister for Works, which that hon. gentleman could not get out of his head in spite of the fact that it had been referred to by nobody—if the hon. member would attempt to save the Treasury in respect to that motion he would be deserving of some praise; but he might as well let the widows alone.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said the member for Fassifern had let the cat out of the bag. He had shown the Committee what they had to expect from a sort of bunching of the three widows. Each had her partisans, and one motion was to be passed if the other were allowed to pass. That was nothing but log-rolling, and it would be establishing a very bad precedent indeed. Surely those people had friends. The people of Ipswich were very wealthy and charitable, and he was sure they would not refrain from doing what everybody else was called upon to do under similar circumstances—putting their hands into their pockets to assist their indigent friends or relatives. That was the course which should be followed, and if it were not followed Parliament would be inundated year after year with such cases, and the more they granted the more applications would be made; in fact there would be no end to them. He had never seen any reason why a widow whose husband had died or had been killed in the Government Service should have more claim on the country than a widow whose husband died in a private sphere of life. The latter had just as much claim on the State as the former, and if the present system of State aid was not considered in the light of a benevolent institution altogether, it would, if motions like the present were passed, be reduced to that position. He moved that the amount be reduced by £199.

Mr. BEATTIE said he remembered the celebrated case brought forward by the Colonial Treasurer, and he had himself brought one or two cases similar to that under notice before the House, and he thought this one might be fairly considered by the Government. He would not have risen to speak at all but for the innuendoes of the Minister for Works with reference to the remarks made by the hon. member for Ipswich. That Minister had also made a speech in which he held himself up as *par excellence* the member for Fortitude Valley. He (Mr. Beattie) could tell him, however, that his speech would not go down, and that the people of the Valley were perfectly satisfied with the decision arrived at on the previous evening with regard to the Valley railway line. As for the question before the Committee, he would support it. If it was intended to carry the two subsequent motions it was only just that they should consider the case

of Mrs. Murphy, whose husband was killed in the execution of his duty. If the amount asked for on behalf of widow Murphy was refused, then members would be at liberty to use their own judgment as to whether sufficient grounds were established for granting sums in the two following cases.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he might explain to the senior member for Fortitude Valley that in the matter he had hinted at he believed that he (Mr. Beattie) was right, and that he (the Minister for Works) was wrong.

Mr. WHITE said he confessed that he scarcely understood the object of the amendment of the hon. member for Cook. He was suspicious that under it lay some design which he (Mr. White) did not understand. He thought the case of widow Murphy was one which called for the sympathy of every member of the Committee. In Murphy's case, they had a man working steadily, and subject to the laws of the department, subject also to be thrown off work by sickness, and to be shifted from job to job—a man who was only paid for his labour when he did labour. He was suddenly cut off, and his widow was not destitute. He (Mr. White) was proud to have that case to hold up as an example to the Civil servants. He did not know that there was any more to say on that case, but there had been very little advanced in support of the next case. In that case, too, the man was killed in the Government Service, but there had been nothing said as to the position the widow was left in. If the principle was admitted for the one, the same principle held good for the other. The three items on the paper were under one principle, and he wished to put them all in one basket. If the hon. member for Cook meant to deal with them all equally, he would assist that hon. member all night rather than that one item should pass and the others be put off the paper. There was no reason why any distinction should be made between the cases. That deceased judge, it appeared, had received some £40,000 from the Treasury, and besides, had had a most lucrative private practice, which would yield very probably nearly an equal amount. At all events the probability was that that deceased gentleman was in receipt of some £3,000 a year for the last twenty years. He had not been cut off suddenly, and he had left his widow destitute—he had left the wife of his bosom destitute—but no apology had been made for that—no reason had been given for that destitution. All that money had been flung into one pocket, and no account had been rendered to the Committee of what had become of it.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member; but he is out of order in discussing the merits of that case. He must confine himself to the question before the Committee.

Mr. WHITE said he meant to lump them altogether. He meant to obstruct as far as he knew how, until they were disposed of in a lot. There was considerable difficulty about the third item. The hon. the Premier had intimated that the Government was willing to take the responsibility of providing for the families of improvident Civil servants.

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. WHITE: Well, what would the expression "distinguished Civil servant" mean?

The PREMIER: "Distinguished public servant" was the expression I used.

Mr. WHITE: Were they distinguished for having a large salary? What was to distinguish them? The idea he would form, which he thought would meet with the sympathy of the public at large, was that a distinguished

public servant was some distinguished man in the country who had obtained the favourable opinion of the people by prudence and purity of conduct; even then they would require some reason why the family of a man who had been paid such a salary should come upon the public. In that instance, the hon. member for Blackall, who brought the case forward, gave no reason why that—

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. member to confine himself to the question before the Committee. He is addressing himself to a distinct question which arises under another Order of the Day.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he could assure the hon. member for Stanley that he intended to observe the same principle with regard to all the notices on the paper.

Mr. KATES said he was sure hon. members were not inclined to discuss the question any longer. The widow deserved their sympathy, but they had a duty to perform towards their constituents and the general taxpayers. He thought the best thing they could do was to negative the motion of the hon. member for Ipswich, and negative all the rest of the motions. He would move that the Chairman do now leave the chair.

Mr. ANNEAR said he did not think that was the proper way to discuss the business before the Committee. He did not see why that question should not be treated the same as any other business that came before them. Let a division be taken on the question, and let those who chose vote for it; and those who did not, let them vote against it. He did not understand what the hon. member for Stanley meant when he said he would obstruct. It was too soon to begin that yet. The hon. member wanted to know about certain persons' careers. If he would wait a little longer he would be told that. The hon. member had been home to England for many years, and did not know who the public men of the colony were nor what services they had rendered. He (Mr. Annear) would have something to say about one gentleman who had rendered great service to the colony; and when it came to a division he would record his vote in the interests of the lady who was left behind.

Mr. BROOKES said he thought the hon. member for Fassifern put the matter particularly fairly, and had expressed a difficulty which was in his (Mr. Brookes's) own mind. Although the hon. member for Stanley had been ruled out of order, he (Mr. Brookes) did not consider he was out of order. He fancied there was a disposition on the part of most hon. members to lump those three items. He could scarcely see how the hon. member could be out of order in speaking upon No. 3 while No. 1 was before the Committee, when they were all doing the same thing as a matter of fact. When he remembered that one reason given on a previous occasion for granting a sum of money to a widow was because her husband had filled a distinguished place in the Public Service he did not consider that a very good reason. There ought to be a much better reason given. He was not prepared to have a paltry vote of £200 rejected, and a vote for £1,000 accepted. He did not think that would be fair. He did not think there was much in what the Colonial Treasurer had said, and in what the hon. member for Cook had said, about the danger of their being inundated with similar motions. He thought it best to settle such matters out of hand, and could not understand the talk about their being inundated with such motions. He did not think there was any danger of the kind. He should not be content to see the widows of two working men shoved on one side for the sake

of passing the third motion. He would therefore vote for the motion and not for the amendment.

The PREMIER said that, so far as he could judge the temper of the Committee, there was no probability of any of those motions being carried. That being so, he thought the simplest way would be to agree to the motion that the Chairman leave the chair. If that were done, it would mean that the other two Orders of the Day be discharged from the paper. That was what he would take it to mean. As there was no probability of anything being done in the matter, he would vote for the motion of the hon. member for Darling Downs, and for that reason only.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he did not think that the hon. gentleman had truly interpreted the opinion of the Committee. He had only spoken on one of the motions and he had supported it. He had listened to what was said upon the other two motions and he meant to vote for them. He believed that was the opinion of a majority of the Committee. As to obstruction upon a vote of that kind, it was simply ridiculous. £200 was proposed to be voted for the widow of a man who had died in the Government Service, and it was as good a case as had come before the Committee. Obstructing the vote would cost 110 guineas a day. For the purpose of preventing a widow getting £200 hon. members were actually going to spend 110 guineas a day upon themselves. Was not the thing a little too ridiculous? He did not believe in obstruction at all. It was only when great emergencies arose that any party was justified in obstructing the business of the House; but in the present case the longer they obstructed the better they would pay themselves. It was too ridiculous.

Question—That the Chairman leave the chair—put, and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 17.

Messrs. Griffith, Dickson, Dutton, Miles, Bailey, Norton, McMaster, Black, Campbell, White, Isambert, Kates, Lumley Hill, Midgley, Govett, Palmer, and Ferguson.

NOES, 20.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Archer, Chubb, Mellor, Sheridan, Beattie, Annear, Moreton, Brookes, Groom, Macrossan, Jordan, Lalor, Smyth, Wakefield, Lissner, Donaldson, Scott, Salkeld, and Macfarlane.

Question resolved in the negative.

Question—That the amount proposed to be given be reduced by £199—put.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said the division just taken showed pretty clearly how the matter stood. It was evident that several hon. members who were interested in the case of one of the widows were going to vote for the whole of them in order to get their own particular motion carried. The amount involved in the motion had nothing to do with the action he was taking; the question with him was the right or wrong of the matter; and as he was thoroughly convinced that the Committee would be doing an utterly wrong thing in carrying the motion, he was prepared to stay there all night, if necessary, to defend the pockets of the taxpayers. He did not see the force of giving way to that kind of rank jobbery, for it was nothing else.

Mr. SMYTH: It is not jobbery, for nobody is making any money out of it.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he would call it log-rolling, then, and it was the most unblushing piece of log-rolling that he had ever seen. It was a question of "You vote for my widow, and I'll vote for yours." He was satisfied, from the closeness of the division, that the widow in question would not get much beyond a £5-note. His amendment was to give her £1, and he

would be quite willing to grant the pound in order to get rid of her. He would do the same in the other cases, or else hon. members would have to do another £110 worth of work at 2 guineas each, to say nothing of the cost of printing, paper, gas, the *Hansard* staff, and everything else. There was a great principle involved in the question, and if the motion were carried the precedent so set would cost the country many thousands of pounds.

Mr. JORDAN said there was certainly a great principle involved in the question, and on that principle he was going to vote for the £200 for the widow of Denis Murphy, because he was killed in the performance of his duty as a public servant. That principle was recognised in the Defence Act referred to by the hon. member for Bowen the other night, which provided that the widows of men engaged in the Defence Force of the colony who lost their lives should be provided for. Why should a distinction be made between a man dying in the defence of his country and a man losing his life in the performance of his duty—especially a man engaged in a dangerous occupation, and whose widow was left in poverty? Before the present case came on, another case was brought before the House, when the House came to the conclusion that persons who had been for many years employed in the Government Service, and dying while in the Government Service, their widows had a claim upon the State and should not be left to suffer poverty. It was said, and accepted by the House, that that would be a disgrace to the colony. If it was right to vote £1,000 under such circumstances, it could not be wrong to vote £200 for the widow of a poor workingman, engaged in the Government Service, who had lost his life in the performance of his duty. The hon. member for Cook, who spoke about log-rolling and jobbery, seemed to be something like the unjust judge they read of, who wanted to get rid of a widow lest by her continual coming she might weary him. The hon. member would give that particular widow £1 to get rid of her. He (Mr. Jordan) intended to give her £200 because her husband, a public servant, died in the performance of his duty. The House having decided to give £1,000 to the widow of a gentleman who for many years had occupied an eminent position in the Government Service, and who was supposed to be in poverty, he should be ashamed to support that case and not to support the cases of the other two widows of men who had died in the performance of their duty.

Mr. FERGUSON said that the more he considered the matter the more convinced he was that they ought not to allow such a motion to pass. If they did he was certain that next session they would have thousands and thousands of pounds to pay for similar claims. The hon. member, Mr. Macfarlane, had given no reasons why the claim should be admitted, except that the man Murphy had been in the employment of the Government for eighteen or nineteen years; that he was working at an excavation at Ipswich; that he was warned by the engineer on several occasions not to go on the top of certain undermined ground; that, in spite of those warnings, he went on the top; that the ground caved in, and that he received some serious injuries; that he had to be taken to the hospital, where he remained for ten days, and died. But, surely, if they admitted that as a reason, in the case of any Government servant who caught a cold, and died ten days afterwards in consequence, his widow had a right to come upon the country for compensation. Why should the Government be liable for compensation in cases of that kind

more than any other employers of labour? Only the other day four men lost their lives in a mine in the Central district, one of the men leaving a widow and eight children. Surely the widow of that man had quite as much right to receive £200 from the State as the Ipswich widow had! That man when killed was developing the riches of the colony, and very likely he had worked for months and months without earning a sixpence, as miners very often had to do. It was quite clear how things were being worked in the present case; he had seen it from the commencement. There was the Ipswich bunch, and the Wide Bay bunch, and the bunch of lawyers firmly united for a certain object; and the only way to defeat such a combination was to follow the advice of the hon. member for Cook, which was the only legitimate course possible, and he, for one, would join that hon. member, and remain there until 6 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. GROOM said the junior member for Cook had stated that there was a principle involved in that motion. The hon. member would perhaps excuse him when he told him that the principle involved in the motion had been recognised by the colony from its foundation up to the present moment. He would not trouble the Committee by going through the numerous cases that had been brought under the notice of the House in which the services of distinguished public men, and other Government servants who were not distinguished, had been recognised by the House when overtaken by disaster or death. He need not go back any further than the case of an under secretary who was attacked with a tomahawk by a police magistrate, and nearly killed.

Mr. MOREHEAD: That was passed in a panic.

Mr. GROOM said the House was seized with a description of panic, and voted in a hurry—which he believed it had regretted ever since—a sum of £600 a year to the individual, and in addition to that it was provided that when he died his widow was to receive £300 a year. Another case was that of a distinguished public servant, who for many years ably presided over the deliberations of the Upper House. On his death the House granted his widow a pension of £250 a year. Another was that of a recent Agent-General of the colony, and when he was incapacitated from performing his public duties he was granted a pension of £500 a year, and when he died the House, last year, voted his widow a gratuity of £1,000. In the face of those facts—when a claim was made for the widow of a working man who had been nineteen years in the service of the Government, and who had never received a higher rate of pay than 6s. 6d. a day, and by whose death she and her children had been deprived of their bread-winner—surely the Committee was not going to stultify itself by refusing to vote the widow the small sum asked for! It had been done in many cases in that House before. He could call the attention of the Committee to the time when the last great flood took place—he did not think there had been another since that time—when a pilot engine was sent from Toowoomba along the line in front of the passenger train for fear of accident. One of the culverts at Gowrie junction had been washed away, the pilot engine was engulfed in a torrent of water, and one unfortunate man lost his life in the discharge of his duty. What did the House do in that case? They granted £500 to the widow and children; so that the principle that the hon. member for Cook referred to had been established by the House. There was no distinction drawn between a man occupying a high official position and a working man—every case was decided on its merits. In every case the same principle was

recognised—that whenever a public servant in the performance of his duty met with a disaster or was killed, the House had made some provision for his wife and family? And why should an exception be made in this case? He had listened attentively to the arguments, *pro and con.*, and he could see no reason whatever why this unfortunate widow should not receive the small sum—for it was a small sum—asked for. He quite agreed with those hon. members who had said that working men should, in those days of cheap insurance, insure their lives, and he believed that a great number were taking time by the forelock in that respect; but it appeared that this man was not able to insure his life out of the small salary he received. He thought that when a man had been nineteen years in the Public Service, discharging his duty faithfully for 6s. 6d. a day, and lost his life in the performance of that duty, it was very niggardly economy to refuse his widow the small pittance asked for in the motion. He should support the hon. member for Ipswich in his motion because he thought it was fair and reasonable, and in accordance with the broad general principle that had been recognised by the House.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he had no desire to interfere with the privileges of any member of that House, but he thought that on the present occasion the hon. the Speaker had gone a good deal out of his way. It was not usual for a Speaker to make himself a partisan. He understood the rule laid down to be that the gentleman who occupied the Speaker's chair should, as far as possible, be neutral, and yet, what did they find last night? That the Speaker got up and denounced the Government for attempting to construct a railway to Fortitude Valley; and now they found him doing something of the same kind. He knew that the hon. member had not many opportunities of delivering himself; he was always full to overflowing and anxious to give vent to his opinions, but he (the Minister for Works) thought it would be just as well if Mr. Speaker endeavoured to discharge the duties of his office and kept as far out of party politics as possible. The hon. gentleman had said that he would do all he could for this widow, Mrs. Murphy; but if he would take his (the Minister for Works') advice he would for the future stick to the duties of the chair, and not mix himself up in those unpleasant affairs. He considered them unpleasant because he believed that if this were carried they would have a great number of them. Why did not the hon. gentleman leave the Chamber at the time of the division? When they elected a Speaker they elected a gentleman to preside over their deliberations, and he thought that gentleman should leave the House to deal with matters of that kind and keep out of party politics. He hoped the hon. gentleman would endeavour to confine himself to the duties of the chair. He was apparently so overflowing—bursting—to give expression to his opinions, that nothing could stop him. He (the Minister for Works) looked upon it that the Speaker and Chairman should be entirely impartial, and keep as much as possible out of party politics. He was quite sure that they would be respected much more if they did so. He was quite satisfied that the large number of members present were quite capable of deciding the question without the assistance of Mr. Speaker. He had no objection to listen while the hon. gentleman was inflicting a long lecture on the House on constitutional principles—no one could listen more attentively, because the hon. gentleman was then in his proper position—but for him to mix up in matters such as those to which he had referred was, he thought, hardly proper.

He gave the hon. member the advice he had given in all sincerity, and hoped that he would not forget it.

Mr. McMASTER said he really thought that by the vote that was come to last night, in reference to the Fortitude Valley Railway, they were going in for economy, on the ground that the country could not afford to spend the money—that the drought in the interior had been so severe that they had no money to construct a railway. Yet they were now asked to vote away money in such a way that there was no telling where it would end. He was quite satisfied that if the motion before the Committee were carried, other hon. gentlemen would find widows and come forward to plead their causes; so that in two or three sessions there would be a larger sum required to meet those claims than would have been required to construct the Valley railway. They were told last night that the Valley people had ample accommodation by the tramway, and if that was all they were to get, why should they not pay £200 to the widow of the man who lost his life on that tramway a few days ago? But the people of the Valley put their shoulder to the wheel, and that widow was now in possession of £200, which had been collected for her. There were two gentlemen, one of whom told him that they had collected £50 by themselves. If the hon. gentleman who had brought forward the motion had brought in a subscription list, and each member had put his name down for two guineas or three guineas, the matter would have been settled. He would rather have given his two guineas than sit up the whole night discussing the matter, as he was quite prepared to do. He looked on the motion as iniquitous, as, if passed, they must deal with the widows of the whole of the Civil Service. The hon. member for South Brisbane said that when the breadwinner had been taken away, in the service of the State, the State had a right to protect the widow. He did not see that the widow of any man in the service, who died suddenly, had any more claim than any other widow; and he thought that ample facilities were afforded to working men to join clubs or insure their lives. The hon. member for Toowoomba said that those men could not afford to pay the expense out of 6s. 6d. per day, but he thought they could. If the man had saved sufficient to build a cottage for his wife, and to leave something like £50 in the savings bank, he might have paid a small amount so as to be able to leave her some £200 at his death. If the Committee voted that £200 they would have to vote the next £200, and also the £1,000. That would be £1,400 to commence with, and he had heard of several members who would introduce similar motions—not that session, perhaps, but next session—if those motions were carried. He would be the very last man to refuse to help any person in need; but he did not consider he had any right to vote away the money of those orphans and widows who contributed their share to the revenue. If hon. gentlemen chose to render assistance to those in need no one could find fault. If the principle was initiated the list would very soon increase, and it was no argument to say that because the Committee had done wrong in the past they should continue to do so. He did not see that because they had voted a sum of money to an under secretary, who was attacked in a cowardly manner, they should vote away £1,400 now, and as many thousands in future. The money the Committee ought to have voted for the railway for the Valley would be paid away to widows in a little while. If they could not afford to spend any money on that railway they

could not afford to agree to those motions, and he hoped that the hon. gentlemen who had taken up the question heartily would not give way, and that they would sit it out. There was a great deal of truth in the remark that it was nothing short of log-rolling; and he intended to vote against the three motions.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he felt very much obliged for the lesson of history given him by the junior member for Toowoomba, both as regarded ancient history and the comparatively modern history of this colony in reference to providing for the widows of distinguished individuals. He knew it had been the custom amongst all nations to provide for such widows, but he had yet to learn that it was the custom of any nation to provide for widows in general. That Committee might have been wrong in the past, and the sooner they found out their mistake and began to do right the better. The hon. member who had just sat down was perfectly correct; he could endorse every word he said about every hon. member having a widow or two next session. There had been one after him (Mr. Hill) and he was certain that if one pursued him for that purpose there must be two or three after every other member of the Committee. It would be a very good thing if they put aside their two guineas for a week or two for that purpose—that was, supposing they received it, and they had not received it yet—but they could vote it with the reservation that if they did not get it they would not give it. If a week's pay were divided among the widows it would give a more substantial relief than anything they were likely to get out of the Committee that night. He was pretty sure that it would come to nothing and that no votes would be carried that afternoon.

Mr. BROOKES said he would like to say a word as to what fell from the Minister for Works. He thought the hon. member had spoken in a very improper manner in his reference to the actions of the hon. the Speaker. The question before the Committee was not a party question at all, and if the Speaker of the House, whoever that member might be, was to be objected to—if it became the opinion of the House that it would be better for him never to speak—then the House would make a very great mistake, because there might be occasions on which it might be that no member of the House was so well qualified to speak as the Speaker. But, besides that, the hon. the Speaker represented a constituency, and that was a very important point to consider. He must, therefore, express his strong dissent from the opinion expressed by the hon. the Minister for Works, who sought apparently to put a difficulty in the way of the Speaker expressing his opinion freely, and as freely as any other member. He considered that the remarks made by the Speaker were very pertinent and that they summed up the matter thoroughly. The junior member for Cook might or might not have a good idea of the ancient and modern history, but he was adrift altogether. There was not a syllable that escaped the hon. member for Toowoomba that did not bear closely on the matter. He (Mr. Brookes) had said what he had to say on the motion, but another remark which he should make occurred to him. The junior member for the Valley seemed to be smarting under something that occurred yesterday. He (Mr. Brookes) was not present, but he read the debate in *Hansard*, and he thought the House was having a great deal too much of the Fortitude Valley railway. The junior member for the Valley, when he had been in the House a little longer, would take his chastisement more kindly. Hon. members who voted against the railway were not robbing the

hon. member—he did not say that with the desire of giving offence—but he thought the senior member for the Valley showed last night the advantage of his long experience in the House—he showed a much better temper. He (Mr. Brookes) hoped they should hear no more of the Fortitude Valley railway, which was past and gone, and which had nothing whatever to do with the question before the Committee. However, he had risen for one purpose and one purpose only, and that was to advocate, in his modest way, the claim of the Speaker to take part in the deliberations of the Committee.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he was sorry he did not hear the junior member for North Brisbane. He thought when he rose that he had stated that he had no desire to curtail the rights of any member of that House, but he thought it was not desirable or discreet for the Speaker to mix himself up in party conflicts. He knew the hon. the junior member for North Brisbane took very peculiar views sometimes, and he was sure the hon. member would not be at all annoyed with him, if he disagreed with him. He did not often disagree with the hon. member. In the main he was thoroughly well pleased with him, but he had not the slightest hesitation in saying that it was not wise or discreet for the Speaker of that House to mix himself up in party politics. The hon. member had given him an opportunity that he had never thought he would have, and he would point out to the hon. member that the residents and electors of Fortitude Valley had a right to remember him as long as they lived. Some years ago when there was a Redistribution Bill going through the House the hon. member for Toowoomba, who was now Speaker—

Mr. MOREHEAD asked, rising to a point of order, if that had anything to do with the question before the Committee?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said the hon. member for Balonne put himself up as a clown, and if he supposed for one moment that he was going to attack him as he did the Minister for Lands last night he was mistaken. The hon. member was a clown and had better go and join a circus.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he wanted to ask the opinion of the Chairman as to whether the Minister for Works was in order in discussing a question that was before the House last night, and that had nothing on earth to do with the question now before the Committee. That was the point upon which he wished the Chairman's ruling.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he did not wish to give offence to the hon. member, and he would withdraw the expression that he was "a clown."

Mr. MOREHEAD said the point he raised had nothing whatever to do with any remarks that might fall from a drunken Minister. The point he raised was as to whether the Minister for Works was in order in speaking to a question which was not before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN said: Of course the Minister for Works was not speaking in order, but he was sorry to say the hon. gentleman was only following the example that had been extensively set during that afternoon.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he would bow to the decision of the Chairman. He had always had the greatest respect and veneration for that hon. gentleman. The hon. member for Balonne took exception to his remarks. He took exception to being called a clown, and he would substitute the word "buffoon."

Mr. MOREHEAD : I do not take exception to anything you said. I do not care what you say.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said all he could say was that the constituents of the hon. member for Balonne had a right to be gratified with the member they returned to represent them. A greater buffoon he had never seen. However, he was not quite sure that the Chairman was not right in his ruling. He did not think he had said anything disrespectful in reference to the Speaker, and, with all due deference to the hon. gentleman, he thought he should confine himself to the duties of the chair. He (the Minister for Works) was quite sure that every hon. member present would agree with him that the less the Speaker entered into party politics the more he would be respected, and he (the Minister for Works) would, notwithstanding the hon. member for Balonne, take that opportunity of saying that some time ago the hon. gentleman inflicted a serious injury on the people of Fortitude Valley ; and not satisfied with that, he gave them another blow last night in voting against the Valley railway.

Mr. SALKELD said he understood the Chairman, in replying to the question of the hon. member for Balonne, to say that the Minister for Works was not strictly in order. He (Mr. Salkeld) thought the same rule ought to apply to every member of that Committee—that there should be no distinction between a private member and a Minister. But the Chairman himself called to order the member for Stanley, who did not wander any further from the subject than the Minister for Works, while in the case of the Minister for Works no notice was taken of his remarks until attention was called to them by the hon. member for Balonne. He (Mr. Salkeld) distinctly objected to one member being called to order by the Chairman and not another, when both were equally out of order.

Mr. SMYTH said it had been decided by the Committee, on division, that the Chairman should not leave the chair. That meant, he presumed, that the case should be settled at once. He did not agree with stonewalling tactics. He was only a new chum in politics, and in that matter did not wish to dictate to the hon. member for Cook. He would, however, suggest that the hon. member should move the reduction of the sum proposed in the motion by £50 at a time, and then in three or four divisions they would come to some understanding, and know whether the Committee, if they intended to grant anything, would vote £50, or £100, or £150, or £200. At the present time they were making no headway at all. He might mention that when a person was killed in a mine, if the mine was in a flourishing condition, it was customary for the shareholders to assist the widow of the unfortunate man as far as possible.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : The country is not in a flourishing condition.

Mr. SMYTH said that any way he thought the Government should do something for the widow of a public servant who was killed at his work, or else introduce a Bill compelling all public servants to provide for their families by insurance. He knew a case at Charters Towers where two men were killed in a mine and the shareholders gave the widow of each a couple of hundred pounds. It was usual for claim-owners to deal liberally with their employes, and they often gave them full pay while they were sick in the hospital ; and he thought it was not too much in the present case to ask the Government to vote the sum mentioned in the motion of the hon. member for Ipswich.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he was very much obliged to the hon. member for Gympie for his suggestion of a way in which an arrangement could be come to that would be satisfactory to all parties concerned, but he (Mr. Lumley Hill) knew a trick worth two of that. He liked to allow himself plenty of margin in those cases. He thought he had done rather handsomely in moving a reduction of the vote by a whole pound at one time. If they did not agree to that, it would be only 10s. next time. With reference to the lecture read to the Chairman by the hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Salkeld, for calling the hon. member for Stanley to order without his attention being directed to the matter, and for not calling the hon. the Minister for Works to order until his attention was called to his remarks by the hon. member for Balonne, he (Mr. Lumley Hill) would say that he noticed several hon. gentlemen directing the Chairman's attention to the fact that the hon. member for Stanley was out of order. Whether he was or was not out of order it was not for him (Mr. Lumley Hill) to say, that being a question for the Chairman himself to decide. In both cases he ruled the hon. members out of order, probably with equal justice. It was, however, a reflection upon the Chairman, and not in accordance with the facts, to say that his attention was not directed to the hon. member for Stanley.

Mr. SALKELD said the attention of the Chairman was called to the hon. member for Stanley in the same way that he (Mr. Salkeld) called attention to the hon. the Minister for Works, by calling out "Question"; but it was not until the hon. member for Balonne asked for a ruling upon the subject that the Minister for Works was ruled out of order, and no one asked for any ruling in the case of the hon. member for Stanley. His (Mr. Salkeld's) contention was that the same rule should be applied in all cases.

Mr. MELLOR said he was very sorry to see the disposition of the Committee in reference to that motion, as he could not see, as had been argued by some hon. members, that it would be establishing a precedent. During the passage of the Estimates last year they voted two sums—one of £280, the other of £200—to the widows of men who had been killed in the service of the Government, and the cases were almost exactly similar to those before the Committee. He thought that the members who had introduced two of the motions for grants that were now on the paper had been unkindly referred to in many instances. It was stated, during the previous discussion on that question, that they were brought forward in consequence of the proposal being made to grant £1,000 to the widow of the late Mr. Justice Pring. That was not correct ; for the case introduced by him had been represented to the Minister for Works by petition before it was brought on in the House, and he believed the same thing had been done by the hon. member for Ipswich. He hoped hon. members would consider the question fairly and do justice in both cases.

Mr. BEATTIE moved that the Chairman leave the chair.

The CHAIRMAN said that motion could not be put, as it had already been negatived.

Mr. BEATTIE moved that the Chairman leave the chair, report no progress, and ask leave to sit again.

The PREMIER said he hoped that if the Chairman left the chair he would not ask leave to sit again, because the Committee did not want another afternoon of the same kind. He hoped the hon. member would omit the words "ask leave to sit again."

Mr. BEATTIE said that, with the consent of the Committee, he would move that the Chairman report no progress.

Mr. KELLETT said that since the motion was under discussion before he had taken the trouble to look up the names of the widows to whom money had been granted as far back as 1878, and the names of the members who voted in favour of the grants. In the case of the widow of Daniel Tregarthen, who did not die in the Government Service, the then Colonial Treasurer (Mr. Dickson) supported the motion very strongly. He was much pleased to find how eloquent the hon. gentleman was on that occasion—as he generally was when he thought there was distress or need, or that the Government should do a certain duty; but he should like the hon. gentleman to show in what respect that case was more deserving of favourable consideration than the motion before the Committee. Murphy died in the execution of his duty, but Tregarthen met with an accident on the “Groper” and died in the hospital; yet the Treasurer warmly supported the grant to Mrs. Tregarthen though he opposed the grant proposed on behalf of Mrs. Murphy. In the same year a motion was brought forward on behalf of the widow of Warden Clarke, who was employed by the Government on a goldfield. Warden Clarke became ill and died, but not while in the execution of his duty; yet the motion was carried on division by 17 to 6. In the same year a motion was brought forward on behalf of the widow of John Murray, who was not killed in the service of the State, and that was passed without division. In 1880 a sum of money was asked for on behalf of the widow of W. Todd, who was employed at the pilot station, Moreton Bay, but was not killed while in the execution of his duty.

Mr. BEATTIE: He was.

Mr. KELLETT said that if the hon. gentleman would refresh his memory he would find that what he had stated was correct. The man was going for letters—which was not a part of his duty—and the boat was capsized. On that occasion the motion was carried unanimously. In 1881 there was the case of Philip Bride, who was not shown to have died in the execution of his duty. It was said that in moving a buoy in the river he strained himself—he was off duty at the time—and that some time afterwards he died. That motion also was carried without a division. Then, in the year 1882, there was the case of Robert Welsh, who was killed in the Maryborough workshops, and the amount of £250 was granted to his widow without a division. In the same year Guard Fox was killed; but the Minister of the day did not consider that death resulted from injury caused by a brake as alleged—and he supposed the Minister was about the best judge—yet the hon. gentlemen then sitting on the Opposition side voted for the motion to a man. The present Minister for Works, the Premier, the Colonial Treasurer, and the Attorney-General voted in favour of a sum of money being granted to the widow of Guard Fox, but now they were going in a diametrically opposite direction, as if they had some special down on the unfortunate widow, whom they wished to sacrifice in the interests of the State. He felt quite angry when reading *Hansard* the other night and seeing how hon. members had voted in the past, compared with their attitude in the present case. Had they some reason for determining to sacrifice the widow Murphy? He thought those hon. members were not more intelligent now than they were in 1882. Let them, then, state their reason for attempting now to stonewall a vote for the widow of a man who was killed in the Government Service. The last vote he had referred to was carried by 24 to 6, and

did it not seem very strange that they should now refuse a paltry sum for an equally, if not more deserving, case? Did the Government think that the public would believe in them simply because they refused £200 to the widow of a public servant? Was that the way to get the best men available for public servants? On the contrary, it was the way to fill the Public Service with men whom he could only describe as the rubbish of the community. Another case he had noticed was that of Mr. John Preston Wells, police magistrate at Normanton. He had no claim except that he was in the Public Service. He was one of those men who was referred to by one of the Opposition members recently, as men on whom the public money was squandered, in the form of large salaries. He had been receiving a large salary for years, and yet members could defend such men although they did not believe in working men who died in the execution of their duty. All those were instances of men whose relations had received Government aid, and the majority of hon. members had voted for the sums granted to those relatives. In some cases the votes were carried by very large majorities; in others without a division at all. He would ask hon. members and Ministers, then, how they could reasonably bring their past policy in that respect to a stop all in a moment over a case like the one under notice? It would be well if the servants of the State had some other arrangements made for them in the form of insurance, but they, no doubt, were led to regard Government employment as a provision for life, and to believe that if an accident happened to them whilst engaged in State Service they would be looked after. There was no doubt that the Government was regarded as having become a mother to public servants as distinguished from men in private employ. He believed that other arrangements should be made to alter that state of affairs, but he saw no reason for drawing an arbitrary line suddenly to exclude the case of Mrs. Murphy. He was certain that when the motion was brought forward the widow felt as sure of the money as if she had it in her pocket; and he considered that it would be unjust to deprive her of the money now. When the proposal was first mooted he himself would have advanced the widow 19s. in the £1 on it, so satisfied was he that it would be granted. To negative the motion now would be a very harsh measure indeed, and the stonewalling tactics of some hon. members might be described in the same terms. He hoped that the majority of the Committee would not allow things to go on in that way, but that better counsels would prevail. As to the members who voted for similar grants in former times, he could not see how they could now vote in a diametrically opposite way.

Mr. WHITE said he was very sorry that his colleague had not advanced the money himself to the widow Murphy. The change which the hon. member perceived in the spirit of the Committee was the result of public opinion. The people believed firmly that the Civil servants were paid highly for their services and considered that they were not indebted to them at all. The public also thought that Civil servants ought to exercise economy the same as any other class in the community—that they should husband their means and be dependent upon themselves. Just after the great rush to the affirmative side of the House on the £1,000 motion for the widow of Judge Pring, he was up country and met with a farmer who was an Irishman and of considerable influence. In speaking about the £1,000 vote the Irishman said, “What a thing it is to have a Government that would do such a thing as that!” “But,” he (Mr. White) said, “the Opposition was more for it than the Gov-

ernment." "Do you tell me," said the farmer, "that Macrossan would vote for such a thing?" "Yes," he (Mr. White) said, "he did vote for it." "Oh, do you tell me so?" was the reply. "Well now, would you not think that he was the very man who would go against it?" He (Mr. White) said, "But of course you see to the contrary"; and he now held that the change in the attitude of hon. members was the result of public opinion, which was entirely adverse to the coddling of the Civil servants. Those employed by the State, whether they were labourers or occupying gentlemanly positions, were highly paid, and should have independence enough to make provision for themselves. That being so, why should the Government undertake to provide for the families of distinguished Civil servants who had been highly paid, but who happened to be so improvident as not to provide for themselves?—unless, indeed, under circumstances of great financial disaster, and after their schemes had gone all awry; when the people would, of course, sympathise with them. Those that were getting £400 a year were trying to equal those that had £600, and those that were getting £600 were trying to make as good a front as those that were getting £800. The system was a bad one. They should provide for their own wives and families. If a financial disaster occurred to any man who was conducting himself properly, of course that was a different matter.

Mr. JORDAN said he thought it would be better if hon. members holding views such as those expressed by the hon. member who had just sat down would move amendments when the salaries of extravagantly paid public servants were before the Committee. If they objected to giving £1,000 a year, or £1,500 a year, to a man, they should say so at the right time; but he did think it was inconsistent for a gentleman who professed especially to represent the working men of the colony—that hard-working class whom he called the true nobility of the land, who earned their bread literally by the sweat of their brow—it was inconsistent for him to take exception to a vote of £200 for a poor woman, the widow of a man who had received 6s. 6d. a day, and had been nineteen years in the Public Service—who was unable to insure his life because of the smallness of the wages he was earning, and who died from an accident—a sudden and violent death. Hon. members who opposed the vote were determined not to make a distinction. Their contention was that if they passed that vote of £200 for a poor widow they had a number of widows of their own—amongst their own friends—whose cases they would bring forward, and that they would insist upon their getting money because their husbands had died. That was not a sound argument. That man died a sudden and violent death when he was bravely performing his duty in a dangerous service. If men lost their lives in the defence of their country, their families were provided for by Act of Parliament, and this case was precisely the same in principle. Here was a navy—his occupation was a very dangerous one, and he was proved to be a brave man. He (Mr. Jordan) was astonished that members of the Committee, and even a member of the Government, were opposed to the vote, because the man had proved himself to be a brave man. He was not afraid of working in dangerous places; he was brave enough to perform his duty under dangerous circumstances; he was warned once or twice not to expose his life, but he was not coward enough to slink away; yet, because he lost his life in the performance of his duty when he was doing dangerous work—bravely died—on that ground his widow was to be left to starve; and an hon. gentleman

who professed to especially represent the working men of the colony was indignant at the idea that they should vote £200 to support that poor starving widow and children. If all the working men of the colony were brought to the House and asked to vote, he was confident that £200 would be carried. He knew the spirit of the working men in the colony; and he knew they would be ashamed to give £1,000 in the other case and refuse £200 to the poor widow of a working man. He did not care how long he sat there, he was determined he would not be dictated to by any hon. gentleman who chose to say the vote would not be carried. There were two parties to the question—those who were determined that the vote would not be carried, and those who were determined that it would be carried; and he had courage enough, though he was an old man, to say that it should be carried if he could manage it. It was possible the Government made a mistake when they supported the motion of the hon. member for Blackall; that was not a case of the widow of a poor working man. It was the case of a gentleman in the Government Service who received a very large salary, and who was bound to make provision for his wife and children, but did not do so. He knew some hon. gentlemen who supported the vote who admitted that they were led away by the pathetic eloquence of the hon. member for Blackall. The House had affirmed the principle that they should give something to that lady, and they would be acting unfairly to her if they refused to give it. He took the view expressed by the hon. member for Stanley, that that lady considered the £1,000 as certain as if it had been promised to her personally by the Premier of the colony. A large majority of the House affirmed the principle that when anyone had been many years in a distinguished position in the Government Service his widow or family should not be suffered to want. He believed it was a principle that would bear looking into; he believed it was a sound principle; and having affirmed it they could not consistently act contrary to that in committee. And having affirmed the principle in that case that they should not suffer the widow of that gentleman to starve, they were bound to give her something considerable, if they did not give her £1,000. That being the case, they could not refuse to help the widows of those poor men.

Mr. McMASTER said he was sure no member of the House would support the working man more than he would; and he was rather astonished at the statements of the hon. member for South Brisbane. It was not the poor working men's widows that came to the House for assistance. It was true two of the questions before the Committee referred to the widows of working men; but he believed they would never have been brought forward had the vote for the larger sum not been on the paper. As a rule, working men helped themselves, and contributed towards the support of the widows of men of their own class. Very few working men's widows came to the House for substantial assistance. Some cases in the past had certainly been quoted, and there might be others whose claims the House and the country would be justified in recognising in the future. Neither of the claims before the Committee were of that kind. He was willing, and he believed the hon. member for South Brisbane would be equally willing, to put down his mite for those widows. Let them make a list at once if they were really in want. Even if the Committee voted the £200 the widows would not get the money for a considerable time, and if, as the hon. member for South Brisbane had said, they were starving, let them go to their assistance at

once. He would like to know where the line was to be drawn in those votes for widows. There were different kinds of widows. There were widows and grass-widows. He could find the Committee a number of grass-widows who would be very glad to get assistance.

Mr. FOXTON: No doubt.

Mr. McMASTER said the hon. member for Carnarvon said "No doubt," but the hon. member knew a large number of them, though he was a much younger man than he (Mr. McMaster) was. He could find a large number of grass-widows whose husbands had left them to earn their own living, and they did not come to that House for assistance. Hon. members might laugh, but they earned their living honestly and by the sweat of their brow. He knew a widow in Fortitude Valley—

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: A grass-widow?

Mr. McMASTER: No; not a grass-widow, but a genuine good woman, more than seventy years of age. He had recommended her a long time ago to apply for assistance to the board of relief and she replied, "Never, sir; while I have nails on my fingers I will work for my living." She had not taken a single shilling from the State. She was now too old to work, but having known her so long, and as she was a person who went to his place for many years, and as Mrs. McMaster had taken to her, he had kept her himself and sent her her rations every week. For some years he had sent her a parcel of groceries every week just as if her order had come to the shop, and he had never thought of asking anything for it. He could find plenty of widows who had claims quite as good as those for whom the votes were being asked. What he objected to was that the claims upon the paper were for widows whose husbands should have provided means for their families while they were in good health. He was satisfied that the votes before them formed only the beginning. They could have a shower of widows, and he hoped the grass-widows—women who had been deserted by their husbands—would put in their claims as well. The hon. member for North Brisbane had made a remark about his snarling under the defeat he suffered yesterday, and said that when he got a little older in the House he would take a defeat more kindly. It was not the first time he had been defeated, and he considered that in that case he was only defeated for a time. The vote would very soon come up again, and he would probably have more assistance. He thought the Committee would do wrong, notwithstanding the eloquence of the hon. member for South Brisbane, in agreeing to those motions. He had every respect for the hon. gentleman and his sympathies, but they would do wrong to recognise the votes on the paper at present. The hon. member had told them he was determined to sit it out. He would be very sorry if the hon. gentleman had to sit in that Chamber all night, because it was very close. He believed, however, that the hon. member was a man of his word, and that when he said a thing he meant it, and he was glad that the parties who were determined to sit it out on the other side would have such good company as the hon. member for South Brisbane. He liked to hear his voice now and again, because he usually spoke good common sense, although he was on the wrong tack that evening. He liked to hear him on the question he was on the other night; but the hon. member would never find the small farmers, whom the hon. member for Stanley called "the nobility of the land," come to them for assistance.

Mr. JORDAN said they were not in the Government employment.

Mr. McMASTER: They were not in the Government employment, but they were in the country's employment. They were the men who were making the country, and it was wrong to expect that those men who were toiling and suffering—as the hon. member for Wide Bay had told them the other night they did suffer—that they should be called upon to pay the amount asked for in the votes. It was not £200 that was asked for. They had a right to look ahead, and they would then see that £1,400 was asked for. The Committee had looked ahead last night, when they put their foot down and said that because the Valley people had a tramway they were not to have a railway. It was said that the country could not afford to spend that money, but it appeared that they could afford to vote £1,400 in the case of the motions on the paper. He was right in saying that it was £1,400, because if they voted the amount in one case they must, as honest men, follow suit and vote the amounts asked for in the others. That was why he had made up his mind that he would not vote for either amount; because he could not consistently vote for the larger sum. Instead of wasting gas—and they were wasting a good deal—

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. McMASTER: Yes; the candle was burning at both ends; and he said that instead of burning gas they should put their hands in their pockets, make up the amount, and have done with it.

Mr. ANNENAR said he thought that was the wrong place for any man to come to and advertise his charity and tell the country what he did. A good man did not make those things known; he kept them to himself. He wished to say a few words to the junior member for Cook, who said that the motions were nothing but a piece of log-rolling. Neither of the hon. gentlemen who had introduced those motions had ever asked him to give a vote upon the question. He did not know the family the hon. member for Wide Bay had interested himself in, but he believed that the man Murphy had been a servant of his for three or four years in Ipswich, but that was about seventeen years ago.

Mr. McMASTER: Give his widow a cheque!

Mr. ANNENAR said he wished the junior member for Fortitude Valley would try to behave himself. The hon. member had stated that he (Mr. Annear) last night got up in a wild and ridiculous manner. Well, he could say that he entered that House, and he believed he was a member of it for six or eight weeks before he opened his lips in any of the debates, and he could claim for himself that his conduct and entry into that Chamber was quite on a par with that of the hon. gentleman. He should claim, also, that though he might have disagreed with his hon. colleague in the representation of Maryborough on some occasions, he had never stood up on a platform and rounded on him and tried to get the crowd to put him down. He would advise the hon. member for Fortitude Valley to leave him alone, and to leave a good many hon. members in that Committee alone. The hon. member told them that he had good lungs and would speak till he was black in the face. He (Mr. Annear) believed that he had as good lungs as the hon. member. He hoped, though, that in using his lungs he should use them in a right direction. He knew that a parrot could speak, but it never talked sense. He hoped that in using his lungs he should not abuse them, but continue to use them in the future as he had in the past, and talk common sense. Since he had had a seat in Parliament neither the Chairman nor the Speaker had been forced to call him to

order. He knew that the Chairman was very impartial as a chairman; and although, no doubt, there had been many times when the Chairman might have called him to order, up to the present time he had never done so. He (Mr. Annear) was only a young member, but he hoped he had some common sense, and he had never got up for the purpose of hearing himself speak. He had always made it a rule to address the House only when he had something to say, and if his speeches were looked at—little as they were recorded in *Hansard*—they would bear that out. He did not wish to have angry words with any hon. gentleman, and he did not wish to create any ill-feeling—he did not think he had done so up to that time—but he had his constituents to look after, and that he should do. He knew that he never offended anybody. He might also say that he was for fourteen years a member of the Maryborough Council, and had also been the mayor of that municipality, and although he did not wish to bring to that Committee the speeches he had made before that council, yet he recognised the fact that in speaking to the council of Maryborough he was speaking to intelligent gentlemen, and he was addressing intelligent and honourable gentlemen when he spoke to that Committee. A remark had been made by an hon. member, whom he would not name for fear it might offend him, that all the money that had heretofore been voted by the House had been voted for wealthy Civil servants. But the hon. member for Stanley, Mr. Kellett, had clearly shown that the money voted from time to time had been for the wives and families of working men who had lost their lives in the Government Service. There was one instance with which he was acquainted—that of a man named Walsh, who was killed at the railway station at Maryborough, by an engine falling upon him. What was the difference between that man's death and the death of the man Denis Murphy, who was killed by a large amount of earth falling upon him? Yet in Walsh's case the House voted his widow the sum of £250. Hon. members ought to have some delicacy in speaking of the widows of those who were now no more, but it seemed to him that there was no delicacy whatever; they were spoken of in the most heartless way—as “those widows”—as if their husbands had rendered no services to the State. He had been in the colony nearly twenty-four years, and he was fairly convinced, with the Premier, that the gentleman mentioned in a succeeding motion was a distinguished public servant. If hon. members took up the Statutes of the Colony, from the time it was first formed till within the last year or two, they would see all over them the name of Ratcliffe Pring.

The CHAIRMAN: I must call the hon. member to order. The motion to which he refers is not now before the Committee.

Mr. ANNEAR: I thought that as you had allowed other hon. members to refer to that case I should be in order in referring to it also.

The CHAIRMAN: I have not allowed any hon. member to discuss the merits of that case.

Mr. ANNEAR said he would bow to the Chairman's ruling, and address himself to the motion generally. He would first say a few words with reference to what had been said about the Speaker. He took it that the Speaker of that Assembly occupied a similar position to that of other Speakers in the Australian colonies, and he had often noticed that the Speakers of Victoria and New South Wales addressed themselves to the business that came before them when the House was in committee. He should be very sorry to see the Speaker of that Assembly compelled to

shut his mouth in committee. When the Speaker left the chair he was simply the hon. member for Toowoomba, and as such he had a perfect right to look after the interests of his constituents and of the people of the colony. That hon. member certainly always addressed himself intelligibly to the questions that came before him, and his remarks had been of great assistance to hon. members on questions that had come before them. With regard to log-rolling, he challenged any hon. member to show that there was any such thing as log-rolling in the case. Did anyone think the hon. member for Blackall would condescend to such tactics to get a motion standing in his name carried? He would let it stand or fall on its merits. As to the hon. member for Wide Bay (Mr. Mellor), he was the last man in the Committee who would be guilty of such conduct, and the same might be said of the hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Macfarlane. The Government had certainly shown very little courtesy to their supporters in that matter, and it ill became any member of a Ministry to stonewall a question of that kind. It should be treated as part of the business of the House, and stand or fall according as a majority or a minority were in favour of it. When the motion for the Fortitude Valley railway was rejected last night many hon. members, himself among the number, did not give that minute consideration to the construction of that railway which they would have done had their minds not been fixed somewhere else. That motion was rejected, so to speak, as a vote of confidence in a gentleman who had been a member of the House for many years; who had addressed himself intelligently to all questions that came before him, and from whose advice the country and the House had often benefited. He referred to the senior member for Fortitude Valley (Mr. Beattie). He only hoped that when he left that Assembly he should have as good a record of the work he had done as that hon. member would have were he to retire into private life to-morrow.

Mr. McMASTER said he regretted very much that he had brought on his head the anger of the hon. member for Maryborough. He had not the slightest intention of doing so, and, besides, it was rather dangerous to rouse the anger of a man who had such powerful lungs. The hon. member accused him of advertising himself. He did not think he had done so, but certainly the hon. member had just advertised himself as a late mayor and alderman of Maryborough—a fact of which he (Mr. McMaster) was previously unaware. The hon. member said that he had seen in *Hansard* that morning that he (Mr. McMaster) had spoken of him as having come to the House in a wild manner. He never made use of such words, and they were not reported in *Hansard*. What he said was that the hon. member had made some wild remarks when he said that he (Mr. McMaster) wanted to get the railway to the Valley simply in order that he might get his produce delivered at 6d. a ton less than he now had to pay. But he had no wish to be personal, nor should he be so long as hon. members left him alone. He intended to treat them all with that respect with which he expected to be treated in return. But if they trod upon his corns he must retaliate. He did not wish to say that the hon. member for Maryborough was not in earnest in advocating the claims of those widows before the Committee, but he thought he had a perfect right to make the remarks he did as far as giving charity outside was concerned. He gave his own charity. He did not ask anybody else for it; but the hon. member who was pressing that claim was asking them to be charitable with other people's money, not his

own. Therefore he had a perfect right to make the remarks he did; and as for the hon. member's remark that he (Mr. McMaster), as a young member, ought to be silent, on that vote he did not intend to be silent.

Mr. ANNEAR: I did not say that.

Mr. McMASTER: One of the remarks used by the hon. member was that he was in the House for eight weeks before he spoke, implying that he (Mr. McMaster) ought also to be eight weeks there before he took part in any debate that came before the House. That argument of the hon. member proved one of two things—either that he was a very bashful young man, or that he became a member of the House before he was ready.

Mr. ARCHER said he did not intend to detain the Committee long. He only rose to advise hon. members who supported the motion to allow those who opposed it to do their own stonewalling. He agreed with a great deal that had fallen from the hon. member for Maryborough, who had just sat down after making a telling speech; but if hon. members were going to stonewall he should let them do the work themselves, and not take it off their shoulders. They could sit there and listen to their sweet voices. It would give the hon. member for Cook, Mr. Lumley Hill, an opportunity of declaring indignantly against log-rolling and all the other evils that took place in that Committee; it would give the hon. member for Fortitude Valley an opportunity of exhibiting a few more traits of his charitable character; it would enable the hon. member for Stanley (Mr. White) to denounce in his straightforward, honest way all such votes; and if they could get the hon. member for Mackay to assist with some of his grand sarcasm they would have a beautiful quartette; and let them do the stonewalling. Of course the hon. member for Cook, Mr. Lumley Hill, would play first fiddle. No doubt the hon. member for Stanley would prove an effectual bass; the hon. junior member for Fortitude Valley would have to play second bass, and the harmony of the quartette would be complete with the sweet voice of the hon. member for Mackay, and make all nice and pleasant. He would advise all who intended to vote for the motion to follow his example. He had not spoken on the question before that evening, and he should not speak on it again.

Mr. STEVENSON said that he, like the hon. member who had just sat down, was not going to detain the Committee long. He did not believe in granting that £200 for one moment, and he intended to oppose it. At the same time he did not see why the junior member for Fortitude Valley should be annoyed with the hon. member for Maryborough, Mr. Annear, for giving him a little castigation. He really thought that hon. member deserved it, and he thought also that the Chairman was wrong in calling the hon. member for Maryborough, Mr. Annear, to order, considering that he let other speakers go on in exactly the same way. The junior member for Fortitude Valley was the first that evening to bring in a foreign subject. In fact, he almost fancied the hon. member took the course he did as a matter of spite because he had been beaten yesterday, and therefore he was going to stonewall the motion before them. The hon. member in the course of his speech said he would oppose the motion on the score of economy—that the House yesterday had refused the Fortitude Valley railway and he was going to refuse the present vote. He (Mr. Stevenson) did not see why fish should be made of one and flesh of another. He thought the hon. member for Maryborough was perfectly right in calling attention to the conduct of the junior member for Fortitude Valley. He was very pleased indeed to see that the

junior member for Fortitude Valley would make such a splendid stonewaller whenever stonewalling was to take place. He had given the Committee a lot of information that nobody ever knew before, and no doubt in the course of the evening he would be able to give them a great deal more. As a young member he was certainly very efficient as far as stonewalling was concerned, for he could repeat things as many times over as any man he (Mr. Stevenson) had ever heard. Regarding the vote itself, he (Mr. Stevenson) had not spoken on the subject before, and he did not see why they should agree to it. If they were going to vote that money simply because the woman was a widow of a Civil servant they could carry on the principle *ad infinitum*. He did not see why the widow of a Civil servant should be treated differently to the widow of a servant who had been employed by any private individual. He dared say the man for whose widow the hon. member for Ipswich desired to get that £200 elected to go into the Government Service because he found he could do better there than in the service of a private individual. Why should she be treated differently from the widow of a servant of his, supposing that servant died and his widow was left out in in the cold?

Mr. MACFARLANE: You would provide for her?

Mr. STEVENSON said perhaps he might not be in the same position in which the hon. member wished to put the Committee; he might not be able to give the widow of his servant £200. If a man who had been a good servant to him died, leaving a widow unprovided for, he should be only too glad to do all he could for her, as far as he could afford it; but why should he come to that Committee and ask it to vote £200 for her? That was where the point came in. He maintained that the hon. member had no more right to ask the Committee to grant such a sum than any private individual had to ask for a smaller sum to be granted to the widow of his servant. Supposing his groom was kicked by a horse, and was sent out of the world just as quickly as the man whose widow this money was asked for was: What right would he have to ask for £200 for the widow of that man? If that vote was granted, he was satisfied that they would never see the end of similar claims. He agreed with a good deal that had fallen from the hon. junior member for Fortitude Valley, and especially when he said that he would be prepared to put his hand in his own pocket to assist a widow. So would he (Mr. Stevenson) for a widow who was in distress, if he could afford it; but he maintained that no member of the House had any more right to come down and ask for a vote of that kind for the widow of a man who died in the Public Service than for the widow of any other man. If they passed the motion the same kind of thing would be bound to go on and they would have to recognise every widow in the colony. What did it matter, as had been said before, whether a man was killed by accident or died a natural death? There was nothing in that. The widow might be just as badly off whether her husband died a sudden or a lingering death. So that had nothing whatever to do with the question, and he said that if they recognised the principle at all they must recognise it so far as to provide for every widow in the colony. He contended that the principle ought not to be recognised, and he was quite prepared to make one to try and stop it.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he rose to make a few remarks in reply to the hon. member for Blackall, who really had given most sagacious advice—in fact, it appeared to come almost from

one of the "wise men of the East"—that the members who were opposing the motion should do the talking themselves. The only thing was that it seemed to be a slight reflection upon his (Mr. Lumley Hill's) intelligence and ability—that he could not keep the business going without the assistance of the others. Of course, if they liked to take the job out of his hands it was all right. There was no use in going on in that way, and attempting to resist, because anyone could recognise the difference between stonewalling Government business and stonewalling a motion of that kind. He had had considerable experience in both, and hon. gentlemen who went in for stonewalling should be perfectly sure that they had a sound ground for so doing, otherwise they could only keep going until public opinion outside compelled them to give in; but there was no chance of public opinion compelling them to give in on the present occasion. In the first place there was no time, and in the next he was sure that public opinion would back them up. The hon. member for South Brisbane had given them some very "high falutin" information, as to how the man Murphy was engaged in a service of danger; and appealed in a most touching manner to the feelings of the Committee to get them to vote away the money of the taxpayers. If he had appealed to them to put their hands in their own pockets it would have been a very different thing. The man in question was warned by his superior officer that he was making danger where there was no necessity for it, and in his intrepidity he caused a fall of earth which killed him. The man was not risking his life on account of any other individuals, or to save his fellow-creatures in any way. There was no merit in being foolhardy, or doing what he was told not to do. He did not suppose that a man who had been for nineteen years indulging in the "Government stroke" was so eager to render a service to the State that he would really sacrifice his life to bring down a few tons of earth in a day. No doubt the hon. member for South Brisbane sympathised thoroughly with the widow in question; but his arguments were very fallacious. He was perfectly sure they would not get much more forward with the business before them that evening. He had forgotten what was the question before the Committee, and it would be as well for them to have a division to see how they stood, and then make a fresh start.

Question put, and the Committee divided:—

Ayes, 17.

Messrs. Miles, Griffith, Dutton, Dickson, Moreton, Stevenson, White, Bailey, McMaster, Kates, Hill, Govett, Ferguson, Palmer, Campbell, Black, and Norton.

Noes, 16.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Foxton, Sheridan, Chubb, Archer, Groom, Jordan, Lalor, Donaldson, Smyth, Kellett, Mellor, Wakefield, Macfarlane, Salkeld, and Brookes.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

THE HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said: Mr. Speaker.—How did the Chairman get out of the chair? There was no motion to that effect, and I do not know how you get into your present position. The motion was that no progress be reported, but I have never heard any motion that the Chairman leave the chair, and you have no right to be in the chair at all. We are now in committee.

THE SPEAKER: It is not for the Speaker to say how the Chairman got out of the chair.

THE PREMIER said: The Chairman was ordered to report no progress, and he could only do that by leaving the chair, and by you, Mr. Speaker, taking the chair and receiving the report. The motion that no progress be reported is a well-recognised form, as laid down in the books on Parliamentary Practice.

GRANT TO THE WIDOW OF THE LATE DANIEL CRICHTON.

On the Order of the Day being called that the House in Committee consider of an address to the Governor, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be placed on the Supplementary Estimates the sum of £200, to be granted to the widow of the late Daniel Crichton, who was killed at the Gympie railway station on the 19th May last—

Mr. MELLOR moved that the Speaker leave the chair and the House go into Committee to consider this Order of the Day.

Question put and passed.

Mr. MELLOR, in moving—

That an address be presented to the Governor, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be placed on the Supplementary Estimates the sum of £200, to be granted to the widow of the late Daniel Crichton, who was killed at the Gympie railway station on the 19th May last—

said there was a little difference between that case and the last that was before the Committee; in fact, he thought it was a case similar to that which the Minister for Works mentioned last week—the case of engine-driver Griffiths, who was killed on the railway. Although Mrs. Crichton had no absolute right to the consideration of the Committee, still he thought it was the duty of Parliament in cases where men were killed on the railway to make some provision for those left behind. By permission of the Committee he would read a petition presented to the Minister for Works by the hon. member for Gympie in connection with the case. They all knew that the Minister for Works had allowed money to be placed on the Estimates for a case somewhat similar. Last year they found £200 placed on the Estimates for a widow whose husband was killed on the railway at Maryborough. He really did not know why the hon. gentleman had not allowed the present case to be dealt with in the same way, instead of being brought by motion before the House. The petition he referred to was as follows:—

"Gympie, June 27th, 1885.

"To the Hon. the Minister for Works and Mines, Brisbane.

"The petition of the undersigned, residents of Gympie, humbly sheweth,—

"1st. That on the 19th day of May last one Daniel A Crichton, employed in the Railway Department at the Gympie end of the Gympie and Maryborough Railway, met his death through an accident whilst engaged in the execution of his duty.

"2nd. That the facts of the case are as follow:—Before commencing the work on which he was engaged when the accident happened, Crichton took the precaution to push back the brake-van from the four loaded trucks of ballast on the siding at the time, so that should they come in contact with the engine and other four waggons then being loaded on the main line they should not touch the van; but instead of coming back with the engine and waggons, as he would suppose, four heavily laden trucks of ballast were uncoupled from the engine and thrown back on the same siding as the van and the other four waggons; that is, they were detached a considerable distance away from the points, and then got a good start with the engine, so that when these four heavily laden waggons came against the four already on the siding it caused them to recoil back and come against the van, which was back some distance on the siding, thus causing the death of Daniel Crichton.

"It is not usual to put out a danger signal in cases of this kind, as by all appearance the job would be done before anything would interfere with the van; although no one was criminally to blame for the accident, it will be clearly seen that Crichton himself was not in fault, and that the occurrence may be considered purely accidental.

"3rd. That the deceased bore an excellent character; that he was steady, sober, and industrious, and was well fitted for the work on which he was employed, having been for a period of eighteen years in the service of the Caledonian Railway Company, Scotland.

"4th. That the deceased leaves a widow and three girls very inadequately provided for, and being at the time of his death engaged in building a cottage for them, which they have now no means of completing.

"5th. Under these circumstances, your petitioners respectfully request that you will be pleased to assist the family by such a grant from the funds of the department as to you may seem fit and just, and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray, etc."

That petition was signed by a great many of the residents of Maryborough, including the mayor of Gympie. Why the Minister could not grant the prayer of a petition so influentially signed he did not know. He thought it would be a just act, and one for which a precedent had already been established, to grant the relief asked for in that case. He moved the motion standing in his name.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he looked upon that vote as one of precisely the same nature as the last, and therefore, without going into any defence of his action, or making use of the forms of the House, he would simply move that the Chairman do now leave the chair, and report no progress.

Mr. BAILEY said before that motion was put he would take the opportunity to impress upon the Railway Department that there was some necessity for provision being made for the families of their own servants who were killed in the execution of their duty. He thought that that lesson, at any rate, would be taught by the conduct of the Committee that evening. It was very evident that the Committee had determined that they would have no more of those widows' allowances. He knew for a fact that if those three motions were passed another three were ready to be brought forward, and perhaps thirty-three at the back of those. Yet it was a cruel thing that the employés on the railways, who had to perform hazardous and dangerous duties at times, should, when they were suddenly cut off in the execution of their duty, have to leave their families dependent on the outside public. He thought such persons had a claim on the Government; he would not say in all cases, but at any rate in many instances. In the case brought forward by the hon. member for Gympie, the man had been many years engaged in railway work in the old country, and for three or four years in the colony, and was killed in the simple discharge of his duty. There was no carelessness on his part; indeed it would be hard to blame a man who was dead for carelessness. The man had left a wife and children who were not in good circumstances, and in that respect differed from the family in the case brought forward by the hon. member for Ipswich. They were dependent on the good offices of their friends and the residents of Gympie. He hoped that the Government would see that men in such positions made provision for their families, or that the department would exercise certain liberality in cases of that kind. That was all they could expect to result from the discussion that evening, and he hoped that would be obtained.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he would venture to correct the hon. member for Wide Bay by informing him that it was a regulation of the department that when a man was employed in any work such as that in which Crichton was engaged he should put up a danger signal. He had not, however, the slightest hesitation in promising the Committee that during the recess the Government would endeavour to devise some scheme to meet cases such as those which had been discussed that afternoon. He believed it was absolutely necessary to do something of the kind. They had had the time of the Committee wasted night after night over a patry affair, and he thought every hon. member

would agree that it was better to try and devise some means for making provision for those cases than to waste their time in such discussions. He thought it was very unseemly for them to be squabbling and fighting over such cases. At the same time he would say that if in making the provision he had mentioned they attempted to interfere with the private rights of people it would very possibly lead to trouble.

Mr. STEVENSON said he did not wish to say anything that would discourage the hon. gentleman from bringing forward any scheme to make provision for the men who were unfortunate enough to be killed in that way. At the same time, he must say that it would be a very bad policy to give anyone in the Public Service the idea that they would have the special protection of the State. He thought such persons ought to lean on themselves, and provide for their families, in case of accident, in the same way as any other person in the employment of a private individual.

Mr. PALMER said that, without taking the liberty of dictating to the Minister for Works as to what he should do in that matter, he would venture to suggest that during the recess, if he desired to alter the present state of things, it would be desirable for him to look at the regulations made by the Public Service Board in Victoria in carrying out the provisions of the Public Service Act, by which it was provided that, since the abolition of the Pensions Act of 1881, every official in the Government Service should insure his life in some insurance society carrying on business in Victoria, for a sum of money equal to the maximum salary of his grade or class at two years' service; or failing that, that he should insure for a sum to be paid at the age of sixty or at his death, or for an annuity at one-fifth of the highest sum paid to men of the grade or class to which he belonged, and on promotion there should be a *pro rata* increase in the amount of his insurance. By adopting such a course they would compel public servants to provide for themselves, and not be dependent upon the State. If the hon. gentleman was anxious to do something in that matter he might adopt some of those regulations, in which there was a great deal of prudence and common sense, and so prevent the continual recurrence of such motions as that now before the Committee.

Mr. KELLETT said he was very glad to hear the Minister for Works say that he would try and devise some scheme for meeting such cases as those, and he would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether, in devising that scheme, he would take into his favourable consideration the two cases they had been discussing that evening? Whatever scheme might be decided upon would not meet the object of those motions, and he thought the Government might recognise those claims.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said that, in expressing the opinion he had as to the servants of his department making provision for their families, he did not think it necessary to state that he would take special care that, whatever provision was proposed, those who benefited by it would have to contribute towards it. He thought everyone knew that he was economical.

Mr. CHUBB: Since last night.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said that he had no intention of making that provision a charge on the revenue. Whatever was introduced would be in the shape of an insurance fund, and those who were to benefit by it would have to contribute towards it. He was afraid that he could not deal with the present cases as suggested by the hon. member for Stanley.

He thought some provision should be made for such cases, instead of wasting time as was done under the present system.

Mr. KELLETT said the hon. member told the Committee that he was a man for saving expense, and an hon. member opposite said, "Since yesterday"—which was a very fair comment on the statement. He should not like the hon. member to appear before the Committee as a man who had always been unwilling to spend public money; and he would read a speech made by the Colonial Treasurer in favour of a sum being granted to the widow of Guard Fox; and he would afterwards read the division list, from which it would appear that the present Minister for Works voted in favour of the motion. In reply to the then Minister for Lands, who stated that the brake used by Guard Fox was not a faulty one, Mr. Dickson said:—

"He did not think the objection raised was a very important one. It was shown that the unfortunate man had lost his life in the service of the Government; and that his death was owing to physical strain and injury received while doing his duty. It might be that he was not competent to work the brake; but, even assuming that to be the case, his widow was still entitled to the consideration of the House. He thought the House should give the widow the benefit of any doubt. The amount asked for was small. He had risen chiefly to say that, if the decision of the House—which he intended to try and help to bring about—was in favour of the amount being voted, the Government should not force the hon. member to go into committee, but accept the decision of the House, and put the sum asked for on the Supplementary Estimates. There were a number of private motions on the notice-paper which would have to be disposed of before the close of the session, and he hoped the Minister for Works would accede to the motion, and dispense with any further proceedings in committee. Seeing that the man was an old servant of the Public Works Department, and that he met his death in consequence of the injuries sustained in connection with his duty on the railway, he was sure every member would agree that something should be done for the widow and orphans."

He did love consistency. He believed the hon. gentleman was consistent in his ideas then—but was he consistent now? The division was then 24 to 6, as follows:—

"AYES.

"Messrs. Griffith, McLean, Dickson, Buckland, Miles, Isambert, Sheaffe, Foote, O'Sullivan, Rutledge, Feez, Hamilton, Perse, Fraser, Macfarlane, Aland, Lalor, Macdonald-Paterson, De Poix-Tyrell, Ferguson, Price, Bailey, H. W. Palmer, and Groom.

"NOES.

"Messrs. Archer, Pope Cooper, Perkins, McIlwraith, Macrossan, and Low."

There was the Minister for Works—who was always defending the Treasury—voting for the gratuity; but now he had taken some other ideas into his head, and was going to leave off being generous in his old age. The hon. gentleman doubted his name being among the "Ayes," and looked over the list while he (Mr. Kellett) was reading; but he was afraid the hon. member's eyesight was failing, as well as his memory. It seemed to him (Mr. Kellett) that since the division he referred to was taken several members on both sides had changed their opinions. All the members of the present Ministry who were in the House on that occasion voted for the motion; and they had not given a single common-sense reason why they should act in a different manner to-night. If the Treasurer could show any good reason for his opposition in the present instance, he must admit that he was a fool when he made the speech just quoted.

Question—That the Chairman leave the chair and report no progress—put, and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 16.

Messrs. Griffith, Miles, Dickson, Dutton, Moreton, Stevenson, White, Norton, Lumley Hill, Govett, Black, Ferguson, Kates, Palmer, Campbell, and Rutledge.

NOES, 15.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Archer, Mellor, Foxton, Chubb, Macfarlane, Sheridan, Bailey, Smyth, Kellett, Donaldson, Lalor, Jordan, Groom, and Brookes.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

The House resumed, and the CHAIRMAN reported no progress.

GRATUITY TO MRS. PRING.

Mr. ARCHER said: Mr. Speaker,—I move that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider of an address to the Governor praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be placed on the Supplementary Estimates the sum of £1,000 to be granted to the widow of the late Mr. Justice Pring.

Question put and passed.

Mr. ARCHER said he had nothing to add to what he had said when he moved the motion in the House. He did not wish to occupy the time of the Committee unnecessarily. If he could by argument change a single vote he would do so with pleasure, but he was perfectly well aware that it was not in his power to change one vote. He therefore moved—

That an address be presented to the Governor praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be placed on the Supplementary Estimates the sum of £1,000 to be granted to the widow of the late Mr. Justice Pring.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he did not wish to go into any discussion on the motion. He did not look on it with any particular disfavour as compared with the motions which had preceded it, but he would move that the Chairman leave the chair and report no progress.

Mr. JORDAN said that as the smaller sums asked for the widows of humble Government employés had been refused he saw his way distinctly to vote that the Chairman leave the chair and report no progress. He could not consistently vote for £1,000 to the widow of the late Mr. Justice Pring when £200 had been refused to the widows of poor men who were killed in the Government Service. He voted for the £1,000 when it was first proposed, but he considered that he would be quite consistent in refusing to vote for it now after what had occurred.

Mr. KELLETT said he intended to take the very opposite course to that indicated by the last speaker. The fact that gratuities which ought to have been more readily passed than the one under notice had been refused was no reason why he should not give his vote for the present motion. If the Ministry of the day chose to go against the voting of small sums for the widows of men killed in the Government Service, that was no reason why he should change his mind in regard to the gratuity for Mrs. Pring. He was not going to be like the Government, inconsistent. He therefore intended to vote for the motion, although he could not say half as much in favour of it as he could for the motions which had just been lost.

Question—That the Chairman leave the chair and report no progress—put, and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 18.

Messrs. Dickson, Dutton, Moreton, Bailey, Miles, Salkeld, Lumley Hill, Kates, Black, Govett, Norton, White, Jordan, Isambert, Palmer, Campbell, Ferguson, and Macfarlane.

NOES, 11.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Archer, Sheridan, Chubb, Griffith, Foxton, Mellor, Kellett, Rutledge, Groom, and Brookes.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

The House resumed, and the CHAIRMAN reported no progress.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER, in moving "That this House do now adjourn," said: Mr. Speaker,—We propose to take the Justices Bill on Monday, and after that to go on with Supply. I hope the leader of the Opposition will devote an hour to the Justices Bill. If he does I am sure he will not object to the House going into Committee. Some amendments to the Bill will be circulated in the morning, but they are almost all provisions which were omitted from the Bill as originally framed, because they were such as could not be introduced in the Legislative Council. There are one or two amendments relating to amendments introduced in that House.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said: Mr. Speaker,—I can assure the hon. member that there is not the slightest chance in the world of that Bill being considered unless the session is prolonged. If it is the opinion of the House that the session ought to be prolonged, I have not the slightest objection. I am quite satisfied that the Bill will not go through the House without just as much discussion as has been given to any Bill of similar importance that has been brought before the House. We are not going to take it on the credit of the Attorney-General, or the Premier, or the late Chief Justice, or the legal authorities of the colony.

Mr. MELLOR said: Mr. Speaker,—I think we should get on with the Estimates as quickly as possible; and if there is any time afterwards, we might go on with the Justices Bill.

Mr. BLACK said: Mr. Speaker,—I must say that when the House so readily consented to Monday being added as a sitting-day I understood, and I believe many other hon. members understood, that it was in order to get through the Estimates. If we are to meet here on Monday for the purpose of rushing through a Bill of such very great importance, as the hon. the Premier has stated, containing over 200 clauses, we shall do nothing with the Estimates on Monday; that is quite certain. I do not think the feeling of hon. members is favourable to a proposal of that sort. I am very much inclined to think that unless the Government, out of their own supporters, can make a House on Monday, they can hardly anticipate any very great assistance from this side of the House. I look upon it as very undesirable that a Bill of over 200 clauses—no matter how good it is, and I admit it is a very good Bill—that a measure of that sort should be rushed through this House at the fag-end of the session. I would suggest to the hon. the Premier, with all due deference to his greater experience, that we go on with the Estimates on Monday, and when we get through the Estimates—which I believe will not be in any way unnecessarily delayed—during the time certain business has to be transacted in the Upper House in connection with it, we can then go on with the Justices Bill, and we shall do all we possibly can to facilitate the passage of that measure. I believe it would then stand a fair chance of going through; but if the Estimates are to be delayed for the purpose of getting that Bill through, the Bill will not get through, and the session will be prolonged unnecessarily.

Mr. BAILEY said: Mr. Speaker,—I agree with the hon. member who has just spoken, to a

very great extent. I think we shall be much better able to make a House on Monday for the consideration of the Estimates than for the consideration of this Bill. There are several members who think that certain clauses of the Bill will require some consideration at the hands of the House, and I think they are quite right. It is a kind of permanent measure, which will remain as a permanent measure for some years, and it will require great care. Hon. members do not wish to obstruct the measure; they wish merely to have an opportunity of carefully considering it, and suggesting any amendments that may occur to them.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—If hon. members say they will not make a House on Monday for the Justices Bill, I have no alternative but to say we will go on with the Estimates; but I hope hon. members will reconsider the matter. I do not think it is a sufficient excuse for hon. members to say they have not read the Bill, and I am sure there is plenty of time to consider it before the session comes to an end. I am very glad to hear the assurance given by the hon. member for Mackay. If hon. members are of the same opinion on Monday, I undertake to go on with the Estimates first, though I shall allow the business to stand on the paper in the order I have given.

Question put and passed, and the House adjourned at twenty-nine minutes past 8 o'clock.