Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 23 JUNE 1892

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 23 *June*, 1892.

Questions.—Queensland Constitution Bill: First reading.—Motion for Adjournment: Leper station at Friday Island.—Adjournment.—Small Debts Court Act of 1867 Amendment Bill: Committee.—Elections Bill: Committee.—Adjournment.

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

QUESTIONS.

Mr. BARLOW asked the Chief Secretary—

Do the Government intend to take any action to meet the wishes of Civil servants for the repeal of superannuation clauses of Civil Service Act, as expressed in the vote lately taken on the question?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. Sir S. W. Griffith) replied—

The Government have not yet arrived at a conclusion on the subject.

Mr. HYNE asked the Chief Secretary—

Is it the intention of the Government to introduce this session a Bill for the formation of conciliation courts of law?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied—

A Bill to provide for the establishment of courts of conciliation on a system analogous to that which prevails in Prussia and other parts of Europe has been prepared, and will be submitted to the House if circumstances allow.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUEENSLAND CONSTITUTION BILL.

On the motion of the CHIEF SECRETARY, leave was given to introduce a Bill to provide for the division of the colony of Queensland into provinces, and for the better government of the colony as so divided.

FIRST READING.

The CHIEF SECRETARY presented the Bill, and moved that it be read a first time.

Question put and passed.

The second reading was made an Order of the Day for Tuesday, 5th July.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

LEPER STATION AT FRIDAY ISLAND.

Mr. HAMILTON said: Mr. Speaker,—I wish to move the adjournment of the House to refer to a matter which seriously affects a portion of my constituents. In the early part of 1889 it was proposed to remove the leper station to Friday Island. This led to very strong objections on the part of the white residents in that portion of the Cook district, and a public meeting was held at that time, when they unanimously pledged themselves to oppose the landing of these lepers by force if it were required, and wires were also sent to the Chief Secretary, who at that time was the Hon. B. D. Morehead. One of the wires was to this effect—

"Learn with much surprise Government sending lepers Friday Island. Public feeling strongly against this as Friday Island is in close proximity to many pearling stations and to Thursday Island. It contains the only permanent fresh water springs in the vicinity convenient for vessels and is constantly visited by crews of sailing boats and trading vessels. Aboriginals from neighbouring islands also visit it constantly and would undoubtedly mix with the lepers despite every precaution which could be taken. Board protest in the strongest manner against proposed deportation of lepers there."

The CHIEF SECRETARY: What document is that?

Mr. HAMILTON: This is a telegram sent on 16th April, 1889, to the then Chief Secretary, Hon. B. D. Morehead, by Mr. V. R. Bowden, who was the chairman of the meeting. That protest was attended to at the time. Mr. Douglas sent telegrams, too, at the time, stating that he thought Dayman Island was the most suitable place for a leper station. I shall not take up the time of the House by reading his telegrams. Attention was paid to the very strong objections of the residents, and it was decided to have the station at Dayman Island. However, last year the Colonial Secretary put a sum of £1,000 on the Estimates to erect a station on Friday Island, probably influenced by the opinion of Dr. Salter, whose opinion as a medical man should be worth a good deal.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. H. Tozer): The Secretary for Works put the money on.

Mr. HAMILTON: It was put on, at any rate; and no doubt the hon. gentleman was probably influenced by the very strong report made in favour of Friday Island by Dr. Salter. The inhabitants of Thursday Island, however, took no action whatever at the time, and the presumption naturally was that they had changed

their views; that they had been converted by Dr. Salter; and the vote was passed; but before any tenders were accepted the public on Thursday Island showed themselves just as alive to the extreme danger, in their opinion, of a leper station being placed there as previously, and they called another public meeting, at which they unanimously decided to object in every possible way to the presence of these lepers on Friday Island. A wire to that effect was sent to the Colonial Secretary on 15th December, 1891, but about a month afterwards, on 8th January, 1892, tenders were accepted for the building which was gone on with, and about £800 has been expended on it. I will just refer to Dr. Salter's letter in which are the whole of his objections to Dayman Island, and the whole of his contentions in favour of Friday Island. He says—

"I take this opportunity to express my utter disapproval of the present leper station at Dayman Island. The death rate among these men has been enormous."

The reason is, as is well known, that low-lying islands in a moist climate are the homes of leprosy, and it is simply pronouncing a death sentence on lepers to send them to such places. In that respect there is the same objection to Friday Island that there is to Dayman Island; so that, if it is inhuman to send them to Dayman Island, it is equally inhuman to send them to Friday Island. He says further—

"The locality is too far distant from Thursday Island, rendering medical treatment in the event of accident practically impossible."

After all, what is the use of medical treatment for leprosy? As a rule, nothing is given internally. People continually imagine they have discovered some external application which is productive of good, but all writers state that the best medicine is a dry climate. In Bolivia, at a leper station called Aqua De Dios, two and a-half day's journey inland, lepers get on better than in any other part of the world, without any doctor at all. It is one of the largest leper stations in the world, and there is no medical man there; yet some of the lepers there are able to pursue their ordinary avocations. Mr. Douglas and Dr. Salter are the only two gentlemen who have spoken in favour of Friday Island. Dr. Salter would naturally be in favour of Friday Island, because he does not get a penny more for attending the lepers whether they are on Dayman Island or Friday Island, and it must interfere with his private practice to go to Dayman Island, because it takes a day to go there and back, whereas it would take very little time to visit Friday Island. He says—

"This distance likewise interferes with the victualling of the patients, for if any emergency call the steamer away for an extended period of time, they must wait till her return."

That objection does not hold good, because the steamer has to go to Patterson every month to supply the telegraph station, which is within three miles of Dayman Island. He states also—

"Among such people as we have here cases of leprosy are likely to occur at any period."

I do not see that that is any reason why the leper station should be stuck under the noses of the residents of Thursday Island instead of at Dayman Island, which is eighteen miles distant. If that reason is worth anything it is a reason why the lepers should not be there at all, because of the thirteen lepers sent to Dayman Island only one was contributed by Thursday Island. The others were sent from Brisbane, Cooktown, Rockhamption, and Cairns; and that should be an argument in favour of having the leper station near one of those places. Dr. Salter also says—

"The fear of blackfellows becoming contaminated by them is groundless."

The majority of authorities contend that leprosy is contagious and infectious, and therefore the fear is not groundless. When I was passing Friday Island lately I saw canoes within 100 or 200 yards of the place. Blackfellows can get there from two or three other islands, and it is impossible to prevent them. Besides that, the lepers can get over the fence or under it. I was over the ground and could see this; therefore I think there is very great danger. He states that blackfellows are less likely to be contaminated on Friday Island than on Dayman Island. But Dayman Island is six or seven miles distant from the nearest island, and Friday Island is only half a mile from several islands; therefore there is much greater danger of blackfellows getting to Friday Island than to Dayman Island from the surrounding islands. Then he says that the blackfellows of Torres Straits "are fast becoming much too intelligent to go near the place when ordered to keep clear." They were not too intelligent to refrain from mixing with the lepers at North Shore, Cooktown. I think that in diseases like this steps ought to be taken to prevent contamination and the spread of the disease, and there is far more likelihood of the disease being spread by means of aboriginal blackfellows, who are very numerous at Thursday Island, if the leper station is situated on an island which is surrounded by islands inhabited by blackfellows. In fact, most of these reasons given by Dr. Salter appear to be nothing but special pleading; and these are the only reasons given in favour of this being a leper station. He also states—

"I am aware the residents of Thursday Island object to the placing of lepers on Friday Island. I do not think the objection is worth anything, for the matter has never been fully explained to them."

I think the matter has been fully explained to them, and they are very much alive to the danger. They believe it is a most dangerous disease, and know that the opinion is held by some of the first authorities that it is capable of being communicated by infection. It is perfectly astonishing to find the extreme bitterness of feeling that exists on Thursday Island. Civil servants, pearl-shellers, and everyone else are against lepers being placed on Friday Island, which is a picnic ground—a recreation ground for the whole place. As I said before, there are many islands near Friday Island. Prince of Wales Island is only 1,000 yards away, and there are ninety or a 100 people on that island. The north-west winds blow across from Friday Island to Prince of Wales Island, and we know that infection is often carried by means of flies. I think some steps should be taken to meet the views of the residents of Thursday Island. There is a large population, which is increasing every day; and the pearl-shelling industry is developing to a great extent. If it is decided to send lepers in that direction, they should be sent to Dayman Island, or, say, Wednesday Island, which is six miles away.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There is no water on Wednesday Island.

Mr. HAMILTON: I have always found on the coast that you can get water by just sinking a little above high-water mark; and I fancy that water could be found there. I know very well that a sum of £700 or £800 has been expended on buildings at Friday Island, but they could easily be used in connection with a quarantine station, to which the people have not the same objection that they have to a leper station. It would be a graceful act on the part of the Government to pay some attention to the wishes of the people at Thursday Island, especially when it is recollected that the whole of the lepers obtained from other parts of the colony are to be shot down among them.

I have shown that the objections of Dr. Salter are not tenable, and, considering the strong objections the people have to the presence of the lepers on Friday Island, I think it is only fair that some weight should be attached to those objections, and the leper station removed to Dayman Island. I move the adjournment of the House.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said: Mr. Speaker,—I confess that I have been rather surprised within the last day or two at receiving a telegram from Thursday Island forwarding a resolution of a public meeting objecting to the establishment of a leper station on Friday Island. No reasons were given for the objection; it was simply a strong protest against the establishment of a leper asylum or hospital on that island. I confess that I am unable to sympathise with that objection. The reasons for removing the leper station from Dayman Island to Friday Island were given last year in the House, and have been repeated this afternoon by the hon. member for Cook in moving the adjournment of the House. I think they are at any rate conclusive reasons why the station should no longer remain at Dayman Island, a place entirely away from all supervision, and with which there are no means of communication except at considerable intervals. It is also in the midst of the aborigines, and is about as unsuitable a place as could be found for a leper station. It was, therefore, imperatively necessary in the interests of humanity to remove the station from there. Where, then, should the station be put? There must be a quarantine station in the neighbourhood of Thursday Island. That we all know. A quarantine station must be established at the northern part of this continent; and after a great deal of deliberation and long consideration, the Government selected what they believed was the best quarantine ground between Townsville and Torres Straits. I think there is no doubt that it is the best site. Various sites were suggested, among them being Fitzroy Island, off Cape Grafton, and the North Shore at Cooktown. But there were objections to both of them. Friday Island is admirably adapted for a quarantine station. It is healthy, well watered, and within a reasonable distance of medical attendance; it is close to telegraphic communication, and is so situated that, no matter what wind is blowing, no contagion can be carried from it to any inhabited part of Queensland. It is a remarkable fact that, whatever wind is blowing, no wind blows from Friday Island to Thursday Island. Certainly the wind blows from there towards the mainland, and there are aboriginals on the mainland, but we cannot select any site that will be entirely free from objections. Friday Island is, however, so situated that the wind never blows from it to any settlement. It is almost unique in that respect. The wind is always north-west or south-east, and Friday Island is three miles south-west of Thursday Island, so that it is admirably adopted for a quarantine station. Thursday Island is in telegraphic communication with the rest of the colony, and in a short time telegraphic communication will be extended to Friday Island, so that it will then be in direct communication with a medical officer. Having a quarantine station on that island, and it being necessary to have a leper station in that locality, why not have them both together? Is leprosy more infectious than smallpox or cholera? I do not think so; and I confess that I cannot think of any more suitable place for lepers. The hon. member suggested that a station should be established on some high land in the interior. But that is not practicable. Where would you establish a leper station in the interior? Would you select a site at Hughenden or Winton?

Mr. HAMILTON: At Charleville.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not think that is practicable. If a station was established there should we have to keep a special train to convey the lepers there? That of course would be embarrassing. Of course, as in many other cases, these people like to have disagreeable things as far away as possible. It is the usual complaint in such cases—"Put it at somebody else's back door, but not at ours." But this leper station is not at their back door. As to the argument that the people on Thursday Island go over to Friday Island for picnics, they cannot picnic there when the island is used for quarantine. But because lepers occupy one part of the island, which is carefully fenced off, that is no reason why people should not land on the rest of the island. Would it be considered dangerous for persons to visit Stradbroke Island because there are two lepers stationed there now? Surely not. We are fortunate in being able to place our quarantine stations a long way off from settlement. In other places they are not so fortunate; but no one considers Manly Beach unfit for habitation because there is a quarantine station half a mile distant. I really cannot see the force of the objection to a leper station being established at Friday Island. It does not spoil the view of the people of Thursday Island. It is three miles off, and separated from that island by a swift flowing current. It has been suggested that the station should be removed to Wednesday Island. Of course, take the lepers anywhere else. But Wednesday Island is not a suitable place, because the wind sometimes blows from that island to Thursday Island. It is also unsuitable because there is no water there. As a matter of fact, Friday Island, as far as my knowledge and personal observation go, and as far as the information the Government have obtained shows, is the only locality in the North where a leper station could be satisfactorily established. I confess I cannot understand the agitation and protest against the establishment of the station when the buildings have been erected and the money expended, and lepers are actually on their way there. I think the Government have come to a very wise conclusion. There is one other matter that I would like to refer to. The hon. member said that a moist sea climate is the home of lepers. If that is so, I do not think it would be a very humane thing to send them away to a different climate, probably to certain death.

The HON. B. D. MOREHEAD said: Mr. Speaker,—I think too much fuss has been made about this leprosy. There is too much panic about it altogether. I saw the other day a book in the library written by an American doctor, dealing with his travels in China. I forget the name of the writer, but he has pointed out quite clearly that if leprosy is the contagious and infectious disease that some people represent it to be, China would have been depopulated centuries ago. We know that it is not. The hon. member for Fitzroy could, I think, tell us what he saw when he was in the East. I think myself that we are going a good deal too far with this leprosy scare; taking away people from their friends and locking them up. That is not done in the West Indies, we know. I believe it is done in South Africa, where they have a wretched island to which those poor people are sent to die. But here we ought to treat them in a more Christian and humane way than is proposed to be done under the Bill which is now before the other Chamber. The question is one that ought to have been more seriously considered than it was. The Bill was brought in during a panic, and was apparently passed in a panic. I know that the present administrator of New Guinea, who had charge of a leper station, does not share the opinion that there is great danger of the spread of leprosy, even in allowing lepers to go about without any

restraint. I sincerely hope that the extreme steps proposed to be taken by the Bill will not be carried out

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said: Mr. Speaker,—It is very unfortunate that a great many members of this House know nothing at all about the islands which have been referred to, and that we have to depend upon a few hon. gentlemen for all the information we have about them. We have a good deal of idle time, and we are paying for ships and sailors, and why could not the Chief Secretary place one of those boats at our disposal to enable us to visit some of those places and judge of them for ourselves? I had the good fortune on one occasion to carry a resolution in this House to enable hon. members to see the Northern parts of the colony; but by some means or another the thing has been allowed to lapse. When a man spends his time and money for the good of his country, his country should at least defray his own outlay. Many of us cannot afford to travel to these places at our own expense, and we ought to be provided with some means of visiting them. For my own part, I should be very glad to see the Northern parts of Queensland, and particularly Thursday Island, where these fortifications and garrisons are to be placed; and I would like also to see other places on the coast and where these lepers are to be placed. I am sure other members are equally anxious to see those places, and I take this opportunity of asking the Chief Secretary whether he will place any of these Government vessels at our disposal for the purpose, or whether we could get passes on the coasting steamers? The hon. gentleman goes to these places himself, and no doubt he is very observant, and it would be beneficial to the colony possibly if he went oftener. On my way up I should also be very anxious to see the marsh which is swallowing all the revenue of the colony in the shape of the Cairns Railway. It is becoming a belief with a great many in the colony that the Cairns Railway is going to swallow up all the money we have. We have a contract there, and it is said that in connection with that work a charge of dynamite or powder is driven into the side of the mountain, and the whole side of the mountain is blown into the river alongside, and the contractor gets 9d. a yard for it. The information I have is that the contractors are not making very much comparatively out of the contract, but they are making scores of fortunes out of the extras. I would be glad to see this place and some of those islands up North. I have spent some thirty years in the colony, and have paid a good deal more attention in that time to other people's business than I did to my own; I do not see therefore why I should be excluded from seeing any part of this colony without having to pay for it out of my own money. It is not out of any curiosity of our own that other members and I would like to see all these places; but it is rather an absurd thing to have members here representing a colony, or parts of a colony, that they have never seen.

Mr. LISSNER: We want separation for that very reason.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I shall be very glad to vote for separation; at the same time the question of the separation of the colony has not the slightest effect upon my argument. I would want to go to those places, whether we were separated or not. I was up North on one occasion, and paid for it, too; for I got the fever and ague, and was afraid to go there ever afterwards. There was a resolution carried in this House to give hon. members passes to visit these places, and I do not see any reason why the system should have been stopped. I do not see why it should not be renewed, as I am satisfied there are many members who would like to see these places, who have not the means to visit them themselves.

Mr. LISSNER: They do not want to go where there are lepers.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: There are not lepers on all of those islands. As for this leprosy, I hold with the hon. member for Balonne that there is not the slightest danger in it, and that a good deal too much is being made of it. I would not have the slightest hesitation in sending half a dozen of them down the river here. Sickness of that kind has no terrors for me, as I know I am never to die until my day comes. There are vessels rotting here that we have no use for at present, and I hope the Chief Secretary will see whether he cannot give us a chance of visiting some of these places in one of them.

Mr. CALLAN said: Mr. Speaker,—I presume the hon. member for Cook, in moving the adjournment of the House to call attention to this matter, is under the belief that leprosy is very contagious. My hon. friend the member for Balonne alluded to a conversation I had with him a few days ago, in which I told him my experience of what Eastern people think of leprosy; and it might be as well if I told the House what I saw in Shanghai some time ago. I suppose Shanghai is about the dirtiest city in the world, and some of the most awful sights one could possibly witness are to be seen there. One of the most awful sights you could see there is the number of persons afflicted with leprosy. I saw men and halves of men there. I really do not exaggerate when I say that I saw in some instances only half the body of a man exhibited before me, and the people of the place do not seem to take the slightest notice of such things. If this leprosy is such an awful thing, and so contagious as we have been led lately to believe it is, how is it that so little notice of it is taken in Shanghai, where there are numbers of lepers? They are to be seen at every street corner, and when they see a European they work themselves across the pathway, if they cannot walk, to exhibit their sores. I assure you that you will see lepers at every street corner in Shanghai, and the population generally do not appear to take the disease, and do not take the slightest notice of it. I am quite sure we are making a great deal too much of the cases that have been discovered here, and it will be an unfortunate thing, I think, if by our legislation people seized with the disease are to be placed in a position where they will be away from all human sympathy, as is proposed.

The HON. J. R. DICKSON said: Mr. Speaker,—I do not think the Government are to be blamed for taking every precautionary measure to prevent the spread of this disease, because although it is of very ancient origin its reappearance in this modern age seems to be accompanied with some uncertainty by the medical profession as to the intensity of its contagiousness. And although the hon. member for Fitzroy has informed us that in Shanghai persons affected with leprosy are permitted to go about the streets freely, without being taken care of, my observations in Honolulu, in the Sandwich Islands, are quite the contrary. There, cases of leprosy are very frequent indeed, and once a person is known to have or is suspected of having contracted the disease, his house is quarantined and he is removed forthwith to Malicolo.

Mr. CALLAN: The disease is new there.

Mr. HAMILTON: No; it has been there for over thirty years.

Mr. CALLAN: It has been in other places over 3,000 years.

The HON. J. R. DICKSON: The reputation of Malicolo is pretty well known throughout the world in connection with the name of Father Damien, and every care is taken of the unfortunate persons who are sent there. I think every precaution should be taken by the Government to prevent the possible spread of the disease, owing to the imperfect knowledge of the faculty in taking proper means to prevent or cure it. With regard to the observations of the hon. member for Stanley, I remember the time when steamer passes were given to members of this House in order to enable them to make themselves more acquainted with the colony; but I believe that system was suspended when payment of members came into force; and certainly I think this is not the time for the extension of expenditure on members of Parliament by the State. If the hon. member's views were carried out, we ought to have something like "Cook's personally conducted tours" for members of Parliament, so that they might become acquainted with the different localities of the colony and so forth. Perhaps the hon. gentleman was only treating the matter facetiously in trying to revive the idea of members of Parliament visiting different portions of the colony to become acquainted with local conditions. Indeed, if they visited those islands, as I have had an opportunity of doing, it would be impossible, without long residence there, to say which site would be best for the establishment of an institution of this sort. I was at Thursday Island only a few months ago—early in November last—when the buildings in question were in course of being erected; and although I had conversations with many of the residents, I heard no objection to the erection being placed on the site referred to. Therefore, the objections seem to have arisen recently. I spoke to the medical officer there, and his opinion was decidedly in favour of having the station on the site selected. No doubt the Government did not decide upon it without full knowledge of all the circumstances; and after the full explanation given by the Chief Secretary, I think the best site has been selected for the isolation of those unfortunate creatures.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said: Mr. Speaker,—If any hon. member desires to become acquainted with the locality of the islands referred to, without going there in ships, as suggested by the hon. member for Stanley, he will be able to do so by referring to the map which I now place on the table of the House. I may say that this matter came before the House last year, when I, as Secretary for Works, asked for £1,000 for a leper station at Friday Island. I did that upon the advice of Dr. Salter, the Government medical officer at Thursday Island, backed up by the strong report of the Hon. John Douglas, the Government Resident there. His words are these—

"Dr. Salter's contention for Friday Island as a leper station is perfectly tenable, and if it is determined to have a permanent establishment for the reception of lepers in this vicinity it is a suitable place.

"A portion of it could be set apart for this special purpose without any harm to the inhabitants of Thursday Island, and without detriment to the general arrangements of the quarantine station, even if it were constituted as proposed—under federal authority.

"But to do the thing properly, an expenditure of at least £1,000 would be required.

"I have marked on a sketch map of Thursday Island and its vicinity, which accompanies this, a site on Friday Island which seems to me to be the most suitable for this purpose, if it is decided to act on Dr. Salter's recommendations.

"I do not for a moment question the propriety of making sufficient and adequate provisions for lepers, under conditions favourable to their humane treatment.

"They have a claim upon the public quite equal to those who have lost the use of their reasoning faculties, and no temporary stress of financial difficulty should prevent us from making fitting provision for their necessities."

These were the facts that came before the Government which induced them to select Friday Island. From inquiries I have made and papers I have read referring to these unfortunate creatures, I have come to the conclusion that those who have been sent to Dayman Island should not be kept there one minute longer than is possible.

The HON. B. D. MOREHEAD: Did not Mr. Douglas recommend Dayman Island?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: If he did in his report he strongly condemns it.

The HON. B. D. MOREHEAD: That is not inconsistent with his general character.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I presume that he has more knowledge now from larger experience. I believe the hon. gentleman is right—that Mr. Douglas did recommend Dayman Island in the first place.

Mr. HAMILTON: Both places are equally unhealthy.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is not so much a question of health as of suitability. The great thing in connection with lepers is that they may be able to get medical treatment, have their wounds dressed, and be looked after generally. Those who were sent to Dayman Island were practically left to themselves to die; but on Friday Island they will have the advantage of a little more cheerful life than at the other place, where they saw nobody except once a month. The difficulty is this: The House last year affirmed that it was desirable, by granting the vote asked for, to erect a leper station on Friday Island, and under instructions from this House I directed arrangements to be made for its construction. With the exception of a telegram, which came to me in the absence of the Chief Secretary, I heard no complaint.

Mr. HAMILTON: I informed you also.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: At the same time that I got that telegram the hon. member received one also. However, the Government Resident has called for and received tenders, and negotiations have been entered into for the erection of the buildings on Friday Island. After all this has been done the inhabitants suddenly wake up and say they do not want a leper station there. Meanwhile, they must remember this: That they are causing lepers to be kept in populous localities who ought to be sent somewhere else. For instance, there is one at present roaming about the bush in the neighbourhood of Cairns. He was put on board the "Albatross," but managed to slip away, and there is great consternation among the inhabitants there as to what has become of that particular leper. There is another at Charters Towers whom we have been keeping for a long time waiting for the steamer; and there is another at Cooktown. These are three large towns, and it is very advisable that these lepers should be taken away from such places and segregated. I am not going into the general question as to whether leprosy is as contagious as it is said to be, because I have to-day received—I do not think any hon. member has seen it yet—the second report of the Royal Commission, which under the presidency of the Prince of Wales has been taking evidence on the subject, which throws a great deal of new light on the subject, and which we at some future time shall have to consider. The Commission are of opinion that it is necessary to segregate persons who have leprosy—they have been sitting in India and China—and in

a few weeks I expect to have their final report. The Commission consists of some of the most eminent men the world can show with regard to this special subject, and the probability is that their labours will throw further light upon what is now very obscure. I do not think there is any necessity for any scare about leprosy, but I do think it is very wise for this community to be on the right side, and to take all needful precautions to prevent the extension of the disease. I have also received some information to-day with reference to leprosy in the Straits Settlements, from which I gather that at Singapore, in 1886, there were 134 lepers; in 1887, 160; in 1888, 173; in 1889, 174; and in 1890, 183; and they have found it necessary to issue a notice in which the attention of shipmasters is called to the fact that anyone bringing lepers to any port is liable to the heavy penalty of £100. So that in that part of the East, at all events, they prevent persons from landing lepers at the ports, and make provision for their segregation, in view of the alarming increase of leprosy in that part of the world. I myself have on two or three occasions deemed it to be my duty to visit the leper station, and I had no fear of going near them so far as the danger of contagion is concerned. But I think it would be a very dangerous thing indeed to allow lepers to perform household duties. There is only one way to prevent that, and that is by segregation under conditions which will render their lives as pleasant to them as can possibly be. I do not know of a more suitable place in the North of the colony for a leper station than Friday Island. It is already the quarantine station, where ships with smallpox, cholera, or scarlet fever on board have to stay; and I do not think, from the papers I have read, that the inhabitants of Thursday Island need be in any way alarmed at the fact that three or four lepers are going to be placed on Friday Island, a distance of three miles away. I mentioned the matter to the members of the Central Board of Health the other day, and asked them whether, in their opinion, there was any prospect of contagion likely to arise to the inhabitants of Thursday Island by reason of the station being placed on Friday Island, and their unanimous opinion was that the inhabitants of Thursday Island need have no fear on that score. Friday Island is, no doubt, a very nice picnicking place for the inhabitants of Thursday Island, and I can well imagine that they do not care to have it interfered with. The same thing occurred with regard to Magnetic Island, when the people of Townsville kept on moving in the matter until they got their way, and very properly, considering the densely populated neighbouring coast. I dare say a great deal of it is a matter of sentiment; people do not like to have lepers or any other objectionable persons within their borders. But the lepers must go somewhere, and the House affirmed that the leper station for the North should be on Friday Island, as the most suitable place for the convenience of the public generally. In the Southern part of the colony we have established a lazaret at Dunwich, a mile only from the station; and the doctors who have visited it are of opinion that the health of the inhabitants of this portion of the colony is in no way endangered by the establishment of a lazaret there. The lepers are separated from the rest of the community; they are treated humanely and kindly. I look upon those people as having a claim upon us for all the consideration we can possibly bestow upon them, and I trust the hon. member will assure his constituents in the North that the Government have no desire whatever to shoot the rubbish of the colony into their particular locality, no more than anywhere else. But, as I said, the lepers have to be sent somewhere, and they are being sent to Friday Island because it is deemed to be the most suitable place that could be selected for the safety and comfort of the lepers themselves; and I hope there will be no change made. The Secretary for Lands has lately visited the place, and I dare say all hon. members have seen the report of His Excellency the Governor, who also visited it, and he has had experience in the matter of leprosy both in India and other places. The report of His Excellency shows that in the choice that was made by the Government, and endorsed by this House, Friday Island was a wise choice.

Mr. GRIMES said: Mr. Speaker,—I cannot agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Balonne and the hon. member for Fitzroy with reference to its not being necessary to take the precautions we are now taking against leprosy. A friend of mine, an eminent citizen of Brisbane, who has returned from a ten years' residence in China, has given me a fearful description of the prevalence of leprosy there. Indeed, it is so prevalent there that it would be a very large contract to collect all the lepers and place them in an institution apart from the rest of the community. In fact, as far as my information goes, such a thing would be absolutely impossible. It would likewise be almost impossible to carry out the precautions we have undertaken in Queensland. I think it was a good thing for the colony when the Colonial Secretary and the Government undertook to separate lepers from the rest of the community. It has already brought about very good results. The Government, it is evident, have not taken action in this matter one day too soon. In view of the number of Chinese who are already in the colony and others who may come, we were running risks which the residents of Queensland could hardly think of. I am very pleased that those precautions have been taken. With reference to lepers, we are bound to treat them humanely, and make them as comfortable as possible; and, in my opinion, when Friday Island was chosen for the leper station for the North of the colony the Government exercised a very wise choice.

Mr. HAMILTON, in reply, said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. member for Balonne says we are going too far. That is what I think: I think we need not go quite so far as Thursday Island, but that we should stop about half-way, and place the lepers in the locality where the majority of them come from. Of all the lepers that were removed to Dayman Island only one came from Thursday Island. It has been stated by some hon. members that there has been too much fuss made about leprosy. That reminds me of the old saying that it is astonishing with what equanimity we can bear the misfortunes of others. Those who talk in that way would be the first to make a noise if a leper station were placed in their own district. Now, I notice that the other day one of the doctors of the Central Board of Health stated that there was no danger of infection from leprosy; but when they happened to go down the Bay to examine a patient, and a small blood vessel was cut when excising a nodule, and the blood spurted out, the doctors scooted out of the hut and did not care about going there again. On the other hand, many other doctors have clearly explained in the books which they have written that leprosy is a transmittable disease, and the Colonial Secretary has told us that the Royal Commission, composed of the most eminent scientific men in the world, appointed to consider the subject, have decided that segregation is necessary, on the ground that leprosy is a contagious disease. With regard to the statement made by one gentleman that in some places

in China leprosy has not spread to an alarming extent, I may say that about thirty years ago there was only one Chinese known to be afflicted with leprosy in the Sandwich Islands, and since then 40,000 have taken the disease. The Chief Secretary says that the agitation has been got up suddenly, but I have shown by telegrams and giving their dates that it has not been got up suddenly. A meeting took place some years ago to protest against the idea of placing lepers on Thursday Island, and they threatened to resort to force if that was done. A telegram to that effect was sent to the Chief Secretary, and it so much impressed him that he decided not to put them on that island. Communications were also sent to the present Ministry before the contract for the present buildings on Friday Island was accepted, objecting to the site; and people interviewed the Colonial Secretary before the tenders were accepted, objecting to their being erected on that island. These facts prove that the agitation was not sudden, and subsequent to the erection of the buildings. Now, Dayman Island was recommended by Mr. Douglas. The Colonial Secretary read a portion of a letter just now from Mr. Douglas, in which he said, after it was decided to make Friday Island the leper station, that it was most unsuitable; but he neglected to read another portion of the letter, in which Mr. Douglas says he does not agree with Dr. Salter's statement regarding Dayman Island. In the first part of the letter there is a clause to that effect, which is borne out by what Mr. Douglas said in 1889 to the Chief Secretary regarding Dayman Island. He said then—

"Lepers disposed of at Dayman yesterday. Very suitable place. They brought a good deal of live stock with them five coops of fowls etc.—J. DOUGLAS."

"11-5-89.

"To Chief Secretary,

"Dayman is about fifteen miles from Thursday Island and three from Patterson. Plenty of water. In every respect suitable. Attendants can go and come easily in the day. Will ration them once a month. Visit them oftener. Quite within touch and sight.—JOHN DOUGLAS."

Thus we see that the Government Resident says that Dayman Island is a most suitable place for a leper station. Now, it has been said that one objection to Dayman Island is that the lepers were so far away from medical attendance, but we know that medical attendance is of very little use in this disease, because at one of the largest leper stations in the world there is no doctor in charge. Do we not know that there are many places in the bush where small communities reside, and which are more than eighteen or twenty miles away from a doctor? but no weight is attached to that. That objection, therefore, is simply absurd, because, as I have said, one of the first leper stations in the world is conducted most successfully without the aid of a doctor. The proper treatment for lepers is to give them a suitable climate. The Colonial Secretary has also said that the removal of lepers from Dayman Island was in the interests of humanity. It is true that ten of the thirteen lepers sent to that island died, but that was owing to the unsuitable climate; it would be equally inhuman to send them to Friday Island for that reason. I do not think it is in the interests of humanity to place them within a few miles of a place where there are 100 men at work, as there at Prince of Wales Island. The Chief Secretary is mistaken when he says that no wind that could possibly blow from Friday Island would affect the residents of the other islands. If he will look at the position of Prince of Wales Island, he will see that the north-west wind from Friday Island blows straight across the portion of Prince of Wales Island where there are ninety or 100 pearl-shellers stationed. We know very well that these ulcerated leprous sores are swarming with bacilli, and that flies communicate the disease. Professor Bottinju, one of the best authorities in the world on certain infectious diseases, distinctly states that flies communicate infection. Flies come over in shoals from Friday Island to Prince of Wales Island in the north-west season, and no doubt the disease will be brought by them. The hon. member for Bulimba, Mr. Dickson, said that when he passed by Thursday Island no agitation was going on in connection with this subject, and that the buildings were then being erected; but he passed by in November, and the contract was not let until the 8th of January. Now, I think the Colonial Secretary has taken a very serious responsibility upon himself, because we know that there is great danger from the disease being spread by aboriginals, as it is perfectly impossible to keep the blacks away from the lepers. They can get over the fence of the enclosure, as I have done myself, or get under it. The hon. gentleman further says that the Central Board of Health are of opinion that there is no danger; but what do they know of the position of the islands? They do not know the distances between them, or their positions, or anything else; and judging by the opinions of some of them in another case of leprosy, I feel disinclined to take their opinion. The Colonial Secretary asked one medical gentleman to diagnose a suspected case of leprosy; he stated that he found the bacillus of leprosy. Two members of the board stated that the finding of leprosy bacilli was not characteristic. Now, Dr. Woodend, Director of Laboratory of the conjoint Board of Physicians and Surgeons of England, says that the only factor that is common to all forms of this disease, and that is met with in every case of leprosy, is the leprosy bacillus; and I prefer to take him as an authority than the medical gentlemen I refer to. After the strong protests that have been made during the last three years by the residents of Thursday Island, of the danger that may ensue by making Friday Island a leper station, if the Colonial Secretary still insists upon establishing a leper station on Friday Island he must take the consequences.

Question—That the House do now adjourn—put and negatived.

ADJOURNMENT.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that the House, at its rising, adjourn until Tuesday next.

Question put and passed.

SMALL DEBTS COURT ACT OF 1867 AMENDMENT BILL.

COMMITTEE.

Question—That clause 2, as follows:—

"Small debts courts held within a metropolitan petty sessions district shall have jurisdiction to try actions, otherwise cognisable by a small debts court, where the debt or demand does not exceed one hundred pounds.

"Where the debt or demand exceeds thirty pounds, the decision of the police magistrate presiding at the hearing shall be the judgment of the court"—

be amended by omitting the words "decision of the," with a view of substituting the words "action shall be tried before a"—put.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said he should like to know whether the Committee intended seriously to consider that clause or not. It had been pointed out that it was giving the court

a very large jurisdiction. The hon. member had found it in the law of South Australia; but there the stipendiary magistrates were trained lawyers, and were appointed on account of their competency. Moreover, in South Australia there was no District Court; so that the conditions were entirely different. He did not practise in the small debts court, but he confessed that it seemed to him that the effect of the change would be to multiply the expenses of litigation instead of being a benefit.

Mr. POWERS said he had pointed out that in New Zealand the jurisdiction of the small debts courts had been extended to £50.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: They have no District Court either.

Mr. POWERS said, judging by the new District Court rules published within the last few days, they would have no real District Court in Queensland. If ever there was a cause for the extension he proposed, it was the new District Court rules passed the other day. It was no longer a court for the poor, but a court for the rich—the same as the Supreme Court; and instead of a trial costing £20, it would cost from £40 to £70 in the case of an action under the Employers' Liability Act. The brief used to be limited, but now the solicitor got paid according to the length he could make it. It might go up to £21 10s., if the registrar allowed it. For counsel's fees £5 5s. used to be allowed; now £15 15s. was possible, with refreshers every day. They did not know anything about refreshers before. Instead of a limited liability there was an unlimited liability, and the District Court would be gone as a poor man's court as soon as the new rules came into force. Then, if a trial lasted over one day, provided it occupied two hours or more of that day, for every succeeding day the barrister was allowed a refresher of £7 7s. It ranged from £3 3s. to £15 15s. for refreshers. If people with small cases were to have any chance of getting justice at a reasonable rate, it was by accepting the clause.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said he had not read the District Court rules; but when he heard wild statements made by an hon. member, he always felt inclined to ask the person making them to point out in detail what he was referring to. If the hon. member would point out what he was referring to, it might be found that the actual facts were very different from the inference that he asked the Committee to draw from them.

Mr. POWERS said he had the District Court rules with him. Under the old rules a counsel's fee was limited to £5 5s., and no refreshers were allowed.

Mr. JONES: Ten guineas.

Mr. POWERS said the judge might increase the fee to £10 10s.; but that was all, however long the case might take.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If that was the rule it was a very unjust rule.

Mr. POWERS said they could limit the liability then. On the trial of a defended action the fees to counsel would now range from £3 3s. to £15 15s.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes; under what circumstances?

Mr. POWERS: Under any circumstances. Under the circumstances set out under the rules—cases from £150 to £200.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Exactly.

Mr. POWERS said that there was also the refresher. If a trial extended over one day, provided the trial occupied more than two hours the first day, there was a refresher of £7 7s. in a £200 case.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is quite different to what the hon. member said before.

Mr. POWERS said it was not quite different to what he had intended to say, and he left it to the Committee to say whether it was. Then there were instructions for brief. Formerly the whole brief used to be £3, and if a solicitor lost a case the client would know what he had to pay. He knew that the brief was limited to £3. But under the new rules the charges for instructions for trial of action for counsel or solicitor other than the solicitor or a member of the firm of solicitors for the party were £1 1s., £2 2s., £3 3s., £5 5s., £7 7s.—he was taking an ordinary action for £150 in the District Court—and £10 10s. on a £200 case; and, in the latter case, in the discretion of the registrar ——

The CHIEF SECRETARY: What is the latter case?

Mr. POWERS: On the trial of action.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: But in what sort of case?

Mr. POWERS said that it was on the trial of any action—that was the latter case. There were (*a*), (*b*), (*c*), (*d*)—(*a*) on appeal or application for a new trial, (*b*) on any interlocutory or other application in court or chambers; and in the latter case, if the registrar was friendly with the one solicitor and not with the other, he might allow £3 3s. Previously it was in the hands of the judges, and he contended that it was better to leave it in the hands of the judges than to have such matters decided by the registrar.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Are you reading the heading of the columns?

Mr. POWERS said he was reading the scale from £150 up to £200

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. gentleman was speaking when he commenced about £30, and anyone who did not know would think he was still referring to that.

Mr. POWERS said they ranged from £3 3s. to £15 15s. He was now talking of an ordinary action for £150, where they were allowed £7 7s., but the registrar might allow £15 15s. Under the old rules the charge had been £5 5s., or the judge might allow £10 10s. if the case went on.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: What are they under £100? We are not dealing with over £100 in the Bill.

Mr. POWERS said that he was talking of the District Court and the extended jurisdiction. He would take a case up to £30, which the Bill proposed to deal with, and he found the charge for drawing a brief, including proofs of evidence, was 1s. per folio of seventy-two words or figures, and 6d. per folio for copying. There used to be a limit before. Then the registrar could allow up to £3 3s. for the instructions for brief in cases between £10 and £30. In cases between £30 and £50 it increased to £2 2s., which the registrar might, at his discretion, increase to £5 5s. Previously it was limited to £3 for drawing the brief, and the brief was £3 3s. or £5 5s., as the case might be, the judge having the power to increase it to £10 10s. Under the new rules, taking a case between £50 and £100, the amount allowed on the trial of action was £3 3s., which could be increased by the registrar to £7 7s. That was simply for the instructions for the brief—he was not taking

into account any of the fees. The fees that would be allowed to counsel in cases between £10 and £30 would be £3 3s.; between £30 and £50, £5 5s.; £7 7s. in cases between £50 and £100; and then there were the refreshers. He contended that the limited liability which had existed under the old rules was preferable, as a solicitor could then tell his client what the cost would be. If ever there had been any reason for the extension of the jurisdiction of the small debts court—which they had affirmed the other night—there was certainly more reason now than ever before after the issue of those new rules for the District Court. A man would now incur an unlimited liability in taking a case before the District Court, and would rather go to the Supreme Court.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that some hon. members appeared to think that because legal members disagreed with the hon. member for Burrum they were making a "dead set" at him. For his own part, so far as regarded the hon. member's desire for law reform, he (the Colonial Secretary) had always supported him in that desire. He quite appreciated the hon. gentleman's efforts to cheapen the cost of law, and of the practice and procedure of the courts; but when he got up and said that, while quite agreeing with the motives of the hon. member, he did not consider the hon. gentleman's mode of dealing with the question would have the effect he desired, hon. members said that the legal members were fighting the battle of their union against the hon. member for Burrum.

Mr. GLASSEY: That is my opinion.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that unless his duty demanded that he should do so, he did not feel much inclined to get up and state his reasons for opposing the hon. member's clauses. There was much in the Bill deserving of support and encouragement, but it did not follow that he should therefore support the Bill as a whole, although the Committee could do as they liked. He had only risen to state that he would give the hon. gentleman every assistance in any reasonable measure of law reform. When he had spoken, when the Bill had been before them on a previous occasion, they were dealing with one particular clause, and he had not made a single observation as to the wishes of the hon. member in regard to law reform. He had only taken the clause itself and explained what it meant. He had narrowed his remarks down to the question—Was it wise to increase the power of the stipendiary magistrates in the metropolitan districts to deal with cases from £30 or £100?

Mr. BLACK: And the Committee decided that it was.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that he did not hesitate to say that they had decided the matter not understanding it—not understanding what was the question they were dividing upon.

Mr. AGNEW: That is a great compliment to pay hon. members.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that he had often come into the Chamber—and so had other hon. members—when the division-bell rang, not knowing exactly the merits of the matter under discussion. Of course, if the Committee were still of the same mind—that it was advisable to increase the jurisdiction of the police magistrates from £30 to £100—he had nothing more to say on the matter. He had given his reasons for opposing it; and since then he had had the opportunity of consulting with many of the police magistrates, and their opinion was that it was very hard for them now, using their best energies, to do justice between the parties on intricate questions of law involved in cases up to £30; and it would be too hard to expect them to decide all the difficult questions that might be involved up to £100. He had looked up the observations he made on the last occasion, because the hon. member for Burrum and some other hon. members said that he talked "in and out," but he could find nothing in the report that he did not now endorse. With every respect for the integrity and the ability of the police magistrates, and also for their impartiality, which he had never questioned in his life, he said it was too much in Queensland to expect the present magistrates, or any magistrates they could afford to pay, to do the work proposed. There was the Supreme Court and there was the District Court available, and a man would choose the court which would give him the best justice; and it was hard to expect the stipendiary magistrates to decide cases up to £100. He had always been in favour of having "a preliminary canter" in those matters, and he would explain what he meant by that. The wardens had never been professional men, yet they had always had unlimited power to decide up to any amount in the warden's court.

Mr. POWERS: And they are police magistrates.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that if a suitor was dissatisfied with the decision of the warden, or the police magistrate acting as warden, he could express his dissatisfaction and begin again. On a second occasion he would have his case tried by a judge with a jury. There were many cases which were rightly decided by a warden, though he was not a professional man, and there was no necessity to go before a judge and jury; but there were many cases in which the best warden or the best police magistrate might be wrong, and when the suitor was dissatisfied he could have his case tried before a judge with a jury. Then the evidence was given over again, and persons were brought face to face as if they had never been in the court below. The hon. member's proposal was simply to make the stipendiary magistrate decide the matter, except upon questions of law, and there was a difficulty of getting even questions of law revised, although the difficulty was not insuperable. Practically upon questions of fact, which would under ordinary circumstances be decided by a skilled judge and a jury, he would make the man who happened to be a police magistrate the sole and final arbiter. He (the Colonial Secretary) would say no more. He had given the best advice he could to the Committee. He believed that, as Queensland was situated at the present time, it would not be wise to extend the jurisdiction of stipendiary justices from £30 to £100.

Mr. GANNON said he would ask how it came about that those increased District Court charges were allowed. Who was responsible?

Mr. BARLOW: The judges make the rules.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I never saw them yet.

Mr. GANNON said he knew that Supreme Court judges could allow £4 14s. 6d. costs for writs that cost about 3s. 4d.

Mr. JONES: You write one out.

Mr. GANNON said they were printed. He could write out 100 in an hour, and would be glad to get 1s. apiece for them. He would give up auctioneering then.

Mr. JONES: You would make a very poor living.

Mr. GANNON said he would make a very good living at it. The hon. member for Burrum deserved the greatest credit for fighting almost single-handed against the other legal members.

He believed the time would come very shortly when an end would be put to the present practice, and that costs would be limited, so that when suitors went to law they would know beforehand what it would cost them. If an Act was passed limiting costs to 20 per cent., say, on the amount of the verdict, and a person brought an action for £1,000 against him, he would know that in any case he would not have to pay more than £200 costs; but under the present state of the law he might lose £1,500 or £2,000, or even £5,000, in defending the action, and not win after all. He had a lively recollection of a case brought before the judges not long ago. It was a question in which certain defendants tried to get leave to defend in an action which hon. members probably recollected. There was a certain document in existence that should have been cancelled, and the defendants in the case, representing £1,800 or £1,900, went before the judge and asked leave to defend. Leave to defend was refused by the single judge. Then they went before the Full Court—that was before its reconstruction—he did not think such a thing would happen now—and asked for leave to defend. Of course, the other judges felt bound to support their brother judge, and they refused leave to defend. What they wanted leave to defend for was to prove that the document that was in existence should have been cancelled. The amount in dispute was £450, though the action was for £1,800 or £1,900, and it cost them about 300 guineas. He thought it was time to have the law made so that rich and poor might stand and fight one another in courts of justice fairly. He believed the Bill now before the Committee would help to do that, and therefore he thought it should be supported by hon. members. He was sorry to hear that the new District Court rules, which most hon. members thought were going to cheapen law, were really going to increase the expense. If the will of the Assembly was to be set aside by rules made by gentlemen who seemed to be beyond that Assembly, he thought that something must be done and would be done. He felt confident that after the general election the new Assembly would take the matter in hand and provide a remedy. It was a disgrace to our civilisation that a man could not go into a court of law with a just cause without running the risk of being ruined. If the plaintiff got a verdict, the usual thing was for his solicitor to make the defendant pay all he possibly could—to stick it into the defendant; and if the plaintiff lost, then it was the usual thing for the defendant's solicitor to stick it into the plaintiff.

Mr. POWERS said it was very easy to be wise after the event; but he anticipated the difficulty, and provided against it in the Legal Reform Bill by having a scale of costs. He fixed that scale a little higher than that allowed in the South Australian courts, and if that had been adopted the difficulty would have been overcome. It was not a case of the judges going against the will of the Assembly; it was placing the will of the Assembly in the hands of the judges, and the only way to bring about legal reform was for Parliament to take the matter in hand. Of course, legal members argued that the Committee did not know anything about the subject, but he contended that that was the only way to effect reform. The reason why costs could not be increased in the small debts court was that Parliament had fixed a scale of costs. As had been said by a high authority, it would appear from the way that costs were multiplied as if man was made for the lawyers and not lawyers for the benefit of man. It was only by Parliament fixing the scale of costs that costs would ever be lessened, and he was now asking the Committee to increase the jurisdiction of a court in which the costs were fixed by Act of Parliament.

Mr. JONES said he had no doubt that it was a very good thing to try and cheapen law, and give all those facilities to suitors. The exertions of the hon. member for Burrum to reform the law certainly merited the approbation of the Committee and the public, but the hon. member could hardly understand the effect of what he was proposing to do. It was said that that Bill was going to give increased jurisdiction to small debts courts, and that the fees allowed to solicitors and advocates were fixed by the original Act. When a plaintiff wished to bring an action for the recovery of a debt he, of course, went to the most astute solicitor he could find, and employed the most skilled advocate he could get. But would any of those professional gentlemen act in a matter involving a great deal of labour and research for the miserable fees allowed for the recovery of a debt of £10? No, they would not; it would not pay them to do it.

Mr. POWERS: They do it in South Australia.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The costs in South Australia are heavier than in any of the other colonies.

Mr. JONES said they did not do it in South Australia. The hon. member proposed in that Bill that when a man got a verdict in a small debts court he should have the right to issue an execution against the lands of the defendant. But who was to pay the costs of getting out that execution and making the necessary searches in the Real Property Office? Those costs would come out of the unfortunate plaintiff, and not out of the defendant. There was not a single clause in the Bill providing that the costs should fall on anybody, and the magistrates had no power to make rules except as to the issue of the plaint.

Mr. POWERS: We have amended that.

Mr. JONES said that had not been amended; the matter had been omitted altogether. The Bill was not to protect plaintiffs, but to protect defendants from costs, and an unfortunate plaintiff if he wished to realise his execution would have to go to a large expense, perhaps £20 or £30, and might get nothing from the defendant. That was the legal reform proposed in the Bill.

Mr. MACFARLANE said the discussion that afternoon reminded him very much of the old proverb that "doctors differ." Lawyers also differed. He had thought very much about law and law expenses, more particularly since he became a member of the House, and he had come to the conclusion that the law wanted to be thoroughly reformed. The amount of cruelty that was exercised by lawyers in connection with their clients was something outrageous, and it was high time not only that the law was reformed, but also that they had some different way of deciding disputes—something in the way of arbitration. If they had, many cases which cost many pounds when taken into court would be settled for £1 or £2. Since that Bill had come before the House a case had been brought under his notice which illustrated what he meant by the cruelty of the law. A poor man who gave a bill for £28 to another person found himself unable to meet it when it became due, and an action for the recovery of the amount was brought against him in the District Court. The case was undefended, and was disposed of in less than two minutes, yet the amount of the debt was increased by the legal expenses to £33. Where did the expenses come in? He (Mr. Macfarlane) thought the Committee should assist the hon. member for Burrum, who was nobly

defending the cause of the poor. He did not expect the lawyers to assist the hon. member, but he implored the lay members to help the hon. member in his endeavours to do what he could to cheapen law. It was ridiculous that poor people who knew nothing about law, but were dragged into it by solicitors telling them that they had a good case, should be ruined by the costs of a suit; and he hoped, therefore, hon. members would render all the assistance they could to effect a reform in that direction.

Mr. BARLOW said he did not believe in indulging in any rough talk about the lawyers; that was not the way to get reform. A man had spoken to him very roughly about a learned gentleman in the colony because that gentleman had received very large fees in a certain case, and he (Mr. Barlow) replied, "Do not blame the gentleman himself; blame the system." He mentioned in the House the other day a case in which a man was utterly ruined by a lawsuit, and the Chief Secretary very properly interjected that it was a matter which, although it only involved a sum of £70, must under the existing law come before the Supreme Court. The only way it could be brought forward was by a motion for an injunction restraining the defendant from doing certain things. The case was an exceedingly simple one. The man had only himself to blame for his foolishness. The municipal council of South Brisbane wanted to make a drain through the back of an allotment, which did not appear to be of immense value. The damage by that proceeding was estimated at £70. Would it not be an easy matter to take such a case before a police magistrate? Either the corporation had a right to do that thing or they had not a right to do it. If they had a right to do it, irrespective of damage, then let them do it; and if they had a right to do it, but not to occasion any damage, and yet did it in such a manner as to occasion damage, they should pay for the damage done. But why should there be such a rigmarole, so many affidavits, and such a multiplication of papers in the legal proceedings necessary to decide such a case? Was it not possible to have the case tried before a magistrate? Could he not have gone down like a sensible man and have looked at the place, and said, "Well, this is wrong, and there has been so much damage inflicted?" Instead of that he (Mr. Barlow) did not know how many pounds worth of costs were incurred in getting leave to defend, or to have some other person put in as defendant. It appeared to him that the municipality of South Brisbane wished to get behind some other fortification, whose name he would not mention.

Mr. STEPHENS: The man was offered a compromise and would not accept it.

Mr. BARLOW said he thought the man was excessively foolish, but he got into the meshes of a system stronger than himself and it crushed him. Of course, if a man deliberately lay down in front of an advancing steam-roller, he should not be surprised if it crushed him; and that was what that man did. But the fault was in the system, and through there not being some short, speedy, and efficacious way of deciding a matter of common-sense. They were repeatedly told by the Chief Secretary, and they had no higher authority, that it was not the amount involved in a case that determined the amount of costs; and a dispute about £5 might involve the consideration of points of law which would move the Privy Council, and all the rest of it, while a dispute about £20,000 might be so simple that there could be no possible doubt about it. But why not try the experiment of allowing the courts of petty sessions to deal with these matters? If a mistake was made the people would soon cry out about it. He saw in some book the other day that in England they had a system of cheap probates, under which letters of administration and probate of wills might be taken out for something like £2. If the kind of thing that was complained of went on, it would only add to the agitation going on on the subject all over the colony and all over Australia. The people rebelled against it, and they would only become still more uncomfortable and irritable under it. He would be glad to see some great lawyer take the matter in hand and simplify it; and if that was not done, the trouble would burst some day.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said he did not wish to occupy the time of the Committee, but he really must protest against the suggestion made that members of the legal profession were unwilling to consider these matters honestly. No less an insinuation than that had been made that afternoon.

Mr. BARLOW: I did not intend to do so.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said the hon. member did not do so, but other hon. members had made that insinuation very plainly, and he protested against it. He thought he had shown, during the many years he had been in Parliament, an inclination to amend the law and simplify it, and he ventured to say hon. members would find upon the statute-book more laws simplifying legal proceedings of which he was the author than they would find proposed by any other person.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: The most stupid laws in the world.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said he had assisted in every way he could to simplify the law; but he was not prepared to submit to the hon. member for Burrum coming there and inviting them to believe that he was wiser than all the judges of the Supreme and Districts Courts, and that the only way to reform the law was to take what the hon. member said was right. If the hon. member proposed a sensible measure he would be glad to assist him in passing it; but if he proposed something which, with the knowledge of the subject he (the Chief Secretary) possessed, seemed to him not to be a sensible proposal, he would be failing in his duty if he did not point that out. It was very easy for laymen to say that because a lawyer opposed a proposal of alleged legal reform he did so from evil motives; but he protested against that argument being used. He protested against the imputation of evil motives against himself and other members of the Committee because they did not happen to fall in with the fads of the hon. member for Burrum, for that was all it amounted to. He was getting tired of that sort of argument. He had had much greater experience than the hon. member, and if he could point out that something which the hon. member proposed and said would work well, would work all wrong and would lead to inconvenience and trouble, it was his duty to do so. Let them argue the matter on its merits. He was prepared to do so and not to occupy too much time over it; but he protested against anything he said being necessarily considered as unworthy of attention simply because it was opposed to what was said by the hon. member for Burrum.

Mr. POWERS said that so far as the matter they were at present discussing was concerned, the clause he was trying to get passed would simply give the proposed increased jurisdiction to one, two, or three police magistrates in the colony, if there were such men in the colony whom the Government could trust.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is not what the discussion is about, unfortunately.

Mr. POWERS said that was what the Bill said, and if the Government could not find men in whom they could place that trust, no harm would be done. The hon. gentleman talked of "fads," and though he thought the hon. gentleman had been in the House for about twenty years, he did not know any law he had yet passed that had lessened costs.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The second session I was in the House I brought in a Bill which reduced the costs of equity suits by about two-thirds.

Mr. POWERS said that so far as equity was concerned, when he brought in his first measure of legal reform he had shown that those costs in ordinary actions were less expensive before 1876 than they were now, and he gave a list of the cases tried and the costs. He said those costs had increased because the costs were not fixed. The hon. gentleman told the Committee that he (Mr. Powers) came there and said he was wiser than the Supreme and District Court judges. That was not so; but he said that the experience they had in any country showed that the only way in which costs could be limited was by fixing a scale of costs by Parliament. Wherever that had been done it had succeeded. When he was in South Australia he saw the clerks of the local courts, and the Secretary for Education, who was also a solicitor, and they told him that their experience in South Australia was just what the Royal Commission found in 1886, and that the fixed scale of costs was a real protection to the public. The scale of costs they had, had been in force for twenty-six years, and the people would not think of repealing them. He was not putting his wisdom against that of the judges, but simply pointed out that in the matter of law reform the only way to reduce costs was for Parliament to fix a scale. The hon. member for North Rockhampton had pointed out that some of the costs would fall upon the plaintiff, but if the principle of extending the jurisdiction of the magistrates to cases involving £100 was affirmed, they would soon have a Bill dealing with the small debts courts submitted by the Chief Secretary as he had done in connection with the District Court. The hon. gentleman brought in a Bill there which became law, and the only fault in it was that it did not extend the amount beyond £200. It had had a beneficial effect, and if the hon. gentleman had extended the amount it would do a great deal of good in the colony, and prevent a lot of cases being brought before the Supreme Court with loss to the public and benefit only to the profession. When the hon. gentleman talked about "a fad," he might say that if it had been a "fad," the House would have refused before now to listen to those questions. The House had already seen that he was in earnest in the matter, and if he made a mistake the members of the profession should point it out to him instead of abusing him.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the question they had to consider was whether that proposal would lessen costs.

Mr. POWERS: Yes; it will.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he would just show the Committee that in one way it would not. A man brought his action before one of these police magistrates, who, unless new billets were to be created and high officials appointed, would not have the training of Supreme Court or District Court judges, and would, therefore, naturally be liable to err on points of law. Two persons would go to law in the small debts court; the one who was disappointed with the verdict would not stop there. If that ended the matter probably the costs would be cheapened, but it would not. The man had his right to go further, and in 99 cases out of 100 he would take the case to the District Court, and there he would be met with the costs the hon. gentleman referred to.

Mr. POWERS: No; it is simply an appeal.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that in some cases the costs of appeal were as high as those at the trial. The man would have a second go in the District Court, and if he was not successful there, he would say, "Having gone so far, I will have my revenge; I shall go to the Supreme Court." He had known people in hundreds of cases deliberately go to law against the advice of their solicitors. He had known persons come into his office, put down a couple of guineas to go to law to determine to whom a turkey belonged, and he had said, "Surely you are not going to law for the sake of a turkey worth only a few shillings?" The reply was, "Never you mind; that has nothing to do with you; you do your duty, and satisfy the court as to my right to that particular turkey." Therefore, the result under the hon. gentleman's proposal would be that, in the first place, there would be a trial in the small debts court; then an appeal to the District Court, where the costs were fixed by scale, and then the party dissatisfied would probably go to the Supreme Court. There would be no finality. Persons would not be satisfied with the decision of one man. The absence of a jury seemed to him to be fatal to the hon. gentleman's contention that the scheme proposed would cheapen costs. He (the Colonial Secretary) knew something of human nature, and was satisfied that when four men to whom a case was referred for judgment decided that a person was wrong, he would go no further; whereas if the case was decided by a stipendiary magistrate in whom, perhaps, he had no confidence, he would probably appeal to the District Court and then to the Supreme Court. He was certain the hon. gentleman's proposal would not have the effect he intended it to have, but that it would keep people going into the vortex of law until probably they would be overwhelmed by Supreme Court costs.

Mr. POWERS said if the hon. gentleman had had the scale of costs before him he would not have made the statement he had, because he (Mr. Powers) would show that he was entirely wrong. Under the District Court rules the cost of "Instructions for appeal or application for new trial" was £1 1s. "Instructions for brief on appeal" were the same. "On trial of action" the costs on brief were not to exceed £21, and the business could be done for £15 15s. under the rules.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The rules will probably be altered if the Bill pass in this form.

Mr. POWERS said if the judges were prepared to go in the face of Parliament that might be so; but he contended that his proposal would cheapen costs to a great extent. As the hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Barlow, had said, if a man was not satisfied with a verdict under the Bill, he could go to the District Court and get the decision of a judge of that court for one-fifth the cost he could now.

Mr. FOXTON: The appeal is only on questions of law or rejection or reception of evidence.

Mr. POWERS said that under the Bill if any person was dissatisfied with the decision of the magistrates, he could appeal to the District Court.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Only on the original evidence.

Mr. POWERS said the original evidence would be taken down and sent to the judge, who might order a new trial in the small debts court.

Mr. FOXTON: Which he will in most cases.

Mr. POWERS said the appeals from the decision of justices were very rare indeed.

Mr. FOXTON: There will be a great many more under this Bill.

Mr. POWERS said if there were, the business could be done at a great deal less expense than at present.

Mr. BARLOW said he should like to know why a case could not be agreed to by the plaintiff and the defendant to a suit, and be submitted to a District Court judge for decision in his own private office.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: There would be no need for lawyers at all then.

Mr. BARLOW said the idea might be intensely ridiculous to legal members of the Committee, but it was not so in his humble judgment. Supposing a magistrate gave a decision on the bench, would it not be in accordance with common sense for the persons concerned to state their reasons on a piece of paper, send them to a District Court judge with the request, "Say whether I am right or the other party is right." That would be a common-sense way of getting over the difficulty, and would do away with costs to a great extent. A similar course to that had been followed in the highest court in the colony, which was asked for a decision as to the validity of the will of the late Hon. James Swan, and also in the case of the British and Australian Trust and Loan Company *v.* McCarthy. Certain facts were submitted to the court upon which a decision was given. Many cases could be settled by the parties coming to an agreement upon certain facts, and referring them to a judge for his decision in his own rooms. The present course of proceedings was getting beyond all bearing, and the people would not suffer it much longer.

Mr. JONES said a good story was told of a person who went into the Court of Chancery, and after hearing a case argued on one side, he said to the Lord Chancellor, "Why didn't you give him a verdict?" The Chancellor replied, "I must wait until I hear the other side;" and after hearing the other side the person referred to said he did not know who should get the verdict. The great difficulty in the way of what the hon. gentleman had suggested was to get two men to agree to a statement of facts, and the most difficult duty of magistrates was to decide after hearing a case which side to believe. He sometimes pitied those who had to give a decision upon evidence that was directly opposite —one side against the other.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Judges are in the same predicament.

Mr. JONES said that police magistrates and justices were not so accustomed to weigh evidence as District Court and Supreme Court judges. Previous to 1867, when a person was entitled to an appeal to the District Court, he was entitled to have a rehearing of the case. The witnesses were brought, and the judge had an opportunity of observing their demeanour. Nowadays, the evidence of the witnesses was taken down by the clerk of the small debts court. Sometimes that work was done very well, but more often, he was sorry to say, it was not done with any attempt at accuracy; the facts put before the District Court judge were not properly stated, and the very point, perhaps, that the appellant relied upon, was not there. To appeal with a jurisdiction increased to £100 would be very dangerous.

Mr. FOXTON said it was with some diffidence that he took part in the discussion, because last week, when he and other legal members expressed an opinion as to whether the measure would work well or not, some lay members of the Committee seemed to think that, in speaking against the proposed extension of jurisdiction, they were actuated by purely interested motives. Such was not the case. But there was one thing he desired to point out, and that was, that a reduction in the scale of fees was by no means the way to cheapen law. To reduce the scale of fees simply meant that the losing party would have less to pay, and that the successful party would have to make up the difference. In that way they were really making law more expensive. He would call the attention of hon. members to one fact. The Bill before them had been the subject of conversation between himself and other members of the legal profession during the past week, and there was not a solitary one among them who had not expressed to him the opinion that the increased jurisdiction to £100 would be a splendid thing for them, for the simple reason that there would be increased fees; and that was entirely his own opinion. Hon. members need not be under the impression that he was opposing the Bill because if it became law there might be some little loss of income to himself. What he wished particularly to impress on the Committee was that the lowering of the scale of fees would not cheapen law. A lawyer preferred to get costs out of the opposite party, but under the proposed system he would have to get them out of his own client, who was probably his friend. If they were going to reduce the scale of fees to such an extent as not to make it worth his while to proceed against a party on the strength of the costs if successful, it stood to reason that the costs would have to come out of the successful party's pocket. Even if the scale of fees was reduced by one-half—say from 6s. 8d. to 3s. 4d. for an interview —that would not cheapen law. It simply meant that you could not recover costs from the other side, and that a lawyer's own client would have to pay if he wanted his services.

Mr. AGNEW said the hon. member might just as well apply his argument to any tailor in Queen street, and say that by reducing the price of a suit of clothes it did not cheapen the cost of clothing. In the same way, he maintained, the reducing of lawyers' fees by one-half would cheapen the cost of law, for it was not likely that a client would have two interviews at 3s. 4d. each instead of one at 6s. 8d. However, with the hon. gentleman's main contention he was inclined to agree. Although not in the legal profession, he had taken the trouble to consult many of his friends who were in it with regard to the Bill, and not one lawyer had given his sincere and honest opinion in favour of the Bill as a means of cheapening law. On the contrary, they one and all said it would be a good thing for them, and that if they had been members of the House it would certainly be to their own pecuniary interests to support it. As he could not and did not want to understand those legal matters, he was prepared to take the opinions of those he could trust; but he was also in entire sympathy with the hon. member in his desire to cheapen law, because he knew of some instances in which flagrant abuses took place daily. He would ask hon. members to bear with him while he described one case, and if the head of the Government could rectify the difficulty he would be doing a great deal for Queensland. It was not generally known that if a tailor or bootmaker sent a bill from Townsville for £5 10s. or £7 10s. to a man in Brisbane, the only means of defending the claim was by going to Townsville. He did not want to initiate

anybody into a new system of making money; but in these hard times if people only knew the easy way of making money——

Mr. DALRYMPLE: They will know now.

Mr. AGNEW said that was the only way of defending such a claim—by going to the town where the tailor or bootmaker carried on business.

Mr. JONES: A man is not going to perjure himself for £5 10s.

Mr. AGNEW said his experience was that they did. Now, it fell unfortunately to his own lot to go to Townsville to defend a case for £12 odd, and though he was associated at the time with one of the leading barristers of Brisbane on the directorate, he had no hesitation in advising him to pay the money, although he knew that he (Mr. Agnew) was not indebted one fraction. However, he determined that he would not pay, but would rather go to Townsville; and what was the result? As soon as he arrived there the case against him was withdrawn. He had gone up at his own expense, and wasted his time to find that the man had arranged with some solicitor; and although there was no case, the solicitor had the audacity to ask his solicitor if he would accept a verdict by consent. He (Mr. Agnew) got the verdict, but had to pay all expenses. A second case was brought against him at Rockhampton; but his time was too valuable just then to allow him to go North, and, although he was no more indebted than in the other case, he consented to a verdict of £4.

Mr. BARLOW: That is a new industry.

Mr. AGNEW said if the hon. member for Burrum could grapple with that abuse in his Bill he was very anxious to assist him, but on the general principle of the measure he agreed with the hon. member for Carnarvon that it would increase the expenses of litigants.

Mr. POWERS said he remembered when Sir Robert Torrens tried to get his Act through, he said the greatest difficulty he had to contend with was the nods and winks of the lawyers outside the House, which he dreaded far more than the arguments of the lawyers inside the House. He said he would take no notice of the nods of lawyers outside, because he had to contend with the arguments used inside the House. He (Mr. Powers) was in exactly the same position now. Only that day his partner said to him, "So and so spoke to me about your Bill to-day. He had not the slightest idea what the Bill was, and when I told him what it was he found it was entirely different to what he had supposed." That was just the same kind of argument as those used by the lawyers who spoke to the hon. members for Nundah and Carnarvon. Surely to goodness he had enough to do in answering the lawyers inside the House, and he could not be expected to deal with outside arguments. He would not reply to arguments used outside the House; and, as far as cheapening law was concerned, let the lawyers who opposed him bring in some measure that would cheapen it; but they would not do it. The only Bills that had been brought in for that purpose were introduced by himself and by the Government, and if they had been carried to their full extent they would have cheapened law. He considered it was unfair to ask him to answer lawyers whose arguments he had not heard. Let hon. gentlemen fight in the House on their own ground. As matters had gone so far, he would move that the Chairman leave the chair, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed; and the CHAIRMAN reported progress.

On the motion of Mr. POWERS, the further consideration of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for Thursday, 7th July.

ELECTIONS BILL.

On the Order of the Day being called for the recommittal of this Bill,

The CHIEF SECRETARY said: Mr. Speaker,—I move that you do now leave the chair.

Question put and passed.

COMMITTEE.

On clause 1, as follows:—

"This Act may be cited as the Elections Act of 1892, and shall be read and construed with and as an amendment of the Elections Act of 1885 (hereinafter called the principal Act) and the Elections Act of 1885 Amendment Act of 1886, which Acts and this Act may together be cited as the Elections Acts, 1885 to 1892."

Mr. GLASSEY said when the Bill was up for its second reading he stated that he did not think the title of the Bill expressed the real intentions of the Government, and he then said the title should have been "The Prevention of Working Men from Voting Act." That was his opinion still; and if the doubts which he entertained could be removed by any further explanation from the Chief Secretary, he would be glad to receive it. He must confess that he viewed the Bill with suspicion, and the chief ground of suspicion arose from the fact that the measure placed innumerable difficulties in the way of persons wishing to be enrolled. The difficulties, in all conscience, were sufficiently great already. He had often expressed the opinion that, in order to give the people every possible facility in that direction, persons should be appointed for that specific purpose. He had no desire to see the enrolment of electors in the hands of irresponsible persons; and it would be much better if responsible persons were appointed in each electorate, whose duty it would be to see that each *bonâ fide* elector obtained his vote. That was not the case at present, and he was sure the difficulties would be increased enormously under the Bill. Another very strong objection he had to the Bill, and one which demanded an alteration of the title, was that there was no provision made for the enfranchisement of a very large number of persons who were entitled to have votes. He had stated during his remarks on the second reading of the Bill that one man out of every four of the white population of the colony, irrespective—and he used that word advisedly, and after having gone very carefully into the question—one man out of every four, irrespective of those persons who were disqualified by the present Act from voting, had no vote. He had gone into the details very carefully, and would give proof for every statement he made. One man out of every four had not got the franchise, and no provision at all was made in the Bill for conferring the franchise upon those individuals; therefore he was suspicious of the measure, and he was perfectly convinced that the real intention of the Government, and of those who supported the Bill, was to increase the difficulty of working men in this colony getting the franchise.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No.

Mr. GLASSEY said that the intention of the Bill was to prevent those men from getting the franchise, and, if possible, prevent those who were on the rolls of the colony from remaining there.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said that he wished the Chairman would confine the hon. member to the clause under the consideration of the Committee. If the hon. member was desirous of altering the short title he should submit an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN said: The hon. member is not acting strictly in accordance with the rules of the Committee. If he wishes to raise a question as to the appropriateness of the short title he should move an amendment upon that before he goes any further.

Mr. GLASSEY said that there was nothing easier than that, and with that end in view he wished now to move the omission of the words, "The Elections Act of 1892," in the 1st line of the clause, and after he did that, he intended to move the insertion of the word "not" after the word "shall" in the 2nd line. For the words he proposed to omit he intended to move the insertion of the words "The Prevention of Working Men from Voting Act"; and he would discuss the Bill from that point of view. Coming back to the Bill, and his reasons for opposing that portion of the clause, and the clause, and the Bill as a whole, but more particularly to the words he had now moved the omission of——

The CHAIRMAN: Do I understand the hon. member to move an amendment?

Mr. GLASSEY said that he moved the omission of the words "The Elections Act of 1892," with the view of inserting the words, "The Prevention of Working Men from Voting Act." That was the title he intended to give the Bill.

Amendment put.

Mr. GLASSEY said he was saying that the difficulties in connection with getting on the roll at the present time were very great. There was not one person in twenty who understood how to correctly fill up the form as it stood at present, and the difficulties would be increased enormously by the provisions of the Bill now under consideration. It had been contended by the Government that there had been a great deal of roll-stuffing going on; but he had not heard any proof yet with regard to that.

Mr. ANNEAR: What about the cases at the South Brisbane Police Court?

Mr. GLASSEY said it was surprising that no sooner were two or three persons——

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Found out.

Mr. GLASSEY said it was really surprising that no sooner were two or three persons brought up at the police court than, because they happened to be working men, and although the most reasonable excuses were given —and truthful excuses—why those mistakes were made, the Government, with the destinies of 400,000 persons in their hands, were panic-stricken, their anger was aroused, their souls were stirred within them, and they decided that there must be a purification of the rolls. He believed there was a member of the patriotic league who had committed an error. What was the reason he was not brought before the court?

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: He was not found out.

Mr. GLASSEY said it had been found out, and it was known to the local authorities. The labour party did not employ detectives; they did their work in the open day, and invited the closest investigation and criticism.

Mr. AGNEW: You employ detectives. That is my criticism.

Mr. GLASSEY said it was only the patriotic league who employed detectives. He would prove from statistics that there had been no roll-stuffing, and now he was going to challenge the Chief Secretary or the Colonial Secretary to point out an electorate where the supposed roll-stuffing had taken place. For the benefit of the Committee and the country, more particularly the latter, he was going to put on record the true facts of the case, so far as he had been able to gather information from the statistics at hand.

Mr. BLACK: Take Mr. Carter's case first.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Take the numerous withdrawals of last week.

Mr. GLASSEY said that when he last spoke he referred to the white adult population of the colony, and to the number of names on the electoral rolls up to date, and then said that 25,000 or 26,000 men in the colony were disfranchised. The Colonial Secretary interjected, "Including prisoners, lunatics, and everybody else that are not entitled by law to vote." On the 5th April, 1891, according to the census return, there were 108,116 white adults in Queensland. He then said that there were 88,931 names on the electoral rolls, and also referred to the fact, which he thought would not be disputed, that there must be at least 10,000 duplicate votes—proprietors who did not live in their respective electorates, but had property there. Deducting 10,000 from 88,931 left 78,931. Now he would give the figures relating to those persons disqualified by the Elections Act of 1886, so far as he had been able to gather the facts up to date. Members of the police force, 785; police magistrates and clerks of petty sessions, 75; assistant clerks of petty sessions, 70; returning-officers, 60; members of the permanent defence force, 100; men in Dunwich, 596; men in prisons, 306; lunatics—males, 762; making a total of 2,754. So that making the full deductions from the number of electors he had already mentioned, there were 26,491 men in Queensland who had no vote.

Mr. PAUL: Because they do not get their names placed on the roll.

Mr. GLASSEY said he would ask whether it was not a reasonable thing to ask that some provision should be made whereby those persons might have a vote. They must in the ordinary nature of things, under the law for raising taxation in the colony, provide one-fourth of the revenue obtained through the Customs, but, notwithstanding that, they had no voice in the legislation of the country. They were bound, of course, to maintain the law, and he contended that many of them who were disfranchised in consequence of the nature of their employment were the backbone of the life of the country. It was monstrously unfair that such a very large number of persons should be deprived of having any voice in the legislation of the country, and that no provision was made in that Bill for enfranchising those persons; yet hon. members were told that it was a Bill for purifying the rolls, so that at the next general election they should get a true expression of the opinion of the country. Where did that come in? It did not come in in that Bill. In addition to the facts he had already mentioned, and to bear out his argument, he would put on record the number of electors in each electorate in the colony, together with the number of white adult males in each, as shown by the census taken on the 5th of April, 1891. Then he would ask the persons who brought in that measure for the purification of the rolls—which was the plea put forward for its introduction, though not the real reason—to give some tangible proof with regard to the alleged roll-stuffing. On the 5th April, 1891, there were in the Albert electorate 1,521 white male adults, and the number of names on the roll at the present time was 1,489. In the Aubigny electorate there were 2,161 men, and the number of names now on the electoral roll was 1,127.

Mr. BARLOW: There has been no opposition to the member of that electorate for years.

Mr. GLASSEY said he wanted hon. members to pay serious attention to the figures he was quoting, as they were particularly significant.

Mr. AGNEW: We have had them circulated amongst us in print.

Mr. GLASSEY said in the Balonne electorate there were 1,844 men, and there were now 547 names on the electoral roll, so that only a little more than one-fourth of the whole population of that electorate were registered as electors. In the Barcoo electorate there were 2,907 men, and the latest return he had showed that there were 1,395 persons on the roll. That was the number on the roll when the last by-election took place. In the Bowen electorate there were 1,264 men, and the number of names on the roll was 649. He would ask hon. members to bear in their minds the figures he was now going to mention. In Brisbane North there were 3,891 men, and there were 3,879 voters on the roll, including 1,000 duplicate voters, so that in reality 1,500 or 1,600 men who ought to be enrolled in North Brisbane were not on the roll. In Brisbane South there were 3,992 men, and the number of names on the roll for that electorate was 3,521.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why are the others not on the roll?

Mr. GLASSEY said the others were not on the roll because of the difficulty in filling up the forms and the numerous obstacles standing in the way.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: And when we try to amend that the hon. member objects.

Mr. GLASSEY said in the Bulimba electorate there were 2,474 men and 2,081 voters on the roll. In the Bulloo electorate there were 1,441 men and only 523 names on the roll, or a little more than a third of the adult male population.

Mr. BLACK: I suppose they had not got the qualification.

Mr. GLASSEY said it all went to show the necessity of having the electoral law simplified, and having some responsible agent appointed by the Government to see that each person who was entitled to vote was properly registered. In the Bundaberg electorate there were 1,478 men and 1,070 names on the roll; Bundanba, 1,125 men in the electorate and 1,414 names on the roll.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: There is the roll-stuffing.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is one man one vote.

Mr. GLASSEY said he hoped hon. members would give him their attention. He had gone very carefully through the electoral roll.

Mr. DALRYMPLE: I should think so.

Mr. GLASSEY said there were upwards of 400 outside persons, having property in the electorate, who had their names on that roll. He could give a little more information about it. There were numbers of little estates being acquired—he did not say by purchase—in his district, and they were being cut up into beautiful little pieces of land, and numbers of claims to be put on the roll were coming in for freeholds and leaseholds.

Mr. ANNEAR: That is thrift and industry.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: This Bill will cure that for you.

Mr. GLASSEY said that in addition to that he might mention that they used to have 140 workers in a mine in that district, but he was sorry to say that about the time the census was taken they had little more than twenty workers in that mine. So that the numbers of people in mining districts varied considerably. In the Burke electorate, at the date he mentioned, they had 2,133 men, and up to date they had 2,981 names on the roll.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: All residents, of course!

Mr. GLASSEY said that, as he had already pointed out, in mining districts the numbers rapidly fluctuated.

Mr. BLACK: Then what is the value of these figures?

Mr. GLASSEY said that in the Burnett district they had 1,763 men, and 1,498 voters on the roll. In the Burrum electorate, they had 1,309 men, and 1,140 voters on the roll. Cairns showed 1,696 men, and 1,325 names on the roll. Cambooya, 1,306 men in the electorate, and 1,069 on the roll. Carnarvon, 995 men, and 744 names on the roll. Carpentaria, 1,444 men in the electorate, and 535 names only on the roll. Charters Towers, 3,934 men in the electorate when the census was taken, and 4,476 names on the roll. Since that time they had had the famous boom in Charters Towers, and he had been told by an old resident of that place, who was lately in Brisbane, that instead of the population being about 14,000, as it was at the time of the last general election, they had a population there during last summer of from 22,000 to 23,000. In the Clermont district there were 1,364 men, and only 790 names on the roll.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: There is no labour party there.

Mr. GLASSEY said there was a very strong labour party there. In the Cook electorate they had 1,916 men and 1,115 names on the roll; in the Cunningham electorate they had 1,582 men, and only 1,072 names on the roll. In the Dalby electorate they had 853 men and 925 names on the roll. Drayton and Toowoomba—2,261 men in the electorate, and 2,368 names on the roll. Enoggera had 1,355 men, and only 1,190 on the roll. He should explain that in the case of Enoggera the number given was taken from the last roll, as he had not the roll up to date for that electorate. Fassifern had 1,272 men in the electorate, and 1,079 names on the roll. Fitzroy 1,398 men in the electorate, and 1,121 names on the roll.

Mr. CALLAN said the hon. member had referred to his electorate, and he supposed he was going to refer to all the rest.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member raise a point of order?

Mr. CALLAN said he did. He did not see why the hon. member should take up the time of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must state his point of order.

Mr. CALLAN said he would like to know if the hon. member should take up the time of the Committee in giving them information which they all had about their own electorates. He did not say it was a point of order, but he wished to call attention to what the hon. member was doing.

Mr. GLASSEY said that in the Flinders electorate there were 1,189 men, and only 955 names on the roll. In the electorate of Fortitude Valley—he would ask hon. members to pay special attention to those figures, because great anomalies were said to have been committed there—when the last census was taken there were 3,905 men, and there were at present 3,245 names on the roll, including duplicates.

Mr. DALRYMPLE: Residentials.

Mr. AGNEW: Lodging-houses.

Mr. GLASSEY said in the Gregory electorate there were 1,275 men, and last year's roll showed only 439 persons on it; not one-third of the men in the electorate were on the roll.

Mr. DALRYMPLE: They did not take the trouble to get on.

Mr. GLASSEY said he had no doubt that was one of the electorates where a considerable amount of roll-stuffing had been going on, according to the statements made. In the Herbert electorate there were 1,414 men, and only 856 on the last year's roll. Gympie had 2,698 men in the electorate, and 2,864 on the roll. Ipswich, 2,128 men in the electorate, and 2,320 on the roll, including duplicate voters.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Good district that.

Mr. GLASSEY said in the Kennedy electorate there were 1,303 men, and only 853 on the roll.

Mr. LISSNER: Gone to the Argentine.

Mr. GLASSEY said that in the Leichhardt there were 960 men, and only 598 on the roll; Lockyer, 1,708 men, 1,481 on the roll; Logan, 1,074 men, 835 on the roll; Mackay, 2,019 men, 1,581 only on the roll; Maryborough, 2,376 men, 2,637 on the roll, including duplicates.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. T. O. Unmack): There are duplicate votes in every electorate.

Mr. GLASSEY said it was only in the towns that duplicate votes were polled to any extent. For instance, there were 1,256 proprietary voters in the Bulimba electorate, and he was told that 700 were not residents at all; so that if ever there was a time in the history of the colony when it was necessary to deal with the electoral question and establish the principle of one man one vote, and only one, it was the present. He did not want more than one vote. In the Maranoa electorate there were 1,217 men, and 1,025 on the roll; Mitchell, 1,463 men, and 959 on last year's roll. He had not been able to get the electoral rolls up to date; why they had not been printed, he could not say. It must be the fault of somebody. He did not say it was the fault of the Government; but seeing that the revision court sat in November last, and it was now nearly July, surely it was time the rolls were printed. In the Musgrave electorate there were 1,499 men, and only 1,086 names on last year's roll; Murilla, 992 men, and only 529 on last year's roll; Normanby, 1,039 men, and 675 on the roll; Oxley, 1,596 men, and 1,244 on the roll.

Mr. GRIMES: A very good average.

Mr. GLASSEY said the fact that there were about 300 men disfranchised in a small electorate like Oxley showed there was something wrong. That was in addition to the duplicate votes. In the electorate of Port Curtis there were 1,677 men, and only 825 on the roll; Rockhampton South, 2,651 men, and 2,538 on the roll.

Mr. BARLOW: Many of those freehold votes also represent residence.

Mr. GLASSEY said no doubt some did, but a great many did not. Rockhampton North, 1,214 men, and 1,105 on the roll; Rosewood, 1,214 men, 1,004 on the roll; Stanley, 1,203 men, and only 950 on the roll; Toombul, 2,141 men, and 2,250 on the roll. He said, without fear of contradiction, there was no electorate in the suburbs, with the exception of Bulimba, that had a larger duplicate vote than Toombul.

An HONOURABLE MEMBERS: That is only an assertion.

Mr. GLASSEY said it was an assertion that could be proved very easily. Toowong, 2,420 men in the electorate, and 2,299 names on the roll; Townsville, 2,637 men in the electorate, and 2,443 names on the roll; Warrego, 1,882 men in the electorate, and only 690 names on the roll; Warwick, 1,075 men in the electorate, and 1,048 names on the roll; Wide Bay, 1,286 men in the electorate, and 1,077 names on last year's roll; Woolloongabba—another place where there was a large duplicate vote—2,302 men in the electorate, and 2,428 names on the roll; Woothakata, 1,990 men in the electorate, and only 1,456 names on the electoral roll; and Nundah, which he had omitted to mention in its order, 1,388 men in the electorate, and 1,463 on the electoral roll. The Colonial Secretary wished him to believe that because the census was taken at the time of the strike, there was a larger number of persons in the colony than would otherwise have been the case. He (Mr. Glassey) said that, taking the population of the colony as given in the census returns, and comparing it with the number of electors on the rolls up to date, there were 26,000 men in the colony who had not a vote. He had gone through those figures so that the Committee and the country should know exactly how they stood. He would now say that there was no justification whatever for bringing forward a measure of the kind they were now considering, which must, if passed—but which he did not think would pass in its present form — increase the already numerous difficulties in the way of persons getting on to the electoral roll. There was not one man in ten who could fill up the proposed form correctly without having had some previous experience; and he had been told by men of intelligence and education that if they had had to fill up the form without any previous experience it would have been rejected as informal. Where did the simplicity come in, when all that paraphernalia had to be gone through before a justice of the peace or a schoolmaster? He would produce a list of schools by-and-by to show that there was a distance of sixty or seventy miles between the two nearest schools in parts of the country, and without a single justice of the peace between them. The real origin and intention of the Bill and of the authors of it—the Government and their supporters—was not to purify the rolls, not to make it easier for men to get on the electoral register, but to place more difficulties in the way of persons obtaining the franchise, and to keep the present party in power until such time as the revision courts sat in November, when some thousands of working men would be struck off the roll on the most flimsy pretexts. No matter where they might be residing they would be expected to attend to notices which they would never receive, in consequence of their having to go to various places to work. Owing to the nature of their work, or to want of means, they would be unable to attend to the notices, even if they did see them, and thousands of the working men of the colony would be disfranchised.

Mr. BARLOW: Objections are to be advertised.

Mr. GLASSEY said they might be advertised, but they would never be seen by those who were objected to. He wanted the Government to tell the Committee plainly that the real title of the Bill was the one mentioned in the amendment he had given notice of. There was no disguising the fact that their intention was not to give the working men the franchise, but to deprive them of the franchise which they already possessed. He meant to speak plainly, and he maintained that that was the real intention of the Government. In every country of the world the people were demanding measures of reform, but in Queensland they were going back. Even in the old country the most standstill Tories had been obliged to take up the question of one man one

vote. There was no provision in the Bill for that. Even in New Zealand they were considering the question of enfranchising women.

Mr. DALRYMPLE: And children?

Mr. GLASSEY said that in Queensland, notwithstanding that there were 26,000 of, he had no hesitation in saying, some of the best workers in the colony, the bushmen, yet there was no provision for giving them the franchise, and they were now told without the slightest proof or justification that the measure before them was demanded and urgent on account of the exigencies of the times. Where was the necessity? Where was the roll-stuffing?

Mr. AGNEW: You have proved it in my district.

Mr. GLASSEY said he had not proved it in a single instance. He had only proved that if the whole of the persons were on the rolls who were entitled to be on, in addition to the duplicate votes, the rolls would be considerably increased. If there was any roll-stuffing it was on the part of the patriotic league. They had the means of stuffing the rolls. Their friends and themselves occupying the two front benches on either side of the House had the means. They had got the bench pretty nearly in their own hands.

Mr. HAMILTON: Utterly untrue.

Mr. GLASSEY said they had got, too, the Press of the colony at their back to support them on every possible occasion; they had got the monetary institutions at their back, and the supposed danger was the labour party. The measure before them was brought in for the purpose of preventing the working men of the colony who might be inclined to vote for labour candidates at the forthcoming general election from doing so. And deliberately that measure, if passed, was intended, and would have the effect of removing some thousands of names from the November rolls of people who could not possibly get on before April next; and in January or February next, if they were to believe the Ministerial organ, the *Courier*, which he generally found was well inspired, they were to have the general election.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The most convenient time.

Mr. GLASSEY said he believed the most convenient time was the present time. He took his stand against the Bill because he knew the intentions of the Government. He knew the intentions of their supporters; he knew the intentions of the patriotic league, and of their friends. They were absolutely terror-stricken and afraid, for fear a few working men—whose votes they used to court, whose sympathies they were always trying to obtain, and whose welfare they pretended to have at heart—should vote for labour candidates.

Mr. HOOLAN: So long as they went with the Liberals.

Mr. GLASSEY said, yes, so long as they went with the so-called Liberals; and now they had the man who at one time was the most advanced politician in Australia, showing himself as the author of a miserable rag like that Bill. Now, he wanted to say a few more words most seriously and earnestly. Was it desirable to bring forward a measure of that sort at the present time?

Mr. DALRYMPLE: Yes.

Mr. AGNEW: You have proved it.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: To prevent roll-stuffing.

Mr. GLASSEY said he would ask if it was desirable to court a conflict with the people, because, as surely as that Bill passed, they would have a conflict with the people.

Mr. HAMILTON: You will take good care to keep behind the conflict.

Mr. GLASSEY: He was not afraid of prison walls, judges, or juries.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You kept well in the background during the strike.

Mr. GLASSEY said he would tell them what he was afraid of—of stabbing in the back, and of his friends being stabbed in the back, and robbed of their political rights; but let the Government come forward and bring in a good measure that would confer the franchise on the people. Let them trust the people, and he had no fear but that the people would trust the Parliament. He would warn the Government, and he would warn their supporters, that if the Bill was passed——

The CHIEF SECRETARY: You warn the Government?

Mr. GLASSEY said he warned them that if that measure passed it would raise a hostile feeling in this country such as they had never seen before. There was not the slightest intention to prevent roll-stuffing; the intention was as he had already stated; and there was not a man in this colony who knew it better than the Chief Secretary, and no man had acted in a more cowardly manner than the Chief Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN: I certainly think the hon. member has exceeded his rights in referring to the Chief Secretary as being guilty of cowardly conduct, and I call upon him to withdraw the words.

Mr. HAMILTON: The biggest coward is the man who said it.

Mr. GLASSEY said he thought hon. members' experience of him was that he had no desire to use unparliamentary language.

Mr. AGNEW: You have a great desire to cater for the public.

Mr. GLASSEY said any language he used——

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon the hon. member to withdraw unreservedly the offensive words he has used.

Mr. GLASSEY said he withdrew them without reserve, and expressed his regret for having used them.

Mr. PAUL: Apologise to the House.

Mr. GLASSEY said if the hon. member for Leichhardt expected him to crawl on his knees he was not the man to crawl. He would make the fullest reparation; but beyond that he would not go for any living man in the world. He would say that the Bill was a miserable abortion of a measure, and that the intentions were as he had stated. One strong reason that he advanced against the measure was that it was not in accordance with the wishes of the people; neither did the authors of the Bill represent the people. They simply retained their positions through fear and mistrust of the people, and they wished, if possible, to have a new lease of power by passing a measure of that kind.

Mr. HOOLAN: Do you blame them for that?

Mr. GLASSEY said he blamed them seriously; he blamed them for taking advantage of their position.

Mr. LUYA: You are doing that now.

Mr. GLASSEY said he believed the Government did not represent the people on that question. He believed the people were decidedly against the measure just as they had been against various other measures which he was not going to refer to at that time. So long as he was able he should oppose the Bill, believing, as he did, that the feeling and wish of the people was for a larger measure of reform, which would offer the utmost facilities for getting on the rolls. There were 108,000 people in the colony entitled to vote. The man who, in

November next, if the Bill became law, robbed him of his vote, or attempted it, had better keep out of his way. The man who robbed him of his vote, robbed him of all that which was nearest and dearest to him; and the men who attempted to deprive the people of their political rights, were only provoking and arousing a hostile feeling and courting a conflict with the people.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: You have been stirring up sedition for over a year.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Let bygones be bygones.

Mr. GLASSEY said the Bill did not let bygones be bygones. If the Government extended the franchise they would be letting bygones be bygones by trusting the people. But to attempt to deprive them of their political rights would have the opposite effect. At least one thing he would promise, and that was that the Bill would only go through when he had no further strength and energy to oppose it. The Government might be sufficiently strong to pass it in the Committee; but his side was stronger outside.

Mr. ANNEAR said he rose to a point of order that the Chairman had had to rule upon before. They were discussing the 1st clause of the Elections Bill, and his point of order was that the hon. member for Bundanba was making a speech irrelevant to the clause under discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Committee is the amendment moved by the hon. member for Bundanba, that the words "Elections Act of 1892" be omitted from clause 1 of the Bill, with a view to inserting the words "Prevention of Working Men from Voting Act." I certainly think the hon. member's remarks are scarcely relevant to the question before the Committee.

Mr. GLASSEY said the Government might be sufficiently strong to carry the Bill. They had seen their strength manifested on several occasions, and no doubt they would see it again; but it would not last. He would seriously advise the Chief Secretary to take into his consideration the effect the passing of the measure was likely to have upon the minds of the people.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I believe it will have a very beneficial effect.

Mr. GLASSEY said he thought it would have the very opposite effect. Any measure that did not give greater facilities to persons wishing to have their names on the rolls would not have a beneficial effect upon the country. It would not suit people in his electorate to have to go all the way to Ipswich after toiling all day in the coal mines, and at some little expense, and to crawl into the house of some justice of the peace.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why crawl?

Mr. GLASSEY said they would have to go to his house and ask him to go into a back parlour, as they wished to have their names put on the electoral roll.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: They might have gone to you if you had not been struck off the list.

Mr. GLASSEY said he was very glad to say he never was on the commission of the peace—at least he was never sworn in. But he had no doubt that if he had sat on the bench he would have taken as good a character there as the Secretary for Mines. He was sure he could have had as steady a character.

Mr. DALRYMPLE: Self-praise is no recommendation.

Mr. GLASSEY said it was sometimes necessary. Interjections of that kind were very easily met. If he did not know there was some ulterior motive behind the measure he should not have spoken as he had. He must express surprise at the conduct of the Secretary for Mines in regard to the Bill, because he had always regarded him as one of the most liberal men in the colony, and one of the most advanced politicians. Instead of that he was urging a measure which would not extend the franchise to the bushmen and miners for whom he had the fullest sympathy. He had some grave suspicion there was something more than the good of the people intended by the Bill. As he had already explained, the intention was to deprive the people of the franchise in November next, and to keep them off the rolls when the general election came on. He should reserve anything further he had to say till a future occasion, and give other hon. members an opportunity of speaking.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said he did not intend to make a long speech in answer to the hon. member, but there were some things he said which should not be passed over without notice. The Bill was introduced for the purpose of securing the genuine representation of the people of the colony in Parliament by preventing the frauds which were now rampant, and to provide for the purification of the electoral rolls. That was the object of the Bill, and if it failed in that respect it should be amended. He did not want to use unparliamentary language, but he must say he did not think he had heard a speech since he had been a member of Parliament so discreditable to any member of it as that of the hon. gentleman, as he supposed he must call him. The hon. gentleman in effect had threatened the Government and the Committee if they did not accede to his views ——

Mr. GLASSEY: Not my views—the views of the people of the colony.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: His views of the best way of securing a *bonâ fide* representation of the people in Parliament—that they should be met with sedition and violence outside.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The CHIEF SECRETARY said that the hon. member had in effect threatened the Committee with mob rule outside if they did not accede to his views to-night.

Mr. LISSNER: That is exactly what he said.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is exactly what the hon. member for Bundanba said.

Mr. GLASSEY: No.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Yes.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said he did not think that threats of that kind would deter one single member of that Committee from doing his duty.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The CHIEF SECRETARY said they were not going to be coerced by the language which the hon. gentleman and his associates had been indulging in for the last few weeks.

Mr. AGNEW: Which he has trained them in.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said the hon. member who interrupted him was right. There was apparently a school of violence.

Mr. GLASSEY: Give some proof.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said that he had received some resolutions that day—he had not read them before. They had been sent to him from a meeting which had been held in the Centennial Hall—they had heard something about a speech which had been delivered there. He did not know who the compiler of those resolutions was, but he seemed to be a person of very poor ability judging from the composition of the resolutions. He seemed to have endeavoured to get together as many insulting epithets and insinuations as he could. The hon. gentleman

was apparently the mentor of those people; and now, to cap all, he had distinctly threatened the Committee and hon. members of it with violence—actual physical violence—if they did not accede to his views. The hon. member had posed as the mentor of those people inside and outside Parliament. Now, he asked the hon. member did he know what his friends were doing? Did he know that amongst the men of whom he posed as the leader at the present time there was a new policy being discussed, and that was the policy of murder? Did the hon. member know that?

Mr. GLASSEY: No, and neither do you.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said that he did know it. He knew that amongst many of the hon. member's friends outside they had for some time past been discussing—deliberately discussing the question of murder—the murder of some prominent members of that Committee. That was a fact.

Mr. GLASSEY said he rose to a point of order. He wanted to ask if it was orderly for the Chief Secretary to impute such motives to him. He gave the question the most emphatic denial. There was not a word of truth in it. He wanted to ask the Chairman's ruling if it was competent for the Chief Secretary——

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Order! Chair! Sit down.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman has stated his point of order. I did not understand the Chief Secretary to use the words which the hon. member says he used. I understood the Chief Secretary to ask the hon. member if he was aware that certain things were going on——

Mr. GLASSEY: Then I am not aware of it.

The CHAIRMAN: And the Chief Secretary was perfectly in order in asking that.

Mr. GLASSEY: Then I am not aware of it. I give it a most emphatic denial.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said he was very glad to hear the hon. member say he was not aware of it.

Mr. HAMILTON: I do not believe it, nevertheless.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said that the hon. member by his exhibition in the Committee that evening had certainly indicated that if those men were discussing acts of violence outside they had his sympathy. He indicated clearly that he had sympathy with acts of violence.

Mr. GLASSEY: I did not say so.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said that the hon. member had stated that if they did not accede to his views deeds of violence would come.

Mr. GLASSEY: No

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He told us violence would come.

Mr. GLASSEY: I said that is what would follow.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said that the hon. member had told them what they had to look for. He hoped they were not going to have much more of that sort of thing, because if they were they would have to act as all representative assemblies—all bodies of men who were met together for business—acted in such circumstances. They would not allow their proceedings to be interrupted by threats of violence or anything of that sort. There was an inherent right in all representative assemblies and all bodies of men who were met for peaceable purposes to prevent their proceedings from being interrupted in that way. If individuals would not obey the ordinary dictates of decent behaviour there was only one remedy, and that was in their power to adopt—it was by excluding them from the precincts of the House during their deliberations. He hoped they would not have to take such a course as that. Yet the hon. member must be aware that they were met to do business as a sensible and peaceable body, and were not to be coerced by threats of violence. They would not tolerate such threats being made in that Committee. He would now refer to the hon. member's speech. His argument was that the electoral rolls of the colony in the present year did not correspond in numbers with the census taken in April of last year. That was extremely likely, and they could take it for granted that it was so. The extent to which they differed varied according to many circumstances—according to the condition of the people and their distribution when the census was taken; according to the interest taken in getting on the electoral rolls; and according to many other things that would occur to the mind of anyone. The object of the Bill was to secure that the electoral rolls should contain as far as possible the names of the whole of the people who were entitled to be on the rolls, and no more. If the Bill in its details failed to achieve that object, then let it be amended by all means; but that was the object of the Bill. He hoped they would have no more exhibitions such as they had had from the hon. member for Bundanba that evening. Certainly it did not add to the credit of the representatives in that Parliament, if indeed any sensible people would judge of the character of the Parliament of Queensland by the exhibition that had been given.

Mr. GLASSEY said that of course they knew the Chief Secretary was angry, and they knew the cause of his anger; he was angry because the motives of the Government had been put plainly before the people of the colony. He (Mr. Glassey) had not threatened the Government or the members of the Committee with violence.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES said he rose to a point of order. He asked if the hon. member was in order in imputing motives to the Government, or to any member of the Government?

The CHAIRMAN said: The hon. member, or any other hon. member, would certainly not be in order in imputing motives; but I did not understand the hon. member to do so on the present occasion.

Mr. GLASSEY said he was rather surprised at the Secretary for Mines, above all men in the Committee, acting as he had done, as he himself generally used strong language. He wanted to say that he had not threatened the Government or members of the Committee.

Mr. LUYA: You read *Hansard* to-morrow morning.

Mr. GLASSEY said he would regret extremely to threaten them.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member has his audience ready listening while he makes an appeal of that sort.

Mr. GLASSEY said he would ask if it were competent for the Chief Secretary to tell him that he had his audience in the street?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I did not say that. I said the hon. member had his audience ready listening while he makes an appeal of that sort.

Mr. GLASSEY said that he had not threatened either the Government or the members of the Committee with violence. No man in that Committee would regret it more than he would. Invariably when strikes had taken place amongst the workers he had counselled them never to resort to strikes, but to appeal to Parliament for redress for their grievances.

Mr. PAUL: What about the Post Office strike? Who got that up?

Mr. GLASSEY said that if the hon. member for Leichhardt would consult the Postmaster-General no doubt he would be able to give him the information he desired.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Hon. T. O. Unmack): Yes; you did.

Mr. GLASSEY said that he gave the statement the most emphatic denial.

Mr. ANNEAR: It is quite true. Mr. Macdonald-Paterson is my authority.

Mr. GLASSEY said that Mr. Macdonald-Paterson's statement was a fabrication.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: The official documents bear it out.

Mr. GLASSEY said that the official documents did not bear it out, and he challenged the hon. gentleman to put them on the table.

Mr. LUYA: That is only strike No. 1.

Mr. GLASSEY said that that sort of gibe and sneer would not have the slightest effect upon him.

Mr. AGNEW: You are too thick in the skin.

Mr. GLASSEY said that it was pretty ancient history now. He would ask hon. members of the Committee to watch the signs of the times, and to examine the handwriting on the wall. It had been found not only in Queensland, but all over the world, in every single case he was aware of, that when there was an attempt made, as he believed there was at the present time, to deprive the people of their constitutional rights, the people invariably resorted to unconstitutional means. He said that without holding out any threat; and he said that if it came it would come, as far as he was concerned, with extreme regret. But he would repeat that the man who would rob him of his right had better not be in his way if he got a hold of him. Hon. members might laugh, but he felt so strongly on the question of being deprived of his right, or of having numerous difficulties put in the way of obtaining his right, that he would be inclined to quarrel with the man or men——

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: This Bill does not want to deprive you of your right.

Mr. GLASSEY said it did. He knew the intention of the Bill as well as the authors. If he did not, he would not have said so in the way in which he had spoken. If there was any attempt on the part of the Government to deprive the people of their just and legitimate rights, then it was between the people and the Government. It was an inherent right—or ought to be—in every man that he should have some say in the government of the country in which he lived. Why should they have to ask Parliament? What was Parliament but a mere fragment of the people?

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: We are sent here by the majority.

Mr. GLASSEY said that if they wanted a real expression of the opinions of the people they must give every man a vote, appoint persons who would register their claims, and see that no names were on the roll but those which ought to be there. He did not want the Chief Secretary to get angry, because that would have no effect on him; nor did he want the hon. gentleman to twist his expressions in a lawyer-like fashion, as he generally did, to mean something they did not mean.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Keep your temper.

Mr. GLASSEY said he would keep his temper; at the same time, when there was an attempt made to misconstrue his language and to put it so before the country, he would certainly repel it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES said he thought the Committee must look upon what they had heard, as the Earl of Beaconsfield described one of Gladstone's magniloquent speeches —as the "hare-brained chatter of irresponsible frivolity." He had a word to say to the hon. gentleman who assumed, solely on his own recommendation, a character so much superior to his own—a comparison which he declined to notice, because, thank goodness, his character, bad as it was, characterised as it might be by intemperance of various kinds, had never yet been characterised by the intemperance which had distinguished that hon. gentleman from the moment he was born up to the present moment. The hon. member had been nothing in the history of the colony but one of the most destructive agencies the colony had ever paid for; he had been the stormy petrel of official as he was now of parliamentary life; he was absolutely destitute of the slightest degree of delicacy in the aspersions and insinuations he hurled against hon. members whose names would be honoured long after he was forgotten. His whole career had been that of an iconoclast, and the Postmaster-General who was unfortunate enough to hold office at the time he was in that department would assure anyone that the hon. member was then a destructive agency. He absolutely wondered—and he said that with a deep sympathy for those who were suffering from the present distress—he absolutely wondered that that man could stand up and accuse him, who was at at least animated with the purest patriotic motives, and whose feeling for his fellow-creatures were quite as deep, and indisputably more earnest, than his own that he could stand up and speak as he had done when he himself was the prime agent and principally responsible for nine-tenths of the suffering in the colony. When there was anything they could poach from the House or from the Government, the hon. member said, "Let bygones be bygones; let capital and labour lie down together like the lion and the lamb; and I, the great prophet, the great oracle of the working classes, will control their votes." Now, what was the real cause of the hon. member's opposition to the Bill? It was not that he believed—he gave the hon. member credit for possessing too high an order of intelligence for that; it was not that he believed that the Government or any member of it was one whit more anxious to deprive anyone of a vote than he was. He did not object to the hon. member getting up and speaking with a little acerbity when replying to warm remarks directed at him; but he objected to the hon. member, with all the ability he possessed, claiming to be able to penetrate the inward minds of Ministers and ascertain their motives in bringing forward the Bill. If there had been a speech made in favour of the Bill it was that which the hon. member had just concluded; and he hoped that when the document he had read appeared in *Hansard* it would receive due consideration. It was difficult to criticise such a document at a moment's notice; but he saw very clearly, while the hon. member was addressing the Committee, that in all those centres of what he might call Trades Hall activity the number of votes was largely in excess of the adult residents in the districts to which they were allotted. He would take as an instance his own electorate, where at least six gentlemen were burning to exhibit their patriotism by earning £300 a year as representatives of that district. The activity had been so great there that the

number of voters was considerably in excess of the population. The hon. gentleman made use of an argument which to a certain extent was telling. Where he felt that the figures were against his line of argument, he explained that a large percentage were dual votes. But that did not apply to Burke, because there the only qualification, with few exceptions, was that of residence. He had had much more experience in the colony than the hon. gentleman, and he was prepared to place his record in the colony against that of the hon. gentleman at any time and under any circumstances. No human nature was perfect, but he would much prefer being the man that he was, with the record of services he had done for this colony and for his mother colony of Victoria, and confessing all his faults, to being the malignant man who had tried to defame his character. There was one thing perfectly certain, and that was that there was no member of that Committee who desired to deprive any man of his vote. He would appeal to the hon. member himself, and in doing so he did not think he could be accused of picking a jury or a judge disposed to favour him; but he appealed to the hon. member himself to point out any record of his that had not been characterised by as true a liberality of sentiment as the hon. member himself or his colleagues had displayed, or to give an instance in which it had been his good fortune to be able to assist what was called the working man where he had failed to do so. If he had failed to do so, instead of being in the position he was now in he would be one of the wealthiest men in that Committee. It was simply because he had allowed the large amount of money that had passed through his hand to flow out of it freely, and because he could never meet distress without relieving it, that he was not the wealthy man he might have been. But, returning to the question, he would repeat that he was perfectly certain that no man in the colony who was justly entitled to a vote need be deprived of it. He agreed that a man should cherish his vote to the fullest extent as the valuable possession of a free man, and he would give the greatest possible facilities for obtaining that vote; but he would not consent to a law being framed with such ambiguity as would allow of the election of men who were not representatives in any sense of the word, but who were delegates brought into the House under the chains of a written agreement. That Committee would be in a very precarious condition if it was to be at the mercy of irresponsible dictators sitting in an obscure lodge who might withdraw their representatives any moment they chose. Were such members representatives of the colony? Certainly not. What he would like to know was the meaning of all the talk they heard about working men? Was there a man in the colony who was worth his salt who had not been a working man? Were the men who had acquired material wealth or intellectual strength not men who had been distinguished by work? What was genius? Had it not been defined to be a capacity for work? Look at the Chief Secretary and the leading members of the Opposition. Why were they in the positions they occupied? Because by the universal consensus of opinion among hon. members they were recognised as the fittest men to occupy those positions. They were not born to those positions. But, to hear some hon. members speak, one would imagine that they were. Those hon. members spoke as if they were dealing with an obsolete state of society in the old world, where men were born with a crown on their heads. The only crown a man was born to in this colony was a crown of sorrows, and to have his motives misrepresented and misunderstood. He did not attach the slightest importance to the attacks of men who indulged in abuse and imputed dishonourable motives. They were simply men whose abuse was absolutely a compliment. But the hon. member for Bundanba was capable of better things; he had read much, and though animated by a wrong agency might have a good motive; and he (the Secretary for Mines) would ask whether the power of the hon. member was not likely to be greater, and his command of the attention of the Committee to be larger, if he would throw away the intemperate system of threatening and the deplorable system of insinuation, and recognise that there were men in the Committee who had infinitely more experience than he had, who were equally as talented as himself, and equally as honest, and quite as capable of judging the feelings of the people. They knew perfectly well that there was, on the part of all good-thinking men, of all men who had a vital stake in the country, a disposition to terminate the present strained relations between certain classes of the community. But was it to be done by the system adopted by some hon. gentlemen? Was it to be done by meetings held at street corners, where abuse was indulged in that would disgrace a Billingsgate fishwoman? Was it to be done by the dissemination of seditious pamphlets, couched in the most blackguardly language, and absolutely endorsed by a gentleman, one of whose claims to sit in that Committee was his close connection with Christian bodies? He alluded to the pamphlet issued at the time of the Bundaberg election, which pamphlet would reflect disgrace on the lowest inhabitants of their streets. He was perfectly certain, as he had said previously, that there was no difficulty whatever in the way of any man in the colony registering his name on the electoral roll in any portion of the colony.

Mr. GLASSEY: Yes; there is.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES said he defied the hon. member to point out to him any population in any part of the world where so large a percentage of the people had exercised an active voice in the election of their parliamentary representatives. There was a very great amount of carelessness—he spoke of the bushmen particularly—in exercising the privilege of voting. There was a large part of the population who would not take the trouble to use their votes if they were enrolled, or walk across the street to be enrolled. They maintained an absolute indifference in the matter. Those men would account for a very large majority of the men whom the hon. member complained were deprived of the franchise. With regard to the statistics quoted by the hon. member, it must be remembered that he admitted that he was unable in all cases to get the rolls for the present year, but had to use the rolls for some preceding year.

Mr. GLASSEY: For last year.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES said that might tell against the hon. member's argument, or it might not. The return to which the hon. member referred required to be carefully examined, because the colony at the time was in such a position that the figures were largely affected by what might be called extraordinary circumstances. The object of the Bill had been explained to the Committee by the Chief Secretary, and he (the Secretary for Mines) thought the majority of members, however much opposed to himself in political opinions, would attach quite as much credit to any statement made by him in his responsible position and endorsed either by the assent or the silence of his colleagues, who also claimed to be tolerably honourable men, in spite of the insinuations of the hon. member for Bundanba—they would, he

thought, attach quite as much credit to the statement of the Chief Secretary as they would to any statement made by the hon. member for Bundanba, especially knowing as they did his extreme views. It was one of the misfortunes of that hon. member that he could not rise to the acme of his own abilities. He was inevitably compelled by an unhappy conjunction of circumstances to speak as he did to those men who liked their language, as well as their grog, very strong. But it would not produce the same effect upon members of that Committee as it did outside. There were a great many members in the House of Commons who had distinguished themselves in what was very graphically termed mob oratory, but when they got into the House they were, as a rule, egregious failures. He did not for one moment insinuate that the hon. member for Bundanba was an egregious failure; he did not think he was, except in the means by which he sought what might be an honourable end. They would admit that he had the courage of all the ancient heroes and all the modern military spirits; they would admit that he was prepared to stand and let the members of the Committee walk over his meagre and unhappy corpse; they would admit that he would stand with his little gun, not like Ajax, defying the lightning, but all the members of the Committee; and there was not a member that would attempt to raise his hand to the hon. member under any circumstances, or to physically hurt him. They all knew perfectly well that the hon. member did not believe that all the members of the Ministry were rogues, thieves, swindlers, and perjurers sitting there for the express purpose of ruining their adopted country. He presumed it was as competent for him to indicate his opinion of the motives for the hon. member's conduct as it was for the hon. member to indicate his opinion of the motives for his (Mr. Hodgkinson's) conduct, and he would now tell the hon. member what the Bill was. It was a Bill to debar any man from having his name twice on the roll instead of once; it would prevent certain organisations with which the hon. member was closely connected from scoring out names and putting others in their place that would vote right. It might seem incredible to hon. members, but the hon. member had admirers in considerable numbers, and they were earnest in their admiration of the hon. member exactly in proportion to their ignorance. He would give the hon. member the credit of knowing that the Bill would strike at the unfair use of the rolls, or "stuffing" the rolls, as it was called; and as the hon. member saw that it threatened his own power to a very large extent, he naturally resisted it. It was only human nature that he should resist it or any attempt to bring about what would happen if that Bill was passed, and he would be reduced to the ordinary position of a man having only one vote and unable to affect any vote but his own. Unless the hon. member was very much more insensible to the appeals of real common sense than he would like to deny him credit for, he did not think he would give them any more of those dramatic defiances. It was just like shaping before a looking-glass when nobody was there, and nothing was broken unless he hit himself. Then with regard to the little gun, there was nothing half so classic about a little gun as there was about a dagger; and with respect to the drama about self-sacrifice and patriotism, and all that kind of thing, it had been originated and rehearsed much more effectually by a man whose claims to recognition in political history stood higher than those of the hon. member. The hon. member must climb for a considerable distance yet before he reached the

[The SECRETARY FOR MINES.

height attained by the late Edmund Burke, and when he had got that gentleman's eloquence and high moral attributes he could then bring his little gun, provided it was not loaded with anything more deadly than strong language, and throw it down before the House, as that gentleman did his dagger.

Mr. HOOLAN said he was glad to hear the Secretary for Mines had remembered his electorate, because, although he was the hon. gentleman's colleague in the representation of that electorate, he must say that some of the electors had forgotten the hon. gentleman's very existence. He would ask the hon. gentleman how he reconciled his statements with the provisions of the Bill which would disenfranchise the people of the Burke electorate. The Bill required any person desiring a vote in that electorate to sign his claim before a magistrate, an electoral registrar, or the teacher of a State school. Wages there were 12s. a day, and there was one portion of that electorate sixty miles from the nearest magistrate, electoral registrar, or teacher of a State school. Suppose a man on the Percy Gold Field wanted to get on the roll, the nearest magistrate, electoral registrar, or teacher of a State school was at Georgetown, and to get there he would have to travel 100 miles by the road; it would take him three days to go, or sixty miles by the bridle track, and he would require to have a horse. Look at the tremendous cost he would be at to acquire a vote if he wanted one. He would remind the Secretary for Mines that there was another part of his electorate, Charlestown, which was thirty miles from the nearest magistrate, electoral registrar, or teacher of a State school. At Castleton they were thirty-six miles from either of these officials, and the same difficulties would beset a man wanting a vote at those places. How in the world were the people in many parts of that electorate to respond to the notices to be sent out by the revision court? Was it possible, reasonable, just, or honest to ask men to leave their work in places like those and attend a revision court to verify their claims to be on the roll? Was it possible even for them to appoint an agent to do the work for them? The organisations there were not as well managed or as perfect in the electoral business as those down South; but even if they were, how would it be possible for them to know whether a man had left portions of that district or not? Admitting that an organisation was willing to act, did that Bill give them power to uphold the claims of those persons whom the revision courts might wish to strike off the roll?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes; it does.

Mr. HOOLAN said it did not. It gave every power to the revision courts and registrars to strike off names, and placed every obstacle in the way of putting them on. There was no getting over that.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: You say so. Prove it.

Mr. HOOLAN said he had proved it by showing the number of places which were at a great distance from the nearest magistrate, electoral registrar, or teacher of a State school, without whose authority under that Bill a man could not get his claim recognised.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The warden goes there every month.

Mr. HOOLAN said the warden went there about once in two years. The manager of the Queensland National Bank, Mr. Arthur Spencer, went there every fortnight, and if they had to go to him there would be something in it. But it was not nice to bring up the officials in the

district and bandy their names about; that was warfare they should not be dragged into. The hon. member for Bundanba had moved an amendment in the title of the Bill, to the effect that it was a Bill to deprive men of their votes; but apart from any wrangling on that matter he would point out that the short title referred to the Elections Act of 1885, the Elections Act of 1885 Amendment Act of 1886, and the Elections Acts 1885 to 1892. Everyone was not so capable as the Chief Secretary. It was an unfortunate thing they were not; if they were, they would be a high-class nation; but it was impossible even for legislators to understand all the complications that would arise under the Bill. There was no doubt the title proposed by the hon. member for Bundanba was the right one; and no matter what the Chief Secretary might say in his anger, or what the Secretary for Mines might declaim in his anger, he (Mr. Hoolan) was fully convinced that the Bill was intended to strike people off the rolls, and not to put them on, and he should continue to believe so until he saw amendments sent round to the contrary effect. One amendment, to be proposed by the hon. member for Ipswich, which everyone admitted would be most desirable, had been sent round, but it had disappeared. It showed that there was something sinister at work—when they found that an amendment prepared by one of their most capable, straightforward, and sensible legislators, one that would have been accepted by all parties, had for some unexplained reason disappeared, and nothing more was heard about it. It was very strange that there had been no change in the electoral law since 1886. The present Chief Secretary was the introducer of the Act of 1886, and at that time he had good and grave reason to interfere with the electoral laws. About that time he (Mr. Hoolan) took part in an election when a ballot-box was stuffed with 165 votes. That took place on a cattle station then owned by Sir Thomas McIlwraith; there were seven votes on the station, two of them belonged to the lighthouse-keeper at Cape Bowling Green; the navvies—the McIlwraith voters—came over from the railway near Ravenswood Junction, stuffed the ballot-box, and cut down the telegraph wires. He (Mr. Hoolan) was then travelling agent for one of the candidates, Mr. O'Kane, so that he knew what he was talking about. A very grave error was committed at that time, and he hoped that no party would ever be guilty of it again, or anything approaching it. It made such a strong impression upon him at the time that he went back to Charters Towers and determined to take no further part in any elections whatever. That and some stuffing at previous elections led to the alteration of the Elections Act, but from that time to the present there had been no attempt to further amend it. The Hon. the Chief Secretary was then the head of a very large party; he was the nominal head of a big majority of the working men of the colony; they followed his lead, and there was never any occasion to alter the law until now, when the hon. gentleman knew that they—whether justly or unjustly he (Mr. Hoolan) would not say—were not prepared to follow him, but had declared against him, no matter how clever he might be. Then all at once there arose a necessity for an alteration of the Elections Act, and in a way which was most objectionable. Why was that? It could not be from anything that had happened since. He did not wish to enumerate all those very grave crimes that were committed at California Gully, Woolgar, and elsewhere, because the labour party had nothing to do with them; they took place between the two big parties, the McIlwraith and the Griffith parties; and rather than see the labour party do anything one-fiftieth part so disgraceful, he would be glad to see it wiped out of existence. He maintained that there was no necessity or reason for altering the electoral law at the present time; no one could point to anything to justify it. There had been an election at Cairns, when money was scattered about pretty freely, and the matter came before the Elections Tribunal; there had also been one or two by-elections since, in connection with which there had been some trifling complaints, but nothing whatever to justify such a very grave alteration of the law. He did not wish to utter vile insinuations; but he maintained that the aim and object of the Bill was the destruction of votes; he would maintain it anywhere while he had a tongue in his head to wag, no matter what insinuations might be hurled about. They had been hurled about pretty freely that evening, when the hon. member for Bundanba had been connected with murderers. He hoped the Chairman would allow him the same freedom of speech that had been allowed to others, and, in reply to the remarks of the Chief Secretary, he would say that whatever the hon. member for Bundanba was engaged in he (Mr. Hoolan) was also engaged in. He knew nothing about any secret transaction of any kind whatever, and he firmly disbelieved that the hon. member for Bundanba knew anything about it.

Mr. GLASSEY: Nothing whatever.

Mr. HOOLAN said there was no such thing intended; although that there would be some move made against that Bill he did not deny, and he hoped to be one of the first to travel round and make objections. If the Chief Secretary and the Secretary for Mines and all the rest of the Government were honest in their intentions and aims, why did they not make good their assertions and prove those who opposed them to be liars before the public? It was no use going on in the way they were. With all their cleverness and all their subterfuge, and backed up by the *Courier* and the *Telegraph* and other daily papers in the world, they would not alter public opinion. The people were too intelligent, and knew too much of politics and politicians, to be led astray in that way. They were not the ignorant, unthinking people they were in years past, and could not be deluded by the Chief Secretary, the hon. member for Bundanba, or anybody else. They took the Bill and read it for themselves, and those who had already spoken about it had, without any inflammatory language, put it under their heel and denounced it as a direct and fatal blow at their rights and privileges which they valued so highly in the present warm political times. If the Government intentions were good, let them carry them out, notwithstanding what the labour party might say to the contrary—they intended to say a good deal before it did pass—and the Bill would speak for itself. It was quite immaterial to him, speaking for himself alone, whether it struck every name off the roll or not. If the Bill was an infringement of the rights and liberties of the working men of the colony, they would be able to see it for themselves, without requiring any inflammatory language from him or anybody else, and they would act for themselves. The hon. member for Bundanba had read a list of the adult males compared with the names on the electoral roll in every electorate in the colony, and the supporters of the measure claimed that it proved their case, that the rolls were stuffed from one end of the colony to the other. No doubt there was an unusual number of names on the roll, but that did not show that they were all going to vote at elections. Why that sinister fear on the part of the

Ministry that there were a number of dishonest persons ready to take advantage of those names being on the roll? He maintained that there was no such dishonesty intended, and to prove it the authorities need only call in question the rolls used at the recent elections, where they would see how many people had not recorded their votes at any polling-booth. The fear on his side was that in expunging the names of persons who had died or left the district, they would strike off a number of people living on the outside of the district, and who, if their names were removed from the roll, had no possibility, unless at great expense and trouble, of getting them on again. According to the hon. member for Bundanba, there were 26,000 persons in the colony who had no vote; and it was quite possible that the effect of the present Bill would be to add from 12,000 to 20,000 more to that number. It was a most unfortunate time to introduce a measure of that kind when people were most anxious to use their political rights, and when every citizen thought that the stamp of manhood was sufficient for his admission to the electoral roll, apart from the residence qualification altogether; and surely a man had a residence qualification after he had resided six months in the colony. It was a direct blow at their privileges to deprive people of votes who were obliged to keep constantly moving from one place to another in the colony. Were they not just as good citizens as those who always remained in the same place? In many cases they were a great deal better. The hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Barlow, could not have any underhand motives; he did not belong to the labour party, and his amendment would have met the wants of the public, and removed what they called the improper designs of the Bill. There was a large and struggling population in the country which was constantly moving from place to place. It was known that there was a movement on foot amongst employers throughout the colony to, as soon as the Bill became law, immediately discharge thousands of people from their employment. Could it be wondered at that those people were anxious to assert their rights? There was a great deal said in that House that had no foundation, but he would appeal to the Chairman, who was behind the scenes, and to the Colonial Secretary, who was still more behind the scenes, to vouch for the truthfulness of what he had uttered. The Bill would increase the difficulty of placing names on the roll, and facilitate the removal of names from the roll. In fact, it was a blow intended to be struck at the birthrights and liberties of the people. Did the Government want to know the opinion of the people with regard to the Bill? If they would postpone it for a short period the labour party would go to every town in the colony and hold meetings, at which a most decided expression of opinion would be given on the matter. The word "cowardice" had been objected to, and he did not intend to use it, but there must be some latent fear when the Assembly would not take a public expression of opinion. The proper way to get at the ear of the Assembly when anything agitated the public mind was by petition, or by resolutions passed at public meetings properly called for the purpose; but there was no chance at the present time to submit the Bill for public approval or otherwise. Why not submit it to public approval in Brisbane or in the suburbs, where the property vote was rampant and overpowered the residence vote? It would not take many days, and an expression of public opinion upon it could be easily obtained. It might be a proper stand to take to listen to Ministers and believe that they were uttering words of truth. But they had no more right to believe Ministers than

[Mr. HOOLAN.

Ministers had to believe them. He hoped that when the Bill became law, as no doubt it would, the people would be perfectly satisfied, and that it would act as a purifier of the rolls; but he maintained that if there had been no manifestation of political feeling, as exhibited on the last two or three occasions when the Electoral Act was brought into operation, the present Bill would not now have been before the Assembly. He intended to give the Bill all the opposition he could. He would ask the Chairman to remember that the labour party were a very small minority, and to allow them the widest possible range in the discussion. He hoped there would be no suppression of speech. No doubt the Chairman's patience would be severely tried, but he trusted that he would stand the test.

Mr. HALL said the principal element introduced into the debate had been personal altercation. He noticed that the Hon. the Secretary for Mines said something as to the political and private character of the hon. member for Bundanba; and as he had done so, he (Mr. Hall) would also like to say a word or two about his character. He was sorry that the hon. member for Musgrave was not present. He had had the kindness to introduce his name to the Assembly, even before he was elected, and he should like to ask the hon. member to point to any instance of his incompetency, because he had known him from the first day he landed in Bundaberg.

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out to the hon. member that the question before the Committee is not a question of the individual character of members. The question is one of electoral reform, and I would ask him to confine himself to the subject before the Committee.

Mr. HALL said he would proceed to do so. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Bundanba was in effect to substitute a new title—"The Prevention of Working Men from Voting Act"—and really he could conceive nothing more likely to have that effect than the provisions of the Bill.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Which one?

Mr. HALL said the 13th clause, which said—

"When an objection is duly made against the retention of the name of any person in an electoral list, the person objected to must appear either in person or by agent at the registration court at which the list is revised, and must prove his qualification orally by the oath of himself or some witness competent to depose to the facts from his own knowledge. And, if he fails so to appear and prove his qualification, the objection shall be allowed, and his name shall be expunged from the list."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is the practice now.

Mr. HALL said he had found in the working of the Act that many men had their names removed without knowing anything about it. He had also known other men left off the roll after having been to the registrar and informed him of their qualification still existing; the registrar had actually made a correction in the manuscript, and then when the annual roll came out the man's name had disappeared from the roll. He could give an instance from the Bundaberg roll. He held in his hand an official document represented to be the electoral roll of persons qualified to vote for the year 1892 for the electoral district of Bundaberg, and signed "John Lamb," returning officer. There was the name there of Richard Ramage, No. 1598. That gentleman received a notification from the registrar some time last August, and he called upon the registrar and satisfied him that he was still a resident of the district and qualified to vote. The registrar marked on

the roll, "Corrected, 10-9-91," in red ink, and at the annual revision that name was left off—by what means was not known.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The justices of the peace would know.

Mr. GLASSEY: Two members of the patriotic league sat on the bench.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: He voted at the election,

Mr. HALL said he voted at the election simply because he went to see the registrar and returning officer and informed them of the circumstances, and the returning officer issued a permit to vote. Still, he was left off the roll, and the man had to go to a lot of trouble to obtain his vote. He (Mr. Hall) did not say the registrar did it with any wilful intention of depriving the man of his vote, nor would he say that the returning officer did it, but nevertheless there was the fact. He opposed the Bill because it did not include the principle of one man one vote. He should like to see that introduced as an amendment, because he was pledged to support that principle. Some hon. members talked a great deal about members representing minorities. Well, he represented a minority, and a lot of other members represented minorities at the same time.

Mr. ANNEAR: Not a lot.

Mr. HALL said a number of them did.

Mr. ANNEAR: No; only three on your bench.

Mr. RYAN: You may represent a minority next time.

Mr. ANNEAR: No fear of that.

Mr. HALL said the votes recorded in favour of one man one vote were numerous at the late Bundaberg election. There were 622 votes polled for the principle of one man one vote, as against 357 against the principle. Therefore, if the Committee required an expression of public opinion, there it was.

The HON. J. R. DICKSON: Bulimba contradicts that.

The SECRETARY FOR LANDS: And it was just the reverse for black labour.

Mr. HALL said that in the Bundaberg electorate there were a great number of freehold qualifications. Out of 1,603 voters on the roll, there were something like 300 absent, dead, or disqualified, and out of that there were about seventy non-resident freehold votes recorded. There were about 200 men in his electorate who were deprived of their votes on account of the difficulty in getting upon the rolls, and the difficulty would be greater if that Bill passed. He had known men, who had filled in their names without the least irregularity, to have their notices returned to them to be filled up again. He was glad to see in the Bill submitted to them that there were columns for age, residence, and occupation, and, with the exception of the increased difficulty of transferring a name from one electorate to another, he believed in the principle of the Bill to a great extent, and would support it. What he would like to see was an easier mode of getting names on the roll, and retaining them there. Only the last time there was a revision court at Bundaberg there were 175 names struck off the roll, out of which about 100 were struck off legitimately, being dead, or absent, or disqualified. But there were some forty or fifty, at any rate, actually residing in the district who were struck off by the over-zeal of some officer. A lot of men were not allowed to vote because they had been struck off and had not had time to get on again.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Tell me the name of one.

Mr. HALL said he could not give names at present, but would furnish them at a future time. The difficulty was in dealing with the floating population. A large number of members of the Committee believed that the nomads had no claim to a vote. But they had a right to vote; they were taxpayers, and had to abide by the laws of the country, and they were men. There were a great number of native-born Australians in the country districts who were negligent in claiming the franchise, and every facility should be given them to exercise the franchise. There ought to be some means of transferring them from one electorate to another. He did not presume to be able to teach the Committee anything elaborate in the way of politics; but would do what he could, as the representative of the working men in Bundaberg, to see that they got their names on the roll and kept them there.

Mr. AGNEW said he had not intended to speak, but he must refer to the innocent suggestion of the hon. member who had just spoken, which seemed to him to contain a very dangerous element. That suggestion was that not only should people now on the rolls be allowed to remain there, but that they should be allowed to vote in any place where they might be at the time.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Peripatetic voters.

Mr. AGNEW said it was a very simple little matter in itself; but he was decidedly opposed to it. The hon. member seemed to think that he represented one class only, the working men of Bundaberg, and that in itself was a mistake. He could see what an enormous point might be made of that suggestion. Suppose there was an election to take place to-morrow, the labour party, having failed to obtain all it asked from the Government, would quietly inform its members that they should ignore the suburban constituencies and go for the head of the Government; so that instead of men voting at Toowong, and Bulimba, and Nundah, and so on, they would all come to Brisbane to vote against the head of the Government, who would go out. The labour party could do just what it wanted. They could control the voters and make them vote in one particular district, and down with the head of the Government. It would be "Down with Griffith and McIlwraith," and, if the Chief Justice did not give them all they expected, down with the Chief Justice also. The labour party had shown how they could call men together at Barcaldine and maintain them for weeks and months; and what was to prevent them calling upon all those bodies to vote against the Chief Secretary? That was the object of the hon. member.

Mr. BARLOW: They could do better than that. They could split their forces and vote against twenty members.

Mr. AGNEW: They would not do that.

Mr. BARLOW: It would be a waste of powder to all vote against Sir Samuel Griffith.

Mr. AGNEW said that they would make a dead-set against the head of the Government for the time being, who had not consented to hand himself over body and soul at their dictation, and that man would be knocked down at the next election. That was the object of the proposal of the hon. gentleman who had just been returned for Bundaberg.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There is a time coming when the eyes of these men will be opened.

Mr. AGNEW said he did not think the Committee were at all likely to accept any such suggestion. At all events, as long as he had a seat in it, unless he saw the matter in some other

light than he now did, he should oppose any such proposal. He believed the Committee and the country would oppose any such attempt to concentrate the political force of the colony and put it in the hands of the so-called labour leaders, which was exactly what the hon. member's suggestion amounted to.

Mr. HALL said it was very evident from what had fallen from the hon. member for Nundah that the labour party was a very powerful party, and was to be very much feared.

Mr. AGNEW: I said the leaders.

Mr. HALL said that the hon. member had twisted his words into a different meaning to what he had intended them to have regarding the transfer of voters from one roll to another. The hon. member had said that he had argued that a man should be allowed to vote wherever he might be. He would not advocate that for a moment, and in fact it would hardly be possible for the labour party—it would not pay them—to transmit a large number of men from one district to another just to record their votes. What he had advocated was that men shifting about in the ordinary course of their callings on leaving one electorate for another should be allowed to have their votes transferred.

Mr. AGNEW: You would not confine it to that purpose.

Mr. HALL said that he would decidedly. The amendment suggested by the hon. member for Ipswich would have covered it. Then again, supposing the labour party were to bring all their voting strength to "down" the Government—if all the elections were on the one day—it would simply mean that in the other electorates the Government would have it all their own way. There was no such intention as that.

Mr. AGNEW: There is.

Mr. LISSNER: We will have a fair fight.

Mr. HALL: Yes; we will have a fair fight.

Mr. RYAN: Not if this Bill is passed.

Mr. HALL said that the Government seemed to be afraid of going to the people. They said, "Let us have everyone on the rolls who has a right to be there."

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HALL said that was what he said. He did not wish to say anything disrespectful of any member of the Government or any member of the Committee; but if they were really sincere and anxious to do what they said they wished to do, then they would so frame the Bill that those 26,000 men who were in one part of the country or another could be put on the rolls. They might be new-chums or they might be natives. It had been mentioned by one hon. member that new-chums had hardly any business in that Assembly at all; but if that were so, there would be very few members there.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No.

Mr. HALL said there were a lot of members who had not been born in Australia.

Mr. GLASSEY: The aborigines were born here. Why are they not here?

Mr. LITTLE: Probably they are as good as some of those who are here.

Mr. AGNEW: Because we made it a white country for white men.

Mr. HALL said that they should keep it for white men, then. He would like to have it kept a white country, and he really thought the Government should include that amendment. If that were done, he was sure there would have been much less opposition from the labour party—if they had any assurance that there would be an opportunity for the whole of the available men, and those who had any business to be on the rolls, to be put on.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES said that the hon. gentleman had made a very moderate speech, and from his point of view a good one no doubt; but did the hon. member realise what might be the effect of such an amendment as he suggested? It would be impossible to work. The representative of any electoral district ought to be picked, and usually was picked, because his constituents had faith in him as being the best available exponent of their wishes; but it would be quite possible at certain periods—without imputing anything wrong to anybody—it would be quite possible that the votes of a thinly-peopled district might be swamped by people who were nomads. Personally, he would like to see every man who was not convicted of crime, or was not mentally unfit to exercise the political right, in the exercise of his full electoral privileges.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES said that if it were possible that some kind of certificate could be given to every man who had established his claim to a vote—a certificate which could be used in any electoral district, and which could not be manipulated by anyone else—that would be a step that he would feel inclined to support but for the objection that he suggested: That it would be possible that the desires of a constituency might be thwarted by the votes of a class of men perfectly entitled to vote, but not competent to exercise their electoral rights in that particular district; that was to say, through not having any vested interests in the district, the guidance of their votes would be a matter of personal choice rather than of the interests of the district itself. He was certain that the hon. member must recognise that would be possible under his proposed idea, and not only possible but very probable. For instance, in the event of a closely contested election, it would be very easy for any organised body of men to swamp that electorate without incurring any expense. It was undeniable that the zeal of the members belonging to those organisations would prompt them to do that at a considerable sacrifice. There was only one other sentiment which led men to make greater sacrifices, and that was religion. They had to guard against that. He was sure there was no desire on the part of any man in that Committee to deprive any competent man of his vote. If that was recognised by hon. members, they would be more likely to lick the Bill into some acceptable shape. He was certain the pleasures of office—let alone the emoluments, which were very moderate—were not so great but that those on either side who had ever held it would gladly resign it to the most devoted adherents of the labour party, provided they would enlarge their views a little outside their own narrow sphere.

Mr. BLACK said that before the Bill had been introduced in committee he had referred to the matter of transferring votes. His contention was that everyone who had resided six months in the colony was entitled to a vote by virtue of his residence qualification. It was immaterial to him what part of the colony a man lived in. He failed to see why, having once acquired the right to vote by virtue of his residence qualification, he should be debarred from having that vote because he happened to leave one district for another. He had referred to that matter on the second reading of the Bill, and he had quoted his own case as an example—where he had moved from one electorate into another, and where he was debarred from voting in his new electorate

because he had not resided there for six months. Of course in Brisbane, if he did not vote for North Brisbane, he could go and vote for the Valley; but if he moved to another part of the colony, although he had been in the colony for very many years, he would actually be deprived of a residence vote in the new electorate he went to, until he had resided there for six months—practically it meant nine months, because he had to give notice some time before the quarterly revision court sat. He contended that that was not right. Anyone who had once proved his qualification by residence should have his name put on the electoral roll. If he intended to change his residence, he should be able to go to the registrar and tell him he was going to move to another electorate; and it should be the duty of the registrar to communicate with the registrar of the district to which the voter was going, and to give to the elector a certificate stating that within a certain time he intended to reside in the electorate mentioned. That would go a long way towards settling the vexed question of the non-representation of a large number of people in the colony. There might be objections raised to the proposal, but he conceived that the justice of the claim entirely outweighed all possible objections. He regretted that the hon. member for Ipswich, who gave notice of an amendment very much to that effect, had not seen fit to bring it forward; and if it was not proposed by anyone else, he (Mr. Black) would propose it himself. It would be far better to concede that measure of what was absolute justice to a large number of electors, now they were amending the Elections Acts, than to allow what he considered was an injustice to a large number of electors to be perpetuated.

The HON. J. R. DICKSON said he was a determined opponent of one man one vote, and he objected equally to the peripatetic vote advocated by the hon. member for Mackay, because that would enable a voter to go from place to place and vote everywhere; he might vote in Brisbane one day and in Roma another; instead of having one vote only, he might possess seventy-two. He rose chiefly to say that while listening to the remarks of hon. members it seemed to him that a certain number arrogated to themselves the right of representing the labouring classes. He denied that *in toto;* he said that the rest of the seventy-two members had as earnest a desire for the prosperity of the working classes as any of those members who called themselves the representatives of the working classes. He thought the residents of the colony ought to be disillusionised of the idea that their interests were confided to three or four gentlemen in that Chamber. He was prepared to give the vote as safely and liberally as possible under present circumstances, and the Bill was not intended to deprive of his right any man who had a legitimate qualification. They had heard a good deal about men being deprived of their right, and about what they would do to anyone who would deprive them of their right. But what did the deprivation consist of? Was it the deprivation of the opportunity of stuffing the rolls? If so, that was a legitimate deprivation. The Bill was intended to enable people who were in legitimate possession of the franchise to remain on the roll, and exercise the franchise undisturbed by the appearance thereon of voters who had either ceased to possess it or had been placed on the roll by improper means. There had been a large amount of discussion on the amendments, and yesterday afternoon some objections were raised on account of the large number of amendments introduced; but to-day the Bill had been circulated with the amendments incorporated in such a shape as to be easily understood, and he thought that those hon. members who supported the Bill ought to recognise the courtesy of the Chief Secretary in having given effect to the opinions and suggestions made by hon. members on the second reading of the Bill. He regretted that there should be anything like obstruction to the measure, which was acknowledged to be one of practical utility. To say that the present rolls were complete and perfect was a proposition which could not be defended by anyone who wished to give an impartial opinion; and he thought that if the Bill would tend to purify the rolls, hon. members should endeavour to make it as perfect a Bill as possible, and not advocate improvements in favour of class interests. He contended that the Bill would injure no class. He objected to the inference that the 26,000 persons alleged by the hon. member for Bundanba to be left off the roll were necessarily members of the working class, though, of course, they were all connected with the working classes. But to say that the 26,000 persons left off the rolls were all members of the labour party was a gratuitous assumption.

Mr. GLASSEY: I did not say that.

The HON. J. R. DICKSON said he understood the hon. member to say that the 26,000 persons who were left off the rolls consisted chiefly of members of the labour party, and that, therefore, the chief injury would be inflicted on the labour party. That he (Mr. Dickson) denied. They would have an opportunity during the discussion on the Bill of dealing with the amendment of the hon. member for Burrum which touched on the one man one vote question.

Mr. HYNE: No; it only deals with plural voting.

The HON. J. R. DICKSON said it touched the fringe of the subject, and he had no doubt the one man one vote question would be discussed on that amendment. He thought that hon. members would do well to accept the view expressed and held by a majority of the Committee—namely, that the Bill was a good one, subject to certain amendments which might be suggested, and that they should try to pass it, so that during the present year and before the general election it might come into operation.

Mr. PAUL said the hon. member for Bundanba had stated in the course of his remarks that there were 576 electors on the roll for the Leichhardt, while there were about 1,100 adult males in the electorate. He (Mr. Paul) had lived in the district for a long time, and he could say, without any egotism as far as he was personally concerned, that it had always been represented by members who had the confidence of the working men, and had that confidence to such an extent that the men did not take the trouble to get their names on the electoral roll. There were difficulties in the present system of registration, and mistakes were made in filling up the forms by educated men as well as by those who had not received much education. The Bill was intended to remedy the difficulties which existed, and instead of preventing men getting enrolled it would assist them to do so, because under its provisions they had only to go to the nearest justice of the peace who would correct any mistake there might be in the application. The majority of justices of the peace were honourable, straightforward men, and would, he was sure, point out any mistakes a man might commit in filling up an application for enrolment, and assist him to rectify it; but really the form was so simple that no one need make a mistake in filling it up. He must express his regret at the language used by the hon. member for Bundanba. In one respect it was most advantageous that the hon. member had used it, because it would do him more harm than anything hon.

members might say about him, and would show that he was not fit to represent honest, courageous, straightforward men. He (Mr. Paul) hoped that after the remarks of the Chief Secretary no hon. member would again attempt to disgrace not only himself but also the Committee as a whole.

Mr. BLACK said he desired to say a few words in reference to a remark that fell from the hon. member for Bulimba. The hon. member seemed entirely to have misunderstood his contention. He (Mr. Black) never advocated a peripatetic vote. Hon. members who lived in suburban constituencies seemed to think that Brisbane was the whole colony, and that what was applicable to Brisbane was applicable to every other part of the country. But it was not so. His contention was that, as six months' residence in the colony qualified a man to have his name put on the electoral roll, a mere change of residence should not deprive him of the right when once he had acquired it. The hon. member for Bulimba stated that he (Mr. Black) had advocated that a man might vote in Brisbane one day and at Roma the next. He never suggested anything so absurd; but, as he had said before, he thought that a man having once acquired the right should not be deprived of it so long as he remained in the colony.

Mr. AGNEW: But should carry his vote in his pocket.

Mr. BLACK said he was not an advocate of voters' rights, but he contended that when a man had once acquired a qualification by six months' residence, he should continue to have the right to vote even if he moved from one electorate to another. When he left the electorate in which he was enrolled, he should take his certificate to the registrar of the new electorate, and his name should then be put on the roll, subject to the revision it would have to undergo at the usual revision court, and it would of course be omitted from the roll on which he was originally registered.

The HON. A. RUTLEDGE said no doubt the hon. member for Mackay was right in desiring that the scheme which he suggested should be adopted if it could be given effect to, but the matter was surrounded with such great difficulties as to make the realisation of the idea an utter impossibility. Quite apart from the question whether a man who had long resided in one locality was qualified to say who was the best representative for a locality which had been to some extent foreign to him during his previous residence in the colony—and there was something in that—did it not strike the hon. member that a system such as he had suggested was open to a very considerable amount of abuse? He (Mr. Rutledge) was free to admit that at a general election the abuse would not be quite so palpable, but there were by-elections during the life of every Parliament. Suppose a member was taken ill, and it was reported that the question of his life was one of a few months, it would be foreseen that there would be a vacancy in the constituency represented by that member in the course of a few months at most; and what was to prevent a number of men, if they desired by any means at all to carry that particular election in a certain way, from getting their names struck off the roll for the district in which they had been residing, and taking their certificate to the registrar of the district in the representation of which there was about to be a vacancy? Or take the case of a member who was obliged to take advantage of the provisions of the Insolvency Act. His seat could not be declared vacant until the House met, which might be some months after the insolvency had taken place, and what was there to prevent men having their names struck off the roll of an electorate in which no election was about to take place, and inserted on the roll of the electorate the seat for which would become vacant the first day Parliament met? The disadvantages of the proposal were such as to far outweigh any advantages which might be conferred upon individual voters. After all, he thought six months' residence was not too long for a man to understand the requirements of a particular electorate. Take, for example, the electorate of Charters Towers. A man going there from Brisbane, and knowing nothing about goldfields or the requirements of a goldfield, would not be as competent to choose a representative for that electorate as a man who had lived there for six months. The disadvantages of the system would be very great, and though it would not be a peripatetic vote in the way some hon. members suggested, still, for many practical purposes, a system of that sort would result in peripatetic voting, because there would be nothing to prevent numbers of persons inscribed on a new roll for a temporary purpose getting their names struck off that roll when their purpose was served, and getting back on to another roll. If they had a system of that kind at work they would find that it was open to many abuses. He had no desire, nor could he discern that there was a desire on the part of any member of the Committee, to keep the exercise of the franchise from any man who was justly entitled to it. He would be no party to any legislation that would deprive any man entitled to a vote of an opportunity for recording that vote; and it was because he could not, for the life of him, see that the Bill would have the effect of preventing any honest voter from getting his name upon a roll that he intended to give it his hearty support.

Mr. BARLOW said he would draw the attention of the hon. member for Bundaberg, whom he congratulated on the moderate speech he had made, to the fact that the 12th clause of the Bill met the case to which he had referred, in which a gentleman had had his name struck off the roll after he had taken the trouble to go to the registrar and see about it. The hon. member would see by that clause that he could himself have appeared as the friend or agent of that gentleman. The clause said—

> "Every notice of objection given under the twentieth section of the principal Act to a person objected to must state that such person must appear, either in person or by agent, at the registration court, and prove his qualification orally by the oath of himself or some other competent witness, and that if he fails to do so his name will be expunged from the electoral list."

The Bill exactly met the views of the hon. member in that respect. They all knew that all political organisations had a gentleman to attend to the interests of their party, and that was not peculiar to labour organisations. And it seemed an unfortunate thing that the gentlemen who represented the labour party did not see that the difficulties with respect to the proposed transfers of votes would work as much against themselves as against those to whom they were opposed.

Mr. GLASSEY: We are willing that that should be so.

Mr. HOOLAN: We do not impute political motives.

Mr. BARLOW said the sooner they got over imputing motives to one another the better, and the sooner they all tried to make the Bill fair and impartial the sooner they should do some good. There was one way in which the peripatetic difficulty might be got over. Strange to say, in Western Australia they had a provision for voting by post, and that was regarded as a terrible enormity by the so-called Liberals or Radicals of Western Australia, who were doing their best to abolish the voting by

post. In Western Australia the constituencies were excessively limited, and in some there were fewer electors than there were members in the Queensland Parliament. Under those circumstances the loss of a vote was a serious matter, and every voter was hunted up and must record his vote. In consequence of that, also, they had a provision for an absent vote, by which if an elector on the roll at Perth happened to be at Albany when an election was going on, he could go before a police magistrate or a justice of the peace, and prove his identity and his right to the vote, and his paper was sent on by post to the place where the election was being conducted, and counted in the poll. It would be quite possible, he thought, if a man went from the Barcoo, say, to the Gregory, that during the time he was acquiring his qualification to be on the new roll his vote might be taken by post, on the West Australian system. He was sure that the sooner they got rid of the feeling that there was a desire to do any injustice the better.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER : It is all on the front cross-bench.

Mr. HOOLAN: It is all over the House, and stronger elsewhere than here.

Mr. BARLOW said that the sooner they got rid of it the better. He thought the suggestion he had made might be of some use in dealing with the peripatetic vote.

Mr. RYAN said he did not intend to delay the Committee on the question. He intended to support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Bundanba, as he thought it would be a suitable addendum to the Bill. The gravest injustice had been, and was being, done to the peripatetic voters of the colony, and they had been deprived of an opportunity for exercising the votes which they were entitled to by the six months' clause. He had dilated upon that at some length upon the second reading of the Bill. He was glad to find that the Bill was likely to meet with a great amount of opposition, and that the members on the front cross-bench were not the only persons in the Committee who were opposed to it. He intended to support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Bundanba.

Mr. GLASSEY said he was very glad to hear the remarks made by the hon. member for Mackay, Mr. Black. The hon. member had shown that he did not distrust the people, and that he was desirous of seeing that every person who had been in the colony six months should have a vote. If there was an honest desire on the part of hon. members to confer the franchise upon every man who had been in the colony six months, the amendment circulated by the hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Barlow, would meet the case. The present Bill did not meet the case, or in any way touch it. As for saying there were no obstacles thrown in the way of the great body of the people getting on the roll, or remaining on it once they were on, the fact was that the Bill bristled with them. It would emphatically increase the difficulties already existing. The Colonial Secretary appeared to think that no names had been left off the rolls at the revision court in November last that were entitled to be on; but he would ask that hon. gentleman to write to the registrar in Ipswich, and request him to give the names of the persons who gave him the names of the individuals to whom notices were sent, about thirty, that, unless they appeared before the revision court or sent some person to certify that they lived in the district, their names would be left off the roll. He (Mr. Glassey) would give one instance that had occurred in his own district. A coal-miner named George Burford, whom he had known for many years both here and in the old country, received notice, not only last year but the year before, that he had left the district, and unless he appeared in person or by agent, and proved his qualification, his name would be struck off the roll. Now, that man had never been out of the district—Dinmore—for the last seven years, yet he had received that circular. Who furnished the registrar with the information that that man had left the district?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That is all proposed to be altered by this Bill.

Mr. GLASSEY said it was not proposed to be altered.

Mr. AGNEW: Those are all objections to the old Act.

Mr. GLASSEY said the only alteration proposed by the Bill was that, in addition to notice being sent to the person whose name was proposed to be struck off, notice to that effect was also to be published in some journal published in the district. His statement could be borne out by the registrar in Ipswich that no less than seventy persons in the district received notices that they had left the locality when they had not done so. Who furnished that information? There was no provision in the Bill that the names of the informants in such cases should be given. He knew who gave the information. The registrar had power to make such inquiries as he thought necessary to guide the revision court, and they invariably applied to the employers of labour in the district and to business men, and if those persons happened to be hostile to the sitting member or to a person they wanted to get removed from the roll, there was nothing more simple than to say he had left the district. That had been done, not only in his own district, but all over the colony; and now the only alteration proposed was that the name of the person who received the notice should appear in the public journals. That person would still be obliged to appear personally, or by agent, before the court to prove his qualification, and how would that work with regard to men who were following their daily occupations in order to live? It simply meant, in the case of the seventy persons he had mentioned, that they must appear in person before the court or appoint an agent who was able to take an oath that he knew all particulars of those persons, who might be scattered over many miles.

Mr. RYAN : Who would pay the agent

Mr. GLASSEY said, that supposing a number of persons were obliged to go into different parts of the colony seeking work, leaving their families behind them, the notice would be sent to their address, and it might take a fortnight or three weeks before it reached them, if sent at all; and unless they were represented at the revision court their names would be struck off the roll.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is the law now.

Mr. GLASSEY said it was a very bad law, and it was not going to be improved by the Bill. He looked upon the vote of an individual as his right, his due, and why not make the procuration of it as easy as possible? He would like to see every man in the colony—police magistrates, judges, policemen, and everyone else—have a vote, and he desired also that the easiest method possible should be adopted to enable a man to vote. If hon. members had the desire they expressed, to see every man have a vote, why did they not ask the Government to appoint agents in various localities to see that every person who had resided in the colony for six months had a vote? That was the law in the old country; but the period of residence required was longer; and that was the system that prevailed in New South

Wales. But, according to the scheme proposed, the persons who received notice would have to lose a day's employment to go to the court to prove their qualification, and in many cases it would be tantamount to losing their employment altogether, because stopping away a day would result in losing their billets. An engine-driver in a mine or on a locomotive could not always get away when he wanted, because it was not everybody who could fill his place; and how about omnibus-drivers, assistants in shops, who were engaged from 8 o'clock in the morning until 8 or 9 o'clock at night?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: For the same reason they could not vote.

Mr. GLASSEY said all those persons were entitled to vote, and there ought to be some persons appointed to see that their names were enrolled.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: According to your argument, they would not be able to vote if they were on the roll.

Mr. GLASSEY said he could not believe in the sincerity of hon. members when they said they desired to see every man have a vote, and at the same time raised every possible objection against persons getting their names enrolled, and when they were enrolled raised all sorts of objections to their names being retained on the roll. In South Australia, if a man resided in one electorate for six months, and his name was on the electoral roll, and if he changed his residence from that electorate to another, a certificate was given to him which entitled him to have his name placed without any delay on the roll of his new electorate. That system had never been abused in South Australia, and it was reasonable to infer that it would not be abused to any great extent in Queensland. When the Electoral Bill was discussed in the New South Wales Parliament, they made a provision that if a person enrolled in one electorate happened to remove to another electorate, when an election took place in the district he had left, he was entitled to apply to a Government official, and state his desire to record his vote for that district by ballot; and that ballot-paper was sent to the electorate he had left, and recorded in favour of the candidate of his choice. In Queensland, all sorts of difficulties were put in the way of people getting their names on the roll, or getting them restored after they had been improperly removed, except at considerable trouble and expense. It showed a want of trust and confidence in the people generally; and when they knew that there were 26,000 men—one-fourth of the adult males—in the colony without votes, it was a reasonable thing to say that the time had come for the enfranchisement of those men. An opportunity now presented itself for the introduction, by the Government, of a clause giving every man in the colony a vote, even although the nature of his occupation was such as to compel him to remove from place to place, providing at the same time certain safeguards that the abuses that had been mentioned should not prevail. He did not want to have his own name removed from the roll and be put to a great deal of annoyance and expense to defend his claim. The law in England was that all proprietors of houses should furnish a list of their tenants once every year to an official appointed in the different localities, and if the proprietor failed to furnish that list, for every name he omitted or mis-stated he was liable, on summary conviction, to a penalty of £2; and if the official in question omitted or misstated any name wilfully, he was liable to the same penalty. Those lists were made up in July of each year, and on the 31st of that month they were published in the most convenient and accessible places throughout the country, so that every person might see whether his name appeared on the list. If it did not, all they had to do was to notify to the official that their names were omitted, and there was a supplementary list published containing the names of those omitted from the July rolls. In Queensland there was a fear that something desperate was going to happen because there was a burning desire in the minds of the people for enfranchisement. It was not wise to resist the just and legitimate demands of the people to have a voice in the legislation of the country in which they lived. Wherever that feeling of fear and mistrust had predominated the people had invariably made their power felt. They had all, no doubt, read of the terrible conflict that took place between the people and the peers in 1831, when there was an attempt made to enfranchise only a small portion of the people. So strongly was public feeling aroused on that occasion, that some of the towns in the country were in flames. Indeed, England had been almost on the verge of revolution before those in authority gave way to the legitimate wishes of the community. New Zealand had adopted the one man one vote system with success, and the present Parliament of that colony had been elected on that system; and the Government there, he understood, were now considering the question of extending the franchise to women, to which he (Mr. Glassey) thought they were justly entitled. In Queensland the Government were taking a step backwards. Instead of giving every member of the community some say in the election of the candidate of his choice, one-fourth of the adult males of the colony were practically denied their rights because the nature of their employment compelled them to move from place to place, so that they could not reside for six consecutive months in any one electorate. He had no desire to see any abuses perpetrated, nor had he ever assisted in any, nor did he know of any; but he did desire that every man and every woman in the colony should have a vote. He would quote a section from the English Act which conferred the franchise on householders. The Poor Rates Assessment and Collections Act, 1869, section 19, read as follows:—

"The overseers in making out the poor rates shall in every case, whether the rate is collected from the owner or occupier, or the owner is liable to pay the rate instead of the occupier, enter in the occupiers' column of the rate-book the name of the occupier of every ratable hereditament, and such occupier shall be deemed to be duly rated for any qualification or franchise as aforesaid. And if any overseer negligently, or wilfully, and without reasonable cause omits the name of the occupier of any ratable hereditament from the rate, or negligently, or wilfully mistakes any name therein, such overseer shall for every such omission or misstatement be liable on summary conviction to a penalty not exceeding two pounds. Provided that such occupier, whose name has been omitted, shall notwithstanding such omission, and that no claim to be rated has been made by him, be entitled to every qualification and franchise depending upon rating in the same manner as if his name had not been so omitted."

It was there the duty of the official to see that every man was on the roll as a voter, and then it went on to still further elaborate the matter. In New South Wales the Government did that work. They appointed persons in the different electorates to enroll each person. South Australia had adopted a similar plan, by which any person residing in some part of the colony for six months could, on transfer to another part, obtain a certificate entitling him to vote in the district where he had gone to reside. He saw no reason why some provision of that kind should not be made in the Bill; but when there was a palpable effort put forth in the opposite direction, it was not to be wondered at that members took up a hostile stand against the Bill. He did not believe in it. It was not an honest attempt to enfranchise the people or give

them facilities for recording their votes, or retaining them when once on the roll. Let them look again at the different railway lines where the population was sparse and where there were few justices.

Mr. O'CONNELL said he rose to a point of order. Was the hon. member in order? He had moved an amendment on the title of the Bill, and was now making a second-reading speech; he was going into all the details of the subject, and he (Mr. O'Connell) would like the Chairman's ruling as to whether the hon. member was really discussing the amendment he had moved or the general principles of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The rules in regard to the limitation of debate in committee are unfortunately very hazy. I cannot help expressing my opinion that the hon. member for Bundanba is trespassing unduly on the patience of hon. members. I think he is not in order in addressing the Committee on the electoral systems of the colonies generally. The hon. member will, I am sure, see on reflection that he is trespassing too far beyond the fair limits of debate.

Mr. GLASSEY said his amendment was to alter the title, and he was adducing the best arguments he could in that direction. There were numerous obstacles placed in the way of working people getting their names on the rolls, and he was showing as far as he was able that the title of the Bill ought to be altered, because from his point of view the present title was wrong. He was particularly anxious to see the proper title given to the Bill, and the only title he could see it was worthy of was the one he had named. There appeared, as he had already said, to be a mistrust of the people, and he said that that mistrust should not exist. The persons who were at present disfranchised were law-abiding people. They conformed to all the laws and many of the customs of the country; they were bound by the nature of things to move about from place to place, and because their employment was such as compelled them to have no fixed abode, they were not allowed to register on the electoral rolls or have any share in the framing of the legislation of the country. Those people always paid their quota towards the revenue of the country; indeed he believed they paid more than their quota, because, many of them being unmarried men, they spent their money freely; and seeing that they were a large body of taxpayers he thought they should have some share in the government of the country. Therefore he contended that his amendment was perfectly applicable. It was fully consistent with his views on the question, that the title of the Bill ought to be "The Prevention of Working Men Voting Act." That title he hoped members would endorse. No doubt they would not; but at any rate that would not be his fault. He might mention a very considerable number of persons, the nature of whose employment compelled them to work long hours daily—butchers, for instance. They had no time in most places to see a justice of the peace. He was showing the obstacles that existed. Was it too late to make an appeal again to the Chief Secretary, asking him to consider the suggestion of the hon. member for Mackay, Mr. Black, to allow persons who had been six months in the colony, and were enrolled, to obtain transfer certificates, either to be carried by themselves or sent by the registrar of the district the voter lived in to the magistrate of the district he was going to. Another suggestion was that responsible persons should be appointed to see that persons entitled to vote were registered. If the Chief Secretary gave a promise to the Committee that he would consider the matter and submit proposals his opposition should at once cease, and they would have a guarantee that there was not that mistrust in the people of the colony that was implied in the Bill as it stood. He was doing his best to remove that mistrust, and hoped that the assurance he asked would be given.

Mr. PALMER said that they were at present on the 1st clause of the Bill, and if the hon. member would reserve his amendment until that part of the Bill came on in which it would have a practical effect he would give him what support he could to make it practicable. He made an appeal on behalf of those members who came long distances. It took him three weeks to come to Brisbane, and he did not come all that way to listen to a needless waste of time. He was in accord with the contention of the hon. member, and would advise him to withhold his amendment until a more opportune time. The hon. member would not be studying the interests of those whom he represented and of members of the Committee if he stonewalled the Bill at its present stage.

Mr. HOOLAN said he had no doubt the assistance of the hon. member for Carpentaria would be very valuable. He came from within 100 miles of that hon. member, and maintained that his time was equally valuable. He came in defence of a principle, and thought he would be acting improperly if he did not show the Bill the strongest hostility from start to finish. Last Tuesday week he and his friends took up a very strong stand against the Bill, and as the hon. members for Carpentaria, Ipswich, and Mackay, and others had the ear of the Chief Secretary, it was their place to try and get the Bill put into shape, and to take the initiative. His friends were hostile to the Chief Secretary, and had not the confidence of hon. members. It would have been a piece of impertinence on his part to have proposed an alteration in the title of the Bill, and he had allowed the hon. member for Bundanba to take the onus of whatever presumption there was in the matter. He had stated before that he believed the Bill should properly be called a Workman's Voting Prevention Bill; he reiterated that statement, and would continue to do so. The further they went on with the discussion the more he was convinced that he was right. At first he was willing to believe that he looked at the measure from an ignorant point of view; but as he listened to what was being said he found that he was right. The working men wanted to see those Bills put in plain language.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not discussing the question before the Committee, and I must request him to address himself to that.

Mr. HOOLAN: You desire to stifle discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not in order in addressing remarks of that kind to the Chair, and he must withdraw them.

Mr. HOOLAN: I suppose I must withdraw them.

Mr. GLASSEY said he would again appeal to the Chief Secretary. Did the hon. gentleman intend to deal further with the measure in the direction indicated, and would he submit certain proposals to confer the franchise upon the large number of persons he (Mr. Glassey) had already referred to? Would he also attempt to carry out the suggestions of the hon. member for Mackay, and in the third place would he kindly consider the necessity of appointing official agents in the different electorates to see to the enrolment of those who were entitled to have votes? If the hon. gentleman agreed to consider those proposals

favourably, his hostility would cease. He had no desire to deprive any man of a vote, but he desired to see that every man should have that vote.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said that he could only say that if the proposals the hon. member referred to were put in a concrete form they would receive the best attention from him; but it was impossible to discuss things in the air. He had not seen any proposal of that kind in a concrete or in a practicable form. At the present time he was not aware of any such proposals in a practicable form. The hon. member got up and made some vague suggestions to have something or other done which would enable a number of men to carry about an election in their pockets. That was the sort of suggestion the hon. member asked him if he would approve of. He certainly would not propose anything of that kind; but any reasonable suggestion put into a concrete form would receive the best attention of the Government. The Government desired to make a good Bill, and the Government would try to make it so; but he could not say what view he would take of any amendment until he saw it.

Mr. DALRYMPLE said that if the Government proposed to embody the suggestion of his colleague, Mr. Black, in the Bill, he would certainly oppose the Bill. The hon. member for Bundanba complained that certain persons in the colony had got no votes. He did not intend to enter into that subject at the present time. He took it that the Chief Secretary was endeavouring to bring the Bill before the Committee for discussion, and if they were going into a discussion on the title it was nothing more nor less than stonewalling and obstruction; preventing it coming before the Committee, preventing them from expressing their opinion upon it, and making any amendments if they felt disposed. What the hon. member was doing in his anxiety to get votes for some people in the West was to endeavour, with an extremely small minority, to prevent the majority in this House from exercising any votes at all. He could not suppose the hon. member—who had plenty of ability to talk, and who had intelligence—had any other object that evening except stonewalling the Bill at that particular juncture.

Mr. GLASSEY: Not at all.

Mr. DALRYMPLE said that if that was the case it would be better to say so. The hon. member could not attempt to dictate terms to the Government. He (Mr. Dalrymple) did not imagine that any Government was going to occupy such an utterly contemptible position as to be dictated to, and to make terms with the hon. member simply because he said he would withdraw his opposition. Did the hon. member think that the Government of the colony, supported by the majority of the people in the colony, as represented by their members, would abnegate their functions as a Government and become the mere tool and mouthpiece of the hon. member, on the ground that if they did he would allow them to introduce the measure? That was what the hon. gentleman was trying to do. It was an attempt on the part of a minority to subvert the rightful claims and privileges of the majority. He was not going into the question brought up by the hon. member; but what the hon. member had shown that evening by his conduct was that any one or two members, if they chose to be greedy and grasping, and if they forgot the duties of hon. members, might absorb, might take to themselves, might monopolise the whole of the time. Everyone knew that it was assumed that hon. members, when they came to that Assembly, had some discretion, that they had some conscience. That hon. member talked about land-grabbing—a greater talk-grabber he had never seen. He presumed if the hon. member had an opportunity of grabbing anything—judging from what he did in that line—he would grab it. Personally the hon. member was insignificant—he was only one out of seventy-two; but the enormous share he desired to take in the discussions had shown him that if other hon. members were disposed to obstruct the proceedings, as they all might, if they chose, they could defeat the ends for which Parliament was constituted. They might prevent any decision being ever arrived at. If the hon. member infected others with the dread disease of *cacoethes loquendi* which had seized him, they would be compelled to introduce what had been introduced in most countries—in France and the United Kingdom amongst others—and that was the *cloture*. He objected to that so long as hon. members did not abuse their privileges and rights, and in so doing trespass upon the rights of others. He was not going to delay the Committee. He did not want to stonewall, and he entirely sympathised with the remarks of the hon. member for Carpentaria. He did not think it was their business to waste time. It was their business to assist in discussing the measures put before them; but there had been a deliberate attempt to prevent discussion. The hon. member for Bundanba, with the economy which characterised the owner of a quartz-crushing machine, who used the water in his dam over and over again, day after day and night after night, had been economical in his ideas. He had not given them one fresh idea. He (Mr. Dalrymple) knew them perfectly; they were like a theatrical crowd that came in at one door, and in three minutes afterwards they might be seen at another door. For his part, he considered it a positive insult to the hon. members who were present. If any hon. member would contribute anything towards the debate they would be glad to listen to it; but there were one or two members, one especially, who came there for no other object than to waste time, with the result that they had nobody to hear what they said. The moment they got on their legs hon. members went away, because there was no fresh matter brought in. The hon. member for Bundanba knew as well as he did that that evening he had distinctly wasted the time of the Committee. The hon. member had reiterated time after time the same old threadbare ideas. He (Mr. Dalrymple) hoped that they would all remember that they had come there to transact the business of the country, and that they would also remember that it was a most improper thing for any one individual to endeavour to monopolise the time of the Committee, more particularly when he talked, and talked, and talked like an old organ-grinder who played the same old useless tunes.

Mr. GLASSEY said it was quite amusing to listen to the speech of the hon. member for Mackay, but when the hon. member began to lecture other hon. members on what he called wasting the time of the Committee, he would just remind him of what took place in 1889, when, with four other hon. members, he actually kept a debate going for nearly a whole session on the sugar question.

Mr. DALRYMPLE: You are quite wrong.

Mr. GLASSEY said that he and another hon. member refrained from speaking because there was an attempt to draw them into a discussion in order to prolong the debate. He had a pretty good memory, and he generally remembered what took place.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not remember anything of the kind ever happening. The discussion continued on several private days, but there was no stonewalling.

Mr. GLASSEY said it occupied several Government days, too, and there was a deliberate attempt to prolong discussion during the whole of the session, so that their ideas on the sugar question might be kept constantly before the people. He refrained from speaking on that occasion rather than give encouragement to prolonging the discussion; and the hon member for Mackay, Mr. Dalrymple, was one of five who said it was the determination of that subsection that the question should be discussed until the country took some notice of the matter. The Chief Secretary now said that if suggested amendments were brought forward in a concrete form they would be considered by the Government; but he had not been four and a-half years in that Chamber without knowing how any proposals emanating from him and those who sat near him would be treated. He was hoping that the Chief Secretary would receive the suggestion made by the hon. member for Mackay, Mr. Black. It was already in operation in South Australia.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Then there can be no difficulty in bringing it forward.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The hon. member for Mackay said he would bring it forward.

Mr. GLASSEY said the hon. member did, but he (Mr. Glassey) also appealed to the Government to bring it forward; and the Government said, "No, if you submit anything in a concrete form we will consider it." He maintained that it was the duty of the Government to submit anything that would tend to give the people of the colony an opportunity of saying who should be their representatives in Parliament. Seeing, however, that hon. members were desirous of getting home or of going on with some of the other clauses of the Bill, he would allow his amendment to go to a division, and let it be either adopted or rejected.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the clause—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 36.

Sir S. W. Griffith, Messrs. Hodgkinson, Cowley, Black, Unmack, Pattison, Murray, Macfarlane, Rutledge, Hyne, Tozer, Grimes, McMaster, Mellor, Campbell, Isambert, Wimble, Hamilton, Dalrymple, Stephens, Battersby, Gannon, Palmer, Lissner, O'Connell, Corfield, Callan, Jessop, Annear, Dunsmure, Paul, Little, Dickson, Luya, Barlow, and Salkeld.

NOES, 4.

Messrs. Glassey, Ryan, Hoolan, and Hall.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That clause 1, as read, stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 36.

Sir S. W. Griffith, Messrs. Hodgkinson, Cowley, Black, Unmack, Pattison, Murray, Macfarlane, Rutledge, Hyne, Tozer, Grimes, McMaster, Mellor, Campbell, Isambert, Wimble, Hamilton, Dalrymple, Stephens, Battersby, Gannon, Palmer, Lissner, O'Connell, Corfield, Callan, Jessop, Annear, Dunsmure, Paul, Little, Dickson, Luya, Barlow, and Salkeld.

NOES, 4.

Messrs. Glassey, Ryan, Hoolan, and Hall.

Question resoved in the affirmative.

The House resumed; the CHAIRMAN reported progress, and the Committee obtained leave to sit again on Tuesday next.

ADJOURNMENT.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said: Mr. Speaker,—I move that this House do now adjourn. We will go on with the same business on Tuesday.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at twenty-two minutes to 12 o'clock.