

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**THURSDAY, 25 JUNE 1896**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 25 JUNE, 1896.

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

QUESTION.

REFRIGERATING CARS.

Mr. GLASSEY (for Mr. Kidston) asked the Secretary for Railways—

1. Have the Government called, or are they about to call, for tenders for the construction of a number of refrigerating cars for use on the Southern and Northern railways?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to provide similar cars for use on the Central Railway?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

1. Tenders have been called for the construction of twelve insulated wagons for the Southern Division and three for the Northern Railway. These are to be used for the conveyance of frozen and chilled meat.

2. Yes, when the necessity for doing so arises.

FIRST READINGS.

On the motion of Mr. CROSS, Bills (1) to limit the security to the mortgaged property and (2) to make provision for State advances and other matters were read a first time, and their second reading made Orders of the Day for Thursday next.

OFFICIALS IN PARLIAMENT BILL.

COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 and 2—"Short title and repeal"—put and passed.

On clause 3—"Governor may declare what Ministers may sit in Legislative Assembly"—

The Hon. J. R. DICKSON said this clause provided that seven of the eight members of the Ministry should be capable of sitting in the Assembly. At present the gentleman who held the portfolio of Agriculture was sitting in another place, and while he did not wish in any way to depreciate his special qualifications for holding that portfolio, because that gentleman, he believed, was an enthusiast in connection with

the agricultural industry, still he unhesitatingly expressed the opinion that such an important portfolio as that of Agriculture should be held by a Minister answerable to the Assembly for the various acts of his administration, and would like the Premier to state explicitly his views on the question.

The PREMIER thought the clause spoke for itself. If a separate Minister for Agriculture was appointed he would be a member of the Assembly. The clause was simply a copy of the existing provision on that subject, with the alteration of eight for seven as the number of Ministers, and seven for six as the number to hold seats in the Assembly.

The Hon. J. R. DICKSON hardly read the clause in the light that seven of the Ministers were to be members of the Assembly. It provided that not more than seven should be capable of sitting as members of the Assembly, but there was nothing to prevent less than seven sitting in the Assembly. It was quite within the power of the Government to decide that only five should sit in the Assembly.

The PREMIER: That has never happened before, and this is simply the law as it stands now.

Mr. HOOLAN did not think there was any necessity for adding the office of Minister for Agriculture to the numerous offices already held under the Crown in the Queensland Parliament. A great deal of attention had been paid to agriculture during the last three years, and there were some three or four very well-paid officials in the department now who were fully capable of managing, controlling, and regulating the whole of the agricultural interest. He did not think that they could find any members of that Assembly who were more competent than the persons now in charge of the department. The appointment of a Minister for Agriculture was not likely to make very much improvement in agricultural affairs, as no Minister could devote greater attention to the department than the present Under Secretary. The Government were creating a billet, presumably for some particular friend, at £1,000 a year. A Minister was not likely to do much for the agriculture of the colony, unless he was assisted by funds, which could be better employed in assisting to develop the department than in paying the salary of another Minister. The present Ministers were not so overburdened with work that it was necessary to make an addition to their number, while there were sixty-three members of the Assembly, exclusive of the Chairman, the Speaker, and Ministers, who would willingly undertake the duties of the Agricultural Department in return for the salaries for which they were now standing up. When their salaries were fixed they would be ready to do the work free of cost, other than their expenses. An additional Minister might add to the dignity and influence of the Ministry, but it would not be any benefit to agriculture.

The PREMIER entered his protest at that early stage against the practice of hon. members making second-reading speeches in committee. The whole of the remarks of the hon. member for Burke were against the principle of the Bill, which was that an additional Minister should be appointed. If the hon. gentleman objected to that principle he ought to have moved an amendment on the second reading. However, the second reading had been affirmed, and it was now too late to reconsider the whole Bill. The question of the appointment of another Minister was not before the committee. What had been referred to them were the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. HOOLAN: It was all very well for the hon. gentleman to speak like that. The hon. gentleman had been drawing a good salary all

the time that other members had been scattered over the country, fighting their elections as best they could in their poverty. Yesterday an important Bill had been rushed on. They had found it in their boxes in the morning, and they did not know but what they would have to at once debate a measure affecting the future destinies not only of Queensland but of the whole of Australasia, without having had time to look at the Bill. They had been obliged to crave the hon. gentleman's gracious permission to adjourn the debate, and the hon. gentleman had graciously consented to an adjournment. The Government were rushing on business, and the Opposition wanted time to consider the legislation submitted to Parliament. The principle of the Bill might be a little thing to the hon. gentleman, who had probably had it cut and dried for the last twelve months; but hon. members on the Opposition side were not in possession of State secrets, and they had no means of getting information about them. In addition to that Bill and the Address in Reply, already six or seven Bills had been thrust into their hands, besides which they had the weight and responsibility attaching to them as two parties now merging into one, in compliance with the earnestly expressed wish of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman must understand that the Opposition was not prepared to submit to rushing on legislation introduced in a most high-handed manner. They had not been prepared to make second-reading speeches the previous day, and they had to make them now, and the hon. gentleman would have to bear with them with whatever pliability of temper he possessed. He considered that the Assembly should have nothing to do with the appointment of another Minister. There was more agricultural knowledge and ability on the Opposition side than there was on the Government side, and members on that side were prepared, when they were paid their full salaries, to conduct the whole of the agricultural affairs of the colony. The Government were creating a purely superfluous office.

Mr. GROOM said that no one had been more surprised than himself when that Bill was allowed to pass its second reading without a word, but there was a reason for it, and for making some allowance for second-reading speeches at the present stage, in the fact that the new batch of Bills had been received by hon. members only yesterday morning, and by some as late as midday. In addition to that, expecting that the Federal Enabling Bill was coming on, it had claimed all their attention, and they had been looking to what had been done in the other colonies in order to be able to take part in the discussion. He did not agree with the hon. member for Burke that there was no need for a Minister for Agriculture, but it should be borne in mind that under the Bill it was proposed to increase the voting power of the Government in this House to an extent previously unknown in similar Assemblies. It would provide for eight Ministers, seven of whom might be in the Assembly, so that one-tenth of the voting power of the House would be represented by Ministers. That forcibly recalled the American Constitution, under which Ministers were not in the House and could exercise no influence upon the opinions of those who were called upon to decide great public measures. While he believed that a Minister for Agriculture was necessary, he agreed with the hon. member for Burke that the appointment would be useless if the Minister when appointed were not provided with funds to carry out his work. They had but a very small vote for agriculture, and if with the appointment of a Minister the bulk of it was to be swallowed up in salaries it was

doubtful whether the work should not be undertaken by a Minister holding some other office, as in the other colonies. In New South Wales Mr. Sydney Smith was Minister for Mines and Agriculture, and he had been stirring up agriculture in a way previously unknown in the history of New South Wales. There was great scope here for a Minister of Agriculture to advance the interests of the industry. Theoretically, the Premier was right in stating that the principle of the Bill had been affirmed, and they had now to consider only the details; but under the circumstances he hoped the Chairman would not be asked to enforce the hard-and-fast rule on the subject. He was going to call attention by-and-by to the extraordinary nature of section 7, which he did not think would have been put in the Bill if the draftsman had read the Acts referred to in the schedule.

The HON. G. THORN objected that under the clause two Ministers might sit in the Council, and in speaking on the Address in Reply he had said that one Minister was sufficient in the Council, though he did not think the present Minister for Agriculture could be improved upon for that office. As to the voting strength, seven Ministers were not too many for the Assembly, and would give about the proportion adopted in the olden days. He moved the omission of the word "more" in the 17th line with a view of inserting the word "less." That would overcome the objections to the clause.

The PREMIER said the effect of the amendment would be that there would be no Minister at all in the Upper House. The Act dealing with the subject had been passed in 1884, and the clause as it stood had worked well for years.

The HON. G. THORN did not object, but under the clause it was possible that there might be two or more Ministers in the Upper House.

The PREMIER: It has always been possible, but it has never happened.

The HON. G. THORN: In that case he would withdraw the amendment.

Mr. GLASSEY thought that before the amendment was withdrawn the clause should be made more clear. If the matter were left to the Governor in Council the Ministers might be so distributed that there might be three in the other House and five in the Assembly, or *vice versa*. He did not know how far it was well-founded, but there was a rumour widely circulated that it was the intention of the Government, when the new portfolio was created, to have two Ministers in the Council, and he was quite sure the House and the country would not agree to any such proposal. He did not offer any objection to the Bill yesterday because he did not altogether share the opinions of the hon. member for Burke. There was a necessity for a Secretary for Agriculture. The Lands Department had grown, and was still growing, so much that no Minister could discharge the multifarious duties in connection with it and attend to another department. Whether hon. members represented seaport towns or mining districts they must all see clearly that their prosperity depended greatly upon agriculture, and it behoved them all to see that that industry received the fullest possible care and attention. If the Secretary for Agriculture had his heart in his work, and was as enthusiastic as the present Minister was said to be, he could do much to promote settlement and offer facilities for the carriage and distribution of produce. When this department was fairly established he believed it would give great satisfaction, and they would not regret their action. He hoped the Premier would make it more clear whether there was to be only one Minister in the other

House, or whether the Governor in Council would retain the present authority to distribute the Ministers.

The PREMIER had no objection, seeing that it was so early in the session, to hon. members making second-reading speeches in committee, but he wished to call attention to the fact that such speeches were being made. There was no new legislation contained in this clause, which was an exact copy of the clause which had been in operation for many years, and which had always worked in the direction the hon. member desired. Any Government which attempted to put a large number of Ministers in the other House would very soon find that it had lost the confidence of this.

Mr. GLASSEY: The Ministry in 1892 might nearly all have been put in the other House, and there would not have been the slightest difficulty about it.

The PREMIER: But they did not do it. No Government which tried to run this House with a small number of Ministers would be able to stand. The House would have that matter in its own hands. He wished to follow the old practice, and have one Minister in the other House and the rest here. The Secretary for Agriculture would be a member of this House.

Mr. GLASSEY: As the Bill was not likely to meet with much opposition in another place, and would go through soon, doubtless the Government had made up their minds as to who the new Minister was to be. He would ask the Premier to take them into his confidence to that extent.

The PREMIER: The child is not born yet.

Mr. GLASSEY was sure he was born, but whether he was being cradled in his new office or not he did not know.

Mr. DAWSON: The hon. member for Oxley.

Mr. GLASSEY said the hon. member for Burke desired that they should take the departments in turn. He had no objection to take a turn at it himself so as to be in training for eventualities.

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

On clause 4—"Until others declared, what Ministers are capable of sitting"—

Mr. GLASSEY pointed out that they were to have a new Minister—the "Home Secretary." Did that imply that they were to have a Foreign Secretary as well? The term was rather wide, and he preferred the old title, "Colonial Secretary." The title proposed would be all very well for a federal Government, but he did not think the proposed change was a very good one.

The PREMIER: If the hon. member would read the Act where the administration of the colony in all its various forms was defined, he would see that the Foreign Secretary was the Chief Secretary and that the War Minister was the Chief Secretary. Colonial Secretary was a very good term for a Minister at home to take who had charge of colonial affairs; in fact, his official title was Secretary for the Colonies. But Colonial Secretary here might seem to imply, to one who did not know what it meant, that he was a Minister dealing with the other colonies. Everything outside the colony went through the Chief Secretary—all correspondence with the other colonies, with the Home Government, and with the Governor himself was done by the Chief Secretary. The Home Secretary meant the Minister in charge of the domestic and internal affairs of the colony itself. The term was well understood, and carried with it a fair description of what the duties of the office were.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 put and passed.

On clause 7—"Responsible Minister changing office not to vacate his seat"—

The PREMIER said some hon. members seemed to think there was no need for the clause. It had been in existence many years, and it simply meant that if, after a person had been appointed a Minister, it was deemed advisable that he should change from one portfolio to another, he should not vacate his seat. As they now read the Act it did not matter whether the clause was in or not, because when a Minister was first appointed he did not vacate his seat.

Mr. GROOM: That was the exact point he wished to get at; there was no necessity for it. He would remind new members that in 1884, when the Officials in Parliament Act was going through, the then Parliament accepted the Bill on trust. It was brought in by such an eminent legal gentleman that everyone thought he could not make a mistake, but he repealed a section of the Constitution Act that the House never intended to repeal. That gentleman evidently did not himself know that he had done it, because during the time he occupied the position of Premier there were several subsequent Ministerial changes, and in every case the Ministers went before their constituents for re-election; and even when the coalition took place in 1890, Sir S. W. Griffith and Sir T. McIlwraith appeared on the same hustings in Brisbane. The clause was an anomaly, and he would suggest that the hon. gentleman should move that it be negatived.

The PREMIER said he had no objection whatever. He only placed it there because it was in the other Act which they were about to repeal. There was no necessity for the clause, and he moved that it be negatived.

Mr. BROWNE pointed out that if they repealed the Act of 1884, and negatived the clause in the present Bill, the old condition of things would still remain in force, and Ministers be compelled to vacate their seats on taking or changing office.

Clause put and negatived.

The remaining clauses and the schedule were put and passed.

The House resumed; and the third reading of the Bill was made an Order for Tuesday next.

#### SAVINGS BANK ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

##### COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 to 5, inclusive, put and passed.

On clause 6, providing that the rate of interest shall not exceed 5 per cent., and that no interest shall be payable on the excess over £200 except in the case of Government trust funds or the funds of friendly societies—

Mr. GLASSEY demurred to placing in the hands of the Executive power to reduce the rate of interest from  $3\frac{1}{2}$  to 3 per cent., because he was extremely anxious that the Government Savings Bank should be made as useful and beneficial as possible, and he feared that if the rate of interest were reduced it might happen, in consequence of a higher rate being offered by other institutions not so stable, or, at all events, not commanding the same amount of confidence and respect, that the Government Savings Bank would be weakened. He was no advocate of a high rate of interest, but he feared the probability was that institutions not very sound—bogus rather than real—might offer unwary investors such rates as would induce them to put their savings into those institutions, and the result might be disastrous to those investors. If they could strengthen the Government Savings Bank and make it more useful and elastic so as to extend its operations to lending on approved and sub-

stantial security, he believed it would be of great benefit to the people. If it were practicable he would like to see a law on the statute-book preventing persons from charging more than a reasonable rate of interest. He had no want of confidence in the administration of the Treasurer in respect to the savings bank, but it was possible other Ministers might come into office who would be influenced by commercial men and those engaged in trade to reduce the rate of interest so low that persons would be inclined to take their money to institutions where the security would not be so sound.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said to some extent the hon. member was right, but he did not think what he feared would happen. People knew very well that if they attempted to get a higher rate of interest elsewhere it involved greater risk. He had already pointed out that if the trustees of widows and orphans wished to get a fixed rate of interest and undoubted security, all they had to do was to transfer their deposits in the savings bank into inscribed stock. By that means they would get a definite rate of interest fixed for nearly fifty years. So long as the money was in the savings bank it was practically at call, and if the value of money fell they must be content with a lower rate of interest. Some people had thought that the rate of interest had been reduced recently in order to hold out further inducements to invest in inscribed stock, but he thought the inducement was there already. When the rate of interest was reduced by another  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., people would then see that it would have been better to have their money invested in stock at  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. The hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba mentioned, on the second reading, that he would like to see a list of depositors whose deposits reached the maximum of £200. The same thing had occurred to himself, but he was sorry to say he had not been able to get the information, because the bank officers had got rather more than they could do, the fact being that, in anticipation of the passing of the Bill, they were now balancing up for the six months. Their regular balancing time would be 31st December, but this Bill altered the date to 30th June. He would, however, refer to the matter again when delivering his Financial Statement. He did not follow the hon. member in his wish that the savings bank should become a lender. The bank had the confidence of the whole colony; but if they once began lending money and contracted a few bad debts it would destroy confidence in the bank. All the money which went through the savings bank, which amounted to many millions, was invested in Government securities, and no other securities whatever, and as long as they followed that course they would retain the confidence of the public.

Mr. JACKSON said he could find nothing in the various Savings Bank Acts in reference to deposits being made by agents, and he therefore thought the matter must be dealt with by regulation. If that was so, and the Treasurer approved of the suggestion he made last session, it would be very easy to make a new regulation.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he should be happy to look into the matter.

Mr. GLASSEY: With respect to what the Treasurer had said about persons investing in Government stock, he thought members would agree with him that the people were not conversant with that particular Act, and the benefits that would accrue to persons investing their money in that way. He would therefore suggest that some literature be published on the subject and made public at the various post and telegraph offices throughout the colony. He thought also

that the Government should offer facilities to persons who were paying away salaries or wages to induce people to save small sums of money.

Mr. CROSS said the Treasurer expressed the hope that the savings bank would never be turned into a lending bank. He would not go into that matter now, but would point out that during the debate on the Address in Reply the matter was mentioned, and certain members expressed the hope that some means would be devised by the Government to enable farmers to obtain cheap money; and he would remind the hon. gentleman that in a letter he wrote to the hon. member for Lockyer during the elections he made some such promise. The hon. gentleman's remarks now were therefore a flat contradiction of what he had said two or three months ago. He understood the hon. gentleman and those with him wishing to discourage depositors from investing in the savings bank, because they were interested in continuing the present banking system. The hon. gentleman was well aware that in an ordinary bank it was absolutely necessary to charge borrowers double the rate of interest allowed on fixed deposits in order to pay a dividend. They made a great mistake when they passed the Act relating to savings bank stock in fixing the rate of interest at  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. for twenty-five years or more; and if they had known as much then as they did now, he did not think they would have agreed to that provision, as the tendency was in the direction of cheaper money. He was extremely sorry to hear the hon. gentleman put his foot down on any hope the farmers might have of obtaining cheap money from the Government. The hon. gentleman referred to the English practice of investing savings bank deposits in consols and other kinds of things, but they had a better example than that where money was available at 1 and even  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. Western Australia had floated a loan at  $2\frac{7}{8}$  per cent. But the conditions here were entirely different from those which prevailed in the old country, where interest-bearing deposits were very seldom taken, and the banks did not lend out fixed deposits on which they had to pay interest. The result was that there they had cheap money, but as long as the system here was based, as it was now, upon the borrowing of money for lending purposes the rate of interest would always be high, and there was no hope of the farmers obtaining cheap money until the matter was taken in hand by the Government. They had the example of South Australia in this respect, and also of New Zealand, though in the latter colony they had made the mistake of borrowing too much money for State advances. He hoped the farmers, and especially the members' farmers union, would take note of the declaration of the Premier and of the Government which was said to have done more for the farmers than any previous Government. The Premier virtually said that the farmers were not going to get cheap money from the Government.

The PREMIER: When the hon. member accused him of giving a flat contradiction to something that he had previously said he thought it would have been wiser for the hon. member to have quoted what he previously said in order to show whether what he said now was a flat contradiction of that statement; but as long as members were not responsible for what they said of course they could not expect anything more from them. He was quite sure that he had never said that the savings bank was to become a lending bank; he defied the hon. member to show that he ever said or wrote such a thing. The hon. member had referred to New Zealand as an instance where farmers were lent money by the Government, but in that colony

they did not use savings bank funds for the purpose. They borrowed money, and borrowed a great deal too much. What did the hon. member mean by accusing him of giving a flat contradiction to some previous statement?

Mr. CROSS: I will show you.

The PREMIER: I would like to hear it now.

Mr. CROSS: If you give me time I will get the record.

The PREMIER knew of no occasion that he had ever encouraged anyone to believe that the savings bank would become a lending bank.

Mr. CROSS: I did not say that.

The PREMIER: The hon. member did say that. But he would take no more notice of the matter.

Mr. CROSS: What he did say was that in reply to a letter from his own supporter, who was contesting the Lockyer electorate, the hon. gentleman gave a distinct impression that he would introduce a measure providing some means whereby farmers would obtain cheap money under the supervision and control of the State. He had been in the electorate since, and knew that that was the impression of a large number of electors.

The PREMIER: What connection has that with the savings bank?

Mr. CROSS could only say that he had heard the hon. gentleman openly boast that he had a happy knack of producing an impression altogether different from what he intended.

The PREMIER: When was that?

Mr. CROSS: The hon. member for Maranoa was one of the gentlemen present on that occasion.

The PREMIER: When was that?

Mr. CROSS: Last session. It was not in this House.

The PREMIER: Where was it?

Mr. CROSS: It was in the smoking room, and he thought the experience of the House and the country would justify the statement that the hon. gentleman was a past master in the art of diplomacy, which he seemed to be, as far as his ability went, in saying what he did not mean and meaning what he did not say.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 7 and preamble put and passed.

The House resumed; and the third reading of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

#### CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

##### COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1, 2, and 3 put and passed.

On clause 4—"Allowance to members"—

Mr. STEPHENSON desired to propose an amendment in accordance with his remarks of the previous evening, but he was in a quandary as to how to proceed, because his amendment had been sent to the Government Printing Office, and had not been returned, and, as it was somewhat lengthy, he could not remember the precise terms in which it was framed. Perhaps hon. members could tell him whether there was any precedent he could follow.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY suggested that the hon. member should send to the Government Printing Office for the manuscript of his amendment. The Government did not wish to take the hon. member at a disadvantage, and until the return of the manuscript they might debate the whole clause.

The HON. G. THORN: If the hon. member gave the substance of his amendment to the Colonial Secretary that hon. gentleman would draft it for him in a couple of seconds.

Mr. GROOM suggested that the hon. member should propose the omission of the words "three

hundred pounds" in the meantime. If he succeeded in creating a blank he would have accomplished his object; whilst, if the blank was not created, his amendment would not be wanted.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that the hon. member had shown him his amendment, which was long and complicated, and he had advised him, if he meant business, to get his amendment printed and circulated beforehand, otherwise there was no chance of getting it passed; whilst, if it was only fireworks, he could please himself as to whether he got it printed or not. The hon. member could move the omission of all the words after "chosen," and by the time he had explained his objection he could have his manuscript back.

Mr. STEPHENSON was quite aware that it was necessary, as the hon. member for Toowoomba pointed out, that before words could be inserted a blank had to be created; but he had been in doubt as to whether he could ask the Committee to create a blank without being in a position to tell them what he proposed to fill up the blank with. What he proposed was to omit certain words with the view of inserting an amendment to provide for the payment of members representing electorates within 120 miles of Brisbane at the rate of £200 per annum, and members representing electorates at a greater distance than that from Brisbane at the rate of £240. The amounts he proposed were not as low as they would have been had he been left to his own opinion, but after consideration with other members who thought as he did of the proposed increase of payment, it had been thought inadvisable to attempt too much, and that they would be more likely to have their ideas carried into effect if they were moderate in their demands. The rates of remuneration he proposed were those in force in the much-vaunted colony of New Zealand, and on that account he claimed that the members under the leadership of the hon. member for Bundaberg should vote for his amendment, as they were constantly referring to New Zealand as a bright example for the rest of Australasia. The amendment provided a substantial increase upon the present rate of payment, and many of those who favoured an increase were not prepared to go to the extent provided in the Bill. Before his constituents he had upheld the principle that far Northern and Western members should receive a higher rate of remuneration than others, and that principle was embodied in the amendment, though his personal opinion was that the figures should be £150 and £200, rather than those he now proposed. Until the Civil servants engaged in the Education and Railway Departments had restored to them the portion of their salaries of which they had been deprived some time ago as a matter of necessity, they would not be justified in doing anything to increase their own remuneration. He moved the omission of all the words after "shall" in the 1st paragraph of the clause with a view of inserting—

"Who shall be elected for an electorate, whose place of nomination is distant 120 miles or more from the Legislative Assembly, shall be entitled to payment, in the manner hereinafter provided, at the rate of £240 per annum; and every member who shall be elected for an electorate, whose place of nomination is distant less than 120 miles from the Legislative Assembly, shall be entitled to payment at the rate of £200 per annum; and in addition thereto in either case to the allowances for mileage and passage money set forth in the second schedule hereto."

Mr. FINNEY said he would vote against differential salaries, because it was absurd that a man who lived 120 miles away from Brisbane should receive £40 more than a man who lived 119 miles away.

Mr. BELL thought the junior member for Ipswich appeared to be setting out upon his

political career with a great deal of what school-boys called "cheek." In the face of deliberations come to by the Government after ample consideration, and of which he could not be ignorant, and more especially after the division that took place last night, and the debate which preceded it with reference to the £300, they had a new member coming down and proposing an amendment which first of all was not ready for consideration, and when it was it was worth very little consideration indeed. The hon. member had said nothing to commend his amendment; in fact, nothing could be said. They had long passed the stage of discussing the principle of payment of members. The discussion now turned upon the pivot of the amount, and if that amount was not settled last night it would be settled before long. No man who admitted the principle could refrain from admitting that £300 was only a moderate allowance for the members of Parliament to receive. The argument of the opponents of the measure that he objected to, was that they should first consider the Civil servants whose salaries were reduced. That seemed to be an echo of the last general election, and it was time they left their hustings cries behind them. This proposal was nothing more than a step towards the rehabilitation of salaries that had been formerly reduced, and they were proceeding in proper order and in due course. The first body of men in the colony who began to feel the depression, and the first institution that suffered retrenchment, was the institution that was comprised in that Assembly. In 1892 a motion was passed by some manoeuvres which, perhaps were not foreign to parliamentary life, but which would not have passed had the whole of the surroundings been thoroughly appreciated, which reduced the salaries of hon. members from £300 to £150 a year. It was not until nearly a year after that that the employees of the State generally had the pruning knife applied to their salaries, so that they were proceeding in due order when they commenced by rehabilitating their own salaries. He congratulated the hon. member, who like another great Englishman appeared to be astounded at his own moderation, and upon having, like that great Frenchman, Danton, pursued a policy of boldness. The hon. member had no hesitation in coming forward, in the teeth of the division which took place last night, and in the teeth of the resolve of the Government, to put this proposal before them. He admired his boldness, but hoped the Committee would have no hesitation in wiping his amendment out of existence.

Mr. GRIMES could not agree with the hon. member for Dalby when he said this question was settled by the division which took place last night. All that was done then was to affirm the principle of the payment of members, and the question of the amount could not be considered as the principle. If it were, this amendment ought to have been ruled out of order, because no notice was given of it. This was one of the details, and it was perfectly within their province to alter it. It was understood when the division was taken that certain hon. members intended to move amendments in this direction. There was a great deal to be said in favour of differential salaries, because those who came long distances were put to more inconvenience than hon. members who represented metropolitan or suburban constituencies. They had to be entirely absent from their business from the beginning till the end of the session, and if their business had to be carried on they had to provide for someone to take charge of it. Then, again, those who lived within five or six miles of the House were able to get home, while those who came from a distance had to keep a second home going in Brisbane or else take lodgings, so that it was only fair that

some should receive more than others. He would vote with the hon. member if he had moved a reduction to £150, as it was in former years. But there was no chance of carrying that amendment. Probably there was no chance of carrying the present one, but there were some members who were anxious to have the opinion of the Committee on the subject. He would rather have seen the Bill thrown out, and he voted against it with that object last night, but as the second reading had been carried the next best thing he could do was to vote for the amendment.

The Hon. J. R. DICKSON said the principle of differential payment had been frequently considered, but had never found support even by anything like a considerable minority, and he did not think it was likely to find any support now. Apart from that, he held that the amendment was out of place, because it was an attempt to introduce a quite different principle from that on which the Bill was based. The House had affirmed the principle of equal payment to every member of the Assembly, and although he had frequently objected in the past to the payment of members, and possibly, if a Bill abolishing it were introduced, he should support it—yet as the principle had been affirmed in its present form he should support it. There were two matters to be considered—the amount of remuneration and the period at which that remuneration should commence, and he held himself perfectly free to vote for an amount different from that contained in the Bill, and for a period different from that provided for the commencement of the salary. At the same time he thought they were beating the air, and departing entirely from the true constitutional practice with regard to Bills in committee, by considering an amendment which entirely departed from the basis of a Bill which had already met with their acceptance on its second reading.

Mr. HAMILTON agreed with the hon. member for Bulimba that differential rates ought not to appear in the Bill, and he presumed that those who supported differential rates had done so simply for the purpose of drawing a red herring across the trail. It was strange that of the Northern members, who would benefit most from differential rates, not one had spoken in favour of it. Those who were now opposing the Bill had never failed to take advantage of the system. Some years ago, when it was proposed to give £300 a year, several conscientious members objected strongly to it; they said it was wrong to vote money to themselves. Although he (Mr. Hamilton) wanted the money very badly, he proposed an amendment to the effect that the Act should not apply until the next Parliament. What happened? Some of those very members who objected to receiving £300 a year walked into the lobby at the critical moment hoping the amendment would be defeated, and when he afterwards saw them and told them, by way of a joke, that it had been carried, he thought they would have dropped. The constituencies desired that members should be properly paid. They knew they could not afford to let members pay themselves. It was well known that members always got paid in some way or other, and the experience of the country had been that when there was no payment of members the country suffered far more than when they were paid. The constituencies considered £300 a year a fair thing to pay to men who looked after their most important interests in Parliament.

Mr. DAWSON said by the division of last night the House affirmed the principle that every member of the Assembly should be paid at the same rate. The hon. member for Ipswich now wanted to introduce an entirely different principle; and everyone who had any regard for

the ordinary practice of Parliament, even though he did not believe the amount should be £300 a year, ought to vote against the amendment. In his references to New Zealand the hon. member for Ipswich had poached on the preserves of Ministers, who were only too apt to point out the defects of that colony whenever they wished to point a moral against the Labour party. Looking at it as a whole, there was no doubt New Zealand was ahead of any of the other colonies, but of course it had its defects. Members on the Government side had an affinity towards its defects; members of the Labour party had an affinity only towards its virtues. It was quite true that the payment in New Zealand was only £240, but there was no differential system; and it must be remembered that the single electorate represented by the hon. member for Flinders was larger than the whole of New Zealand. If the hon. gentleman wanted to closely follow the New Zealand system he should alter his amendment so as to give the hon. member for Burke £1,000 and differentiate the others till he got to Brisbane, where the lowest amount should be paid. He complimented the opponents of £300 a year on their activity in opposing that amount—an activity that was only surpassed by their activity in attending at the Treasury on pay day.

Mr. GROOM said they were asked by the amendment to determine the question of differential payment. He challenged hon. members to name one British dependency with representative government where such a thing existed. Everybody knew that the seat of Government of the Dominion of Canada with its immense territory was at Ottawa, yet the members coming from districts beyond Manitoba were paid the same amount as the members living in Ottawa. In 1891 there was a convention of representative men for all the Australian colonies. They drafted a Constitution for Australasia, and fixed the salaries of members of the House of Representatives at £500 per annum. Nobody proposed that the representatives living in Sydney should receive less salary than the member who might be elected to represent the electorate of Cook or Carpentaria. The salary was not attached to the distance a member would have to travel, but to the office of member of Parliament. The Committee were asked to decide that members living 119 miles from Brisbane should receive £200, while those living 121 miles away should receive £240 a year. But the sum should be attached to the office of member as remuneration for services rendered to the country; it should not depend on the distance from the capital. All the members in the Norwegian House of Commons were paid at the same rate, and the payment was uniform wherever members were paid. The question had already been discussed times without number, and when the differential system was tried here those who had charge of its administration—himself and the Clerk of the House—found that it led to a very unsatisfactory state of things. Members came into the House between 4 and 5 o'clock simply for the purpose of getting their names recorded so that they might draw their pay for attendance. The system was both degrading and unworkable. Hon. members were beating the air in trying to cavil about whether the amount should be £240 or £300; and he submitted that they should be guided by the experience of other countries and by the decision of the Convention in 1891 and make the payment uniform.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that the Government intended to adhere to the Bill. Two principles were asserted in the amendment—namely, differentiation and reduction. The first would lead to great anomalies. Why should the

hon. member for Bulimba, for instance, receive £200 a year, while he, who lived a few yards away from that hon. member, received £240 a year? With regard to the question of reduction, the Government had considered the matter and had decided—as he had before stated would be the case when the circumstances of the colony called for it and they could afford it—that the former rate of payment should be restored. The amount that members had been receiving lately was merely a small indemnity for the expenses to which they were put; now it was proposed that they should be paid for their services, and the payment must be equal. If the hon. member wanted to test the question of differentiation, the amendment should take another form. It might be that, in addition to payment, members might receive travelling expenses according to the distances they had to travel to attend Parliament, but that was a question of detail which could be dealt with in the schedule.

Mr. McMASTER said that though he supported the rejection of the Bill as a whole on the second reading, he could not vote for an amendment proposing a differential rate of payment. He never did believe in a differential rate, and considered that Southern members were equally as good as members from the far North, and equally worthy of £300 a year. But he had always opposed members voting money to themselves. He did not think they ever should have done that, and it would have been better if the last Parliament had determined the amount that members were to receive in this Parliament. If members were determined to have £300 it was much better that the Bill should go through as it stood. He had on the second reading opposed the principle of the Bill, which he considered was included in the two-thirds clause and the schedule. He was not prepared to support the amendment.

Mr. STEPHENSON would like to say a few words in defence of the action he had taken. It seemed there was a general desire to sit heavily upon new members in their endeavour to do what they conceived to be right. He was very much astonished at the remarks of the hon. member for Dalby, Mr. Bell. He did not value that hon. member's opinion the snap of a finger. He did not care whether that hon. member considered his action cheeky or not. He would do what he considered to be his duty, and whether he got credit for good intentions or not, he trusted he would always have the courage of his convictions, and stand up and say what he believed in and what he did not believe in, and vote accordingly. He attached no weight to the argument that because the differential system had not been tried elsewhere it should not be tried here. The hon. member for Toowong tried to reduce the matter to an absurdity by pointing out that a person who resided 120 miles away would get something more than the man who resided only 119 miles away. If the differential system was tried at all, apparent anomalies would creep in, because if they fixed the boundary at 500 miles it would be pointed out that the man at that distance would be at a disadvantage as compared with the man 501 miles away. Therefore there was no force in that argument. He admitted it would have been better, looking at it from the point of view of those members who were not prepared to vote for the larger sum, if the amendment had been divided into two; that was to say, proposing the differential scheme after a conclusion had been come to as to whether the amount should be £200 or not. He could see that the tendency of a double-barrelled amendment was to cause some confusion. He did not know whether the rules of the House would permit it, but he was prepared to submit the amendments separately if that was

the desire of hon. members. Notwithstanding all that had been said by hon. members on both sides, he did not wish it to be understood that he was abandoning anything that he had advanced in favour of the amendment. He regretted having received so little encouragement, but that mere fact would not have a tendency to discourage him in the future. He should do what he considered to be his duty whether he was supported by six or sixty members. Because the majority was against him that did not necessarily show that he was in the wrong. He did not think the instances quoted by the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba were altogether on all fours with the principle proposed in the amendment, and unless hon. members expressed a desire to have the amendment put in a different form he should adhere to it as originally formulated.

Mr. DAWSON thought hon. members would be very pleased to learn that the hon. member for Ipswich was prepared to stick to his duty at any cost, but when the hon. member complained of older members sitting heavily upon him he should recollect that a new member should not in the first instance try to sit heavily upon old members. If he did they would no doubt retaliate. The objection urged to the clause was not urged because members thought it was doing a crying injustice to the colony. He had heard members get up and say they had made certain pledges to their constituents; that in the face of those pledges they could not vote for £300 a year, and that they were quite satisfied that the feeling in the country was against an advance to £300 a year. His reading of the instructions given to members of that Chamber at the last general election was that every member who claimed a right to sit in caucus meetings and take a part in the counsels of the present Government was bound absolutely to record his vote for that clause as it stood.

MEMBERS on the Government side: No, no!

Mr. DAWSON: At the time of the general election in the fore-front of the Government programme they found increased pay to members of Parliament, and when the Colonial Secretary summarised that programme in his address increased pay to members of Parliament appeared in a prominent place in large black letter. Therefore, every member who decided to follow the fortunes of the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government pledged himself to support an increase in the payment made to members, and as to the amount he took that on trust, until the hon. gentleman decided what he should propose in the Bill to be submitted to the House. The amendment, beyond the shadow of a doubt, proposed an entirely new principle, and he believed there was on the records of the House a ruling to the effect that any amendment proposed in committee which had the effect of altering the principle of a Bill was distinctly out of order, and could not be put from the chair. He had some recollection of a very exhaustive debate that took place last session on that question, and it was a very moot point whether this amendment could be accepted. However, he did not wish to raise that point; he merely suggested it to hon. members, because he believed that when the matter went to a division the hon. member who had proposed the amendment would not be able to find a companion to join him as teller.

Mr. CASTLING: The hon. member for Charters Towers had stated that members who were at the caucus meeting that had been referred to pledged themselves to that proposed increase of payment to members. Speaking for himself, and he believed for others who were present, he might say that he had a perfectly free hand in the matter. He told

some members of the Ministry directly afterwards that he was not in favour of the proposal, and he understood all along that they were free to do as they chose in the matter. Although sitting behind the Nelson Ministry, he intended to have a free and independent hand; he was not bound hand and foot to the Ministry. He did not know whether that was, as the hon. member for Dalby put it, a piece of cheek on his part, but he came there as an independent member, and he considered that he had a perfect right to bring forward anything he pleased—though he did not suppose that would be very much—and he was not going to take lessons from the hon. member for Dalby or anybody else. He believed that new members might have as much sense as members who had sat in that Chamber for ten years.

Mr. LORD sincerely hoped that the hon. member for Ipswich would withdraw his amendment. He (Mr. Lord) could not support it. He had considered the matter of differential payments to members, and he could not see how it would work at all, unless it was by giving Northern members an increased allowance for expenses. A vote should be taken as to whether the remuneration should be £240 or £300 per annum; and if the hon. member for Ipswich would withdraw his amendment he would move that £240 be substituted for the £300 in the Bill. When the matter was discussed last session the consensus of opinion was that £240 was a fair and reasonable amount to pay hon. members.

Mr. McCORD had a few remarks to make, and, as a new member, he hoped they would not be characterised as a piece of cheek, and that he would not be called a schoolboy. A point to which no one had referred was with reference to the positions hon. members were elected to fill. In the first place, he was elected to represent the constituency of Burnett, but he was also returned to assist in framing laws for the benefit of the whole colony, and, whether he lived in the Burnett district or in Carpentaria, he took it that he should make himself acquainted with the wants of the whole colony. If members living in the neighbourhood of Ipswich were not familiar with the different parts of the colony, they should visit them. £150 a year was not sufficient to enable a member to become acquainted with the various portions of the colony; £300 was little enough. The accident that they happened to be elected for a particular district should have nothing to do with their remuneration.

Mr. DANIELS considered the amendment ridiculous in the extreme. The electorate of Cambooya being over 120 miles distant from Brisbane, he would get £40 a year more than the hon. member for Toowoomba, whose long parliamentary experience should render his services of more value to the country than his (Mr. Daniels'). A lot of those hon. members who were opposed to the Bill were not amiss at interviewing the Colonial Secretary to give them a special train or a steamer for a trip about the country, but the £300 should enable them to travel at their own expense, instead of confining themselves to their own little corner.

Mr. PETRIE regretted very much that he could not agree with the amendment. He intended to stick to the Bill as it was. He would not have spoken, but for the fact that when the question had been before them the previous session he had opposed it. Circumstances, however, had then been different. The matter had been brought in by a private member; further, he had pledged himself to oppose any increase, and he had also thought the time inopportune, seeing that the Government were retrenching Civil servants all round. He did not believe in the differential system, as it had

been proved to work unsatisfactorily. He would like to see the measure passed as quickly as possible. It had been brought in by the Government, and, as a faithful follower of the Government, he did not intend at that particular moment to desert them.

Mr. STEPHENSON: To save time he was prepared to withdraw his amendment, and to accept the offer made by the hon. member for Stanley. That would give hon. members an opportunity of saying whether they were in favour of increasing members' salaries from £150 to £300. As to being a faithful follower of the Government, he hoped he would be found—so far as he approved of their actions—as faithful a follower as the hon. member for Toombul or the hon. member for Dalby. He certainly would not subordinate his own opinions, when he believed them to be right, to those of the Government, or any party that might be formed in that House at any time. Referring to the charges which had been levelled against him, directly by the hon. member for Dalby, and inferentially by the hon. member for Charters Towers, it would be recollected that when speaking the previous evening he had said that he was reluctant, as a new member, to thrust himself forward, but he did not see any of the older members, who had expressed much the same views as he had, at all willing to back up their expressions of opinion yesterday by their actions to-day, and that was why he had given notice of the amendment. He had followed precisely the course that he had told his constituents some three months ago he would follow; and, whether his actions and words met with the approval of the Committee or not, they met with the approval of his own conscience, and with that he was quite satisfied. With the permission of the Committee, he would withdraw the amendment.

Mr. McDONALD: Before the amendment was withdrawn, he wished to know whether either the hon. member or the hon. member for Stanley was going to propose another amendment?

Mr. LORD: I have an amendment to propose.

Mr. McDONALD: He would like to know what the amendment was before he would consent to the withdrawal of the present amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the Committee that the amendment be withdrawn?

Mr. McDONALD: No.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. LORD said he proposed to move an amendment on the 19th line—

Mr. McDONALD rose to order. Down to the 20th line had been carried, and the hon. member would not be in order in going back.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot move an amendment upon a part of the clause before the word "hitherto."

Mr. GRIMES said it was very unusual when an amendment had been announced not to allow it to be put. Were hon. members who were in favour of the £300 content to see it passed in that most indecent way?

The CHAIRMAN: I must remind the hon. member that the question is that clause 4 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. GRIMES: I was speaking to that.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will not be in order unless he moves an amendment. I draw the hon. member's attention to Standing Order 258, which says that when a clause or amendment is under discussion a member speaking shall confine himself to the matter of that clause or amendment.

Mr. GRIMES said he was speaking to the question, and seeing that the hon. member for

Stanley was not permitted to move his amendment, he now advocated the cutting out of the whole clause. Hon. members were taking a very unusual course, and the hon. member for Flinders had shown a want of courtesy, seeing that the feeling of the Committee had been only against one portion of the previous amendment, in not allowing it to be withdrawn so that it might be submitted in accordance with the expressed wishes of those who had taken part in the debate. That was the course which the member for Ipswich desired to follow, and it was unseemly to take advantage of the point raised by the hon. member for Flinders to block further amendments. He protested against the way in which the measure was being passed.

Mr. McDONALD was very sorry if he had hurt the hon. member's feelings, but the first time he had heard the point raised was when it was raised by the hon. member for Oxley against himself (Mr. McDonald). That hon. member had taught him the Standing Order, and had impressed it so clearly upon his mind that he just thought he would see how it would work to-night, and it had worked very well up to the present.

Mr. CRIBB remembered the hon. member for Burke on one occasion referring to members on the Ministerial side of the House as "watch-dogs," but like some other watch-dogs they had been given a bone and had forgotten their duty to the country. He did not think the hon. member for Dalby had intended to be personally offensive to his hon. colleague when he referred to his "cheek." Schoolboys, vulgarly speaking of one who tried to do what was unjust or unfair to the rest, said he had a "cheek," and in the same way he might characterise the proposal to dip their hands into the Treasury for £10,000 extra as "a piece of cheek." He had definitely stated his intention to his constituents to oppose payment of members, and that statement had met with their general approval. His hon. colleague had moved his amendment to meet the wishes of many who had spoken on the subject. As to the election cry referred to by the hon. member for Dalby, when they were likely to occupy their positions for the next three years it could hardly be said that what was said now was an election cry, though last session was remarkable for the addresses made through *Hansard* to constituents. As to members having been retrenched before the Civil servants, he pointed out that they had been retrenched as the result of a feeling throughout the country that £300 a year was too much to pay to members, and it was not until after that reduction had been made that the country got into such a position that it was found necessary to resort to the retrenchment of the Civil Service to economise their funds. The large amount fixed by the Bill might not be thought too much for some members who suffered a great deal of inconvenience in attending Parliament, but there were others who did not suffer to the same extent. He had been spoken to by a candidate for parliamentary honours, who told him that he proposed to give his whole time to his duties, and would be satisfied with the present remuneration. He replied that if he adopted that principle he would make it very hard for other members of Parliament, as he did not think he could be expected to give his whole time to his constituents, who had sent him in to represent them during the time Parliament was sitting, and if he gave his attention to their affairs during the session they would be satisfied. He thought that if hon. members adopted that principle they would raise up a class of professional politicians.

The CHAIRMAN: I would remind the hon. member that we are now in committee, and the question is that clause 4 stand part of the Bill.

The hon. member will see that this is not the time to make a second-reading speech.

Mr. CRIBB was very sorry if he was out of order, but what he wished to convey was that the argument against the amendment was that if hon. members gave the whole of their time for £300 a year they would receive little enough.

Mr. McMASTER thought this was the proper time for the opponents of payment of members to stand shoulder to shoulder, and reject the clause altogether. The 2nd clause had repealed the Payment of Members Acts of 1890 and 1892, so that if this clause were knocked out there would be no payment of members at all. He would not have spoken had not the hon. member for Charters Towers tried to show that hon. members sitting behind the Government were in duty bound, if not compelled, to support the Government. It would be well for hon. members opposite, and for the country, if they had as free a hand as hon. members on his side. The Government had not asked any hon. member on their side to vote either for or against the Bill, and he had made no promises to his constituents, so that he was free to exercise his own judgment. He hoped the clause would be rejected.

Mr. STUMM did not think hon. members opposite had treated hon. members on the Government side fairly or with courtesy. When they asked the other night for permission to withdraw an amendment that the hon. member for Toowoomba had shown to be absurd, that permission was willingly granted, and it was allowed to be moved in an amended form, and a similar courtesy should have been extended on the present occasion, especially considering that it was asked for by a new member. Owing to the refusal, he occupied a somewhat difficult position. He believed that payment of members and triennial Parliaments were the sheer-anchors of democratic government, but he did not think that the financial position of the colony justified the increase of their salaries from £150 to £300. He was surprised that hon. members opposite should support this increase with such wonderful unanimity, seeing that only the other evening one of their number, who posed as their financial authority, declared that the colony was in a deplorable condition, and that anyone who moved amongst the business people could see it for himself. He (Mr. Stumm) did not accept that as a correct statement of the condition of the colony, but that remark met with such a general chorus of approval from the other side that he should have expected their assistance to reduce the amount to £240. He was also opposed to this increase on the ground that with the exception of the New South Wales the rate proposed was higher than in any of the other colonies. South Australia, with fifty-four members, representing 126,000 electors, paid £200 a year; and New Zealand, with seventy members, representing 302,000 electors, paid £20 per month, with a proviso that, if any hon. member absented himself for more than five days without reasonable excuse, £2 per day should be deducted for every day over the five days. In the face of that it was not fair to attempt to increase their salaries to £300 per annum. It had been insinuated that members on the Government side were disloyal to their party in not accepting the Bill. He would remind the Committee that when the Premier moved the second reading of the Bill he said distinctly that if the House refused to pass the second reading he should not take the least offence, also that while £300 was the maximum amount that could be paid under the Bill there was no objection to any member moving a reduction. It was therefore quite open even for a supporter of the Government to propose a reduction to £240.

Question—That clause 4 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 47.

Sir Hugh Nelson, Messrs. Foxton, Tozer, Philp, Cross, Glassey, Stewart, Finney, G. Thorn, Dickson, Jackson, Kerr, Hardacre, Fitzgerald, McDonald, Browne, King, McDonnell, Story, Smith, Dawson, Bell, Fogarty, Boles, Drake, Kidston, W. Thorn, Turley, Daniels, Groom, O'Connell, Corfield, Petrie, Bridges, Newell, Battersby, Dibley, Hoolan, Murray, Dunsford, Hamilton, Leahy, Lissner, Tooth, McCord, Sim, and Lord.

NOES, 11.

Messrs. Stumm, Bartholomew, Cribb, Grimes, Callan, Collins, McGahan, Thomas, McMaster, Castling, and Stephenson.

Resolved in the affirmative.

On clause 5—"Allowances when to be paid"—

Mr. HAMILTON proposed that the 1st paragraph be amended so as to read—"The amount to which each member is entitled under the provisions of this Act shall be payable from the date on which the writ of his electorate is returnable until he ceases to be a member. This provision shall apply to the present Assembly." Under the Bill as it stood members would be entitled to be paid from the date on which they were sworn in, while members elected at any future time would be paid from the date of election. If the amendment were accepted, payment would commence from the 11th May, the date on which the writs were returnable.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the Government accepted the proposal because it was entirely in keeping with the Triennial Parliaments Act. That Act provided that a Parliament should be deemed to commence from the date on which the writs were returnable, and the Government considered that was the proper date for payment to commence.

Amendment agreed to; and clause passed with a consequential amendment.

On clause 6—"No payment to salaried members"—

Mr. GLASSEY thought something should be said with regard to the anomalous position of the Chairman of Committees in the Assembly as compared with the other Chamber. The position in this Chamber was very important, difficult, laborious, and often dangerous to health on account of the long hours that officer had to occupy the chair. Notwithstanding that, it might be rather a delicate thing to advocate an increase in the salary of the Chairman while he was in the House and listening to the debate, still he contended that the office was by no means well paid. He hoped the Government would consider whether something might not be done in the direction of the Chairman retaining, if not the whole, at all events, part of the salary as a member in addition to his official salary. Considering the small margin between the salary of an ordinary member and that of the Chairman the office was not well paid, and the Government might fairly direct their attention towards an increase of the emoluments of the office.

Mr. BATTERSBY said it was not often he agreed with the member for Bundaberg, but he did so on that occasion. The Chairman had most responsible duties, and, considering the length of time he sat in the chair, and the rote he had to listen to, he was worthy of higher remuneration. If the Government would not consent to giving him the whole salary of a member in addition to his official salary, they might allow half, or at least add another £100 a year to the office.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the clause contained a principle that Ministers and officers should have fixed salaries, and that there should be no other emoluments of a shifting nature. Whatever amount the House thought fit to give to its Chairman should be fixed defi-

nately in the schedule. If hon. members thought that the Chairman of the Council or Assembly or both were not sufficiently provided for, when they came to the schedule they could deal with the matter. So far as the principle was concerned, it should apply to all salaried officers. Therefore it would not be wise to make any attempt to alter the clause.

Mr. BELL thought it would be better if after the words "Legislative Assembly," on the 33rd line, the words "other than Ministers of the Crown" were added. The salaries which Ministers received was paid in their administrative capacity. They received their salaries on account of the work they did in giving executive effect to the laws passed by Parliament, but they did not receive any recompense for the work done in Parliament. He would like to hear the views of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches as to the advisableness of inserting those words.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said in the Bill they had previously passed the salary of Ministers was fixed at £1,000 a year. That being so, there was no occasion to discuss the proposal made by the hon. member.

Mr. BELL thought the hon. member much too diffident. He was not present when the previous Bill was passing through, but it must be admitted that Ministers' salaries were paid on account of their administrative functions only. He could not see why Ministers should not be paid salaries as members of Parliament as well as private members.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

On clause 7—"Act how amended or repealed"—

Mr. FITZGERALD said considering there were three or four of the most able lawyers in the colony on the opposite side, it might be rather presumptuous on his part to raise the question but he would like to know whether that clause was according to the Constitution. Could they really bind future Parliaments to the extent of saying that an Act should only be repealed by a two-thirds majority? When a new Parliament came into existence it had the same powers as the preceding Parliament and they could not abrogate those powers unless a superior legislature gave them authority to do so. If they looked through the Constitution given to them by the British Parliament they would find that the only authority given to them to insist upon a two-thirds majority in the case of alteration or repeal was in reference to the constitution of the Council by making it elective or partly elective and partly nominative. He contended that the present Parliament had no power to prevent a subsequent Parliament from repealing or altering that law except by a two-thirds majority. If the clause was in order, then in an electoral reform Bill they might insert a provision to the effect that "This Act shall not be altered, amended, or repealed except by and with the consent of seventy-one seventy-seconds of the members for the time being of the Legislative Assembly." He should like to have some information on the point.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it was not a question as to the power of Parliament to pass such a clause, but a question as to the wisdom of adopting such a provision. It was often said that the work of Parliament was the work of the Ministry for the time being, because the Ministry had a sufficiently strong following to carry any measure they might bring forward. The Government thought that the matter of the payment of members should not be in the discretion of any Premier, or any set of Ministers, and desiring that the question should be determined by the House and removed from interminable party discussion they had introduced that provision into the Bill. The object

was not to bind future Parliaments, and it would not have that effect, because if the clause was passed and the country demanded an amendment of the Bill they would see that their will was carried out by two-thirds of the members of both Chambers. The Government had submitted the measure, hoping that it would become part of the Constitution Act, so that the question should not be debated every session of every Parliament, and it was for the Committee to say whether the provision was a wise one. There had been more intrigue, more unpleasantness, more recrimination, and more hypocrisy over the question of payment of members than on any other question that he knew of; and as the country had decided that members should be paid, the question should be finally settled. That was the reasonable course to pursue.

Mr. FITZGERALD: The hon. gentleman had mistaken his point. They were all agreed that the question should now be settled once and for ever, but what he wished to know was whether they had the authority by such a clause as that to prevent a subsequent Parliament repealing the Bill by a bare majority. He contended that they had not.

Mr. GROOM thought that anyone acquainted with the Constitution Act and the Orders in Council which preceded it would naturally come to the conclusion that the present Parliament could bind its successors just as previous Parliaments had bound their successors. The colony had the full right to manage its own affairs within its own territories; but if they passed measures which conflicted with imperial interests, then, of course, they went beyond their jurisdiction, and the representative of the Crown in the colony would reserve such measures for the royal assent. When Queensland was separated from New South Wales they took over the Constitution of New South Wales, but in 1867 they framed a Constitution for themselves. In that Constitution it was provided that no alteration should be made in the Constitution of the Council except with the consent of two-thirds of the members of both Houses of Parliament. That provision had bound every succeeding Parliament, and remained the law up to the present. The original Constitution Act of New South Wales was drafted by William Charles Wentworth, and sent home and passed by the Imperial Parliament; but in 1858 the Parliament of New South Wales had passed its own Constitution Act, and when Queensland became a separate colony in 1859 that Act was taken as the Constitution Act of Queensland. He had been at first under the impression that a bare majority could repeal that clause; but, having consulted a gentleman more learned in the law than himself, he found that the clause had been drafted in such a way that it could not be repealed by a bare majority. Considering the interminable discussions that had taken place during the last twenty-two years, it was just as well that there should be some finality to the question. The colony had assented to the principle of payment of members, and they might as well place this question beyond the caprice of a Minister and a chance majority, as was done the last time, with discredit to the last Parliament and those who introduced the measure. The main point was that there was a principle involved in that clause—whether with the knowledge they possessed that their Constitution could not be altered, however much they might desire it, unless they secured a two-thirds majority, it was worth while perpetuating that principle in that Bill. There was this important distinction, however, that whereas an amendment of the Constitution Act would embody great principles of State policy, that was merely a matter of detail, affecting the payment of

members of the Assembly. Consequently, he was of opinion that there was no sacrifice of principle at all in adopting the two-thirds majority.

The PREMIER pointed out that there was a great difference in the way the clause was worded compared with the clause referred to in the Constitution Act. The clause in the Constitution Act simply provided for a two-thirds majority on the second and third readings of a Bill in both Houses before there could be any alteration made in the Constitution Act. The clause under discussion was wider in its meaning, because it provided that the Act could not be altered, amended, or repealed except by and with the consent of two-thirds of the members for the time being of the Council and Assembly.

Clause put and passed.

On the 1st schedule—"Salaries of officers of Parliament"—

Mr. GLASSEY said that while he had no intention of proposing an amendment he would again draw attention to the enormous amount of work performed by the Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Assembly compared with that performed by the President and the Chairman of Committees in the Council. He had moved a reduction of the President's salary in the Estimates last year; but as a large majority had decided that the salary should be unaltered, he did not intend to move another reduction. He merely wished to know whether the Government did not think that the salary paid to the Chairman of Committees of the Assembly was too low, seeing that the Chairman of the Council had so much less work to perform for the same salary.

Question put and passed.

The second schedule and the preamble were put and passed.

The House resumed; and the third reading was made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

#### INEBRIATES INSTITUTIONS BILL.

##### SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. JACKSON: I moved the adjournment of the debate upon the second reading of this Bill yesterday, not because I thought I was specially qualified to lead off the debate to-day, but because I was asked to do so because the leader of the Labour party was not prepared to take up the discussion at that time. This or a similar Bill was before Parliament in 1894 and again in 1895, but it has been very little debated. In 1894, only two or three members spoke upon it, and in 1895, besides the introducer of the Bill, two members only from this side—the hon. members for Enoggera and South Brisbane—spoke upon it. I support the Colonial Secretary in his contention that this is a Bill which ought not to be treated with levity. The subject with which it deals is not a fit subject to jest upon, though I remember, that in 1894 one hon. member who has since been translated to a serener if not to a higher sphere indulged in some would-be witty remarks upon it.

"He jests at scars who never felt a wound."

This is too serious a question to be trifled with by jest. There is probably not a single member in this House who has not in some way or other, through a relative or a friend, felt the evils that arise from indulgence in intoxicating liquors. In some respects it is a stain on Queensland's good name that it should be necessary to introduce a Bill of this sort into a Queensland Parliament, but looked at from another point of view, it is perhaps to the credit of the Government that they are introducing legislation on this matter. The objection has been taken to this Bill, and probably will be taken to it again, that it interferes with the liberty of the subject, but

the trend of all laws is to interference with the liberty of the subject. It is a cry we hear very often from Conservatives, but a book recently published dealing with that subject says—

“We can hardly, even in imagination, draw the line beyond which the State may not at some future time see its way to make claims upon the individual.”

The hon. member for Enoggera in 1895 made the objection that the Bill would interfere with the liberty of the subject, but perhaps what he had in his mind was that there was some danger of individuals being shut up in inebriate asylums who should not be there. In answer to that objection I shall quote a few sentences from a work on “Drunkenness” by G. R. Wilson, M.B., and which I believe is almost as good an authority upon the subject as the work from which the Colonial Secretary quoted last night. Mr. Wilson says—

“For the cure of habitual drunkenness it is absolutely necessary to have compulsory confinement under appropriate conditions, and for a lengthened period, according to the requirements of the case. With this end in view, a Habitual Drunkards Bill has been drafted. To this Bill one but rarely hears any strong objection made. The two favourite arguments against it are on the score of interference with the liberty of the subject, and secondly, on the ground of expense. It demands some patience to consider the former of these objections. By the time the patient requires compulsory confinement he has forfeited much of his claim to the liberties and privileges of a well-conducted citizen. The danger of such an abuse as the confinement of a patient who did not require it might easily be obviated. Dr. Clouston, as an asylum physician, has treated over 10,000 insane patients, and is able to say that he has never known a case of wrongful detention in an asylum.”

The last part of that quotation conclusively proves that there is no danger that a Bill of this description is likely to unduly interfere with the liberty of the subject. I have seen it stated on the authority of a professor of physiology that drunkenness is a selective agent in the way of the survival of the fittest by wiping out the unfit, but there is not much in an argument of that sort, because drink wipes out the fit as well as the unfit, and it is not common to any particular class. It affects the wealthy as well as the poor. We have all heard it remarked that so-and-so is a fine fellow when he is not in drink, so that I do not think that drinking can be justified upon that ground, and I do not think that an argument of that kind ought to be adduced at all as an objection to the passage of a Bill of this description. Sometimes we have heard it argued upon similar lines to this that freetrade in drink would be a very good thing. I remember coming across some lines of Macaulay's in some of his writings in which, referring to the granting of political liberties, he argued that the first effect of granting liberty was license, and in the same way he illustrated his point by stating that very often the effect of allowing unlimited indulgence in alcoholic liquors was license, and there was no restraint. But after a while the people learned to use them properly, and the effect was that they restrained themselves. That argument, as regards political liberties, may be right enough, but I do not agree with his deduction, because the experience where freetrade in drink has been tried is conclusive that it is injurious. France, Belgium, Germany, and Switzerland have tried freetrade in drink as a panacea for intemperance. In Switzerland, between 1870 and 1880, the result was that drink shops increased by 22 per cent., and crime and insanity increased to a remarkable extent. I do not know what the percentage was, but we may infer from that that freetrade in drink was a failure. Some people also argue that poverty has a great deal to do with drink. There is something in that; but not so much as those who use that argument wish to make out. Some

people say that it is the cause of drink, and others, with much more reason, say that drinking is the cause of poverty. I agree with those who say that drinking is more the cause of poverty than that poverty is the cause of drink, and I can give some evidence to prove my contention. A short time ago a New York paper, called *The Voice*, contained evidence given by twenty superintendents of inebriate asylums upon this point. It says—

“The points established by all the expert testimony in the case were these—(1) That drink is very generally a cause of poverty; (2) that the drink habit as a rule is formed not under the stress of penury, but in times of comparative comfort; (3) that inebriety is a disease of the will, of the brain, of the nerve-tissues, of the stomach—a disease of the whole system—showing as marked physiological changes as those shown by other diseases; and that these effects of alcohol are independent of a man's external conditions, and are just as likely to be incurred by a drinker who is in moderate circumstances as by one who is in either affluence or penury.”

I think our own experience will prove that that testimony is correct. I believe in the Bill so far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. The hon. member for South Brisbane was the only member who spoke at any length upon this subject last year, and he put his finger upon the weak spot of the Bill, which is this: There is no provision in it by which pauper patients can be admitted. It is a class Bill—a Bill for the wealthy and not for the poor. When the Colonial Secretary introduced it last night he said he had tried to frame it so that it would apply to all classes of the community, but I challenge him to show how any poor person can be admitted into any of these asylums.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: You assist me to pass £1,000 on the Estimates, and you will soon find out.

Mr. JACKSON: I shall be very glad to see the money put on the Estimates for this purpose; if it is it will remove all the objections hon. members on this side have to the Bill. As the Bill stands it is not provided that the Government shall endow these institutions, but that they shall control establishments started by private individuals. Of course magistrates can commit people to these institutions, but we know that unless there is provision made for the payment of their keep the magistrates will not commit persons to these asylums, unless they are prepared to pay the scale of fees that will be provided in the regulations. I have not very much more to say, as the Colonial Secretary's interjection has removed the objections that I and most other members on this side had to the Bill. We contend that the poor should be entitled to admission to these institutions; that as the State takes the money for licenses to sell drink, and sets these public-houses down amongst the people, it should make amends in some way or other. As the hon. member for South Brisbane pointed out last year, in Chicago 7½ per cent. is taken from the license fees, and in New York 10 per cent., towards the support of these inebriate asylums. It is not a new principle to make the drink traffic help in the way of promoting temperance. The same principle is applied in Switzerland, where the State controls the distillation of spirits. Although this is controlled by the Federal Government, the profits go to the cantons, but there is a proviso that one-tenth of the profits shall go towards the promotion of temperance. It would not be a bad principle to introduce into this Bill, but if the Government intend to put a sum of money on the Estimates to provide for the admission of pauper patients, that may meet the difficulty, although I would rather see it come out of the special fund I have referred to. I have nothing more to say except that in one sense I am glad to see the Bill

brought forward. It will do some good, and I believe it will reclaim many men and women who are at present given up to the vice of intemperance.

Mr. HAMILTON: I am very glad to see this Bill brought forward, and although I should like to have seen it a little more comprehensive, yet it is better to go slowly than not at all, and any defects it may be found to have can be remedied by future legislation. The craving for drink is a disease which not only brings disaster to the individual, but to all who are connected with him. That it is a disease everyone who has studied the subject will admit, and it is a disease which no effort of the will can cure. Persons suffer from it in periodical attacks, and those are the times when they require restraint and medical treatment. If a number of those periodical attacks have been surmounted by this restraint and treatment, and the morbid feeling disappears, we may expect a cure. I will give the experience of one individual, a personal friend of my own, who has not tasted drink for the last ten or twelve years. He told me that he was a slave to drink for many years, and that he recognised it as a disease. Some people said to him, "Why not make an effort of the will?" His reply was, "You might as well try to cure typhoid fever by an effort of the will, as to cure the diseased desire for drink." My friend said to me, "I will give my own experience. I would go on a burst, and when it was over I would have no desire for drink for two or three months, when the same craving would come over me again. I have used every effort of my will against it, but in vain. Every day the desire grew stronger. If I was successful in overcoming it one day I knew I should give way the next; and if by any supreme exercise of will I abstained the next day I felt that I must inevitably fall on the morrow. I simply could not restrain myself from it." This man tried restraint and medical treatment, and twelve years have elapsed since his cure was completed. He now holds a very high position in the Civil Service—I shall not particularise in which colony—it may or may not be in this. I could mention other instances where similar cures have been effected. Indeed, I am convinced it is the only possible treatment that can be resorted to with any chance of success; and we know that it is often the best and brightest men in the community who suffer from the disease, and they are lost to us on account of it. I have much pleasure in supporting the measure, and I think the Colonial Secretary is entitled to the thanks of the community for having brought it forward.

Mr. CALLAN: With the hon. member for Cook I agree that the Colonial Secretary is entitled to the thanks of the House for having brought forward this measure. Of course it applies more especially to those who are habitual drunkards. But there is another class of men who are habituated to the use of morphia by hypodermic injection, who suffer even more from this disease than those who drink alcoholic liquors; they also should be taken into consideration. But, whatever the cause of the disease, the object of the Colonial Secretary is a worthy one. I shall support the Bill most strongly, and trust to see it soon passed into law. It is quite time we in this colony made an effort to try to stop the ravages caused by habitual over-indulgence in poisonous drinks and still more poisonous drugs.

The Hon. J. R. DICKSON: I do not think we have any reason to regret that the progress of Parliament in this matter has been somewhat tardy. When a Bill of a similar character was before the last Parliament there was a feeling amongst members that it might unduly interfere with the liberty of the subject. There was also a feeling that by the creation of these private

retreats we were perhaps legislating for the creation of abuses through the want of proper supervision. However, I think we have learned since then that our apprehensions on that score were unduly aroused, and from what we have seen in connection with similar institutions in the colonies, we have not that fear of abuses creeping into these private retreats which were apprehended when the last measure came before us. There is a gentleman in this city who has taken a very deep interest in this question, and to whom equally, I think, with the Colonial Secretary is due the credit of this matter being persistently brought before the legislature. I refer to our worthy police magistrate, Mr. Pinnock, who has had considerable experience in dealing with habitual drunkards. I know, from conversations with him, that he is particularly anxious that legislation in this direction should take effect, so as to enable him to provide for those unfortunates, and place them under proper supervision and care. It is, of course, a tentative measure as far as this colony is concerned, and perhaps the disease itself is not so common as it is frequently represented to us. Doubtless we are all aware from time to time of worthy, excellent individuals who seem to succumb to this disease, and who require some restraining influence under which they may receive proper treatment, and perhaps be permanently cured of their craving for intoxicating liquors. However, as I said on the former occasion, a great deal will depend upon the careful administration and supervision by the Government of these retreats, otherwise there is a danger that they may be used for other than the legitimate purpose of curing patients who have either voluntarily surrendered themselves or who have been placed there by relatives. That is what should be carefully guarded against, and even a more vigorous supervision than is provided in the Bill should be insisted upon. It would be a misfortune if, after creating these institutions, they should lead to any of the abuses which were apprehended at the time the former measure was discussed. From what Mr. Pinnock has impressed upon me and upon other members, and I have no doubt upon the Colonial Secretary, I feel convinced that in this Bill we are moving in the right direction. Therefore it is my intention to support this Bill.

Mr. HOOLAN: In this Bill there is not a great deal of cause for grief or sorrow. It is supported by certain hon. members qualified to give an opinion on the matter. I dare say there is a necessity for it; but there is a greater necessity for stopping the origin of it—the drink curse—in its entirety. We may say that for the future persons who indulge too often in "nips" will have somewhat of a bad time under this Bill; that is, they will lose caste more or less as reputable citizens and undergo restraint; and as these retreats will be some kind of private mad-houses, persons confined in them will for the future have more or less the stigma of lunacy.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: They must go voluntarily to the retreats.

Mr. HOOLAN: Considering that the Supreme Court and the District Court and the police court and the Attorney-General are all included in it, I fail to see where the "voluntarily" comes in.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There is a distinction between an "institution" and a "retreat."

Mr. HOOLAN: One very commendable thing, for which the Colonial Secretary deserves thanks from everyone, is the provision that any person who desires that one of his friends or relatives be placed under careful surveillance may apply to the Attorney-General, who is only allowed to charge one guinea costs, no matter what trouble it may give him. It is to be hoped

that persons will freely avail themselves of this privilege, if it is only for the sake of lowering law costs, and setting an example to the colony in the way of law reform. But I suppose the provision is here by mistake, and that the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill and his brother advocates will rectify the mistake at the earliest opportunity. Certain hon. members are discontented with the Bill because it is one to provide especially for the care and attention of the wealthy classes when they suffer too much from intoxicating liquor. I do not join with them in that feeling. Of course it is not a poor man's Bill; it is a fortunate thing that it is not. Looked at from one point of view it is a matter for congratulation that a Bill can be introduced particularly for the wealthy classes, and place them under restraint without extending a similar privilege to the working men. That is the opinion of every working man and every working woman in the colony, and as their champion I say they are not likely to go to the papers, or the mayors, or the police magistrates, or even to their representatives to call indignation meetings at which to burn the Colonial Secretary in effigy over this. On the contrary, the name of the Colonial Secretary, who is not very popular, is likely to become a household word through this Bill; he is likely to be very much respected. I suppose the hon. gentleman thinks that there is a monopoly of inebriates in and around Brisbane; but such is not the case, though there is a good number. Fortunately, from a revenue point of view, inebriates, drunkards, toppers, or boozers are scattered broadcast all over the country, and one of the difficulties that will arise will be in establishing these so-called retreats. With regard to the efforts made to provide some kind of cure for the curse of drink, that is in every way commendable; but this is only the feeblest way in the world to attempt to mitigate the drink curse. This is no arrest of the evil—an evil that has become an established custom, an established curse, and an established crime in the country. We know that members of the Government are often placed in very peculiar positions. Their friends outside urge upon them the necessity for doing this, that, or the other, and an easy way of getting rid of unfortunate people who have grievances, domestic or otherwise, is to bring in a Bill. But they cannot bring in a Bill like this and say that it is a sincere and honest attempt to prevent in any way the curse of drink in Queensland. I do not say that the Government is not guided by the most sincere motives, but I say that this idea of placing drunkards of both sexes under restraint is nothing more nor less than so much paper hypocrisy. We know that the Government derive a great deal of their revenue, a great part of their salaries, and a great part of their officers' salaries, and the cost of administration, from the curse of drink, and from that curse alone. They see it going on under their own eyes; they encourage it in every way; they sit and guzzle it at their banquets; they hunger after it and delight in it; and then we have them coming down here and suddenly discovering that something must be done for the people who are a trouble to their families, and who cannot otherwise be restrained. Reform like charity begins at home; and no man, whether legislator, Minister, clergyman, or civilian, should attempt to reform the public until he has reformed himself. Governments should reform themselves, and we have no single Government in Australasia that does not from its very inception hoist the banner of drink. They sail along under the banner of drink; they regulate the whole of their daily lives under the banner of drink; in public they cannot speak with a glass of water by their sides, but they

substitute bottles and decanters and casks of grog—grog surrounds them, grog compasses them about, grog overwhelms them, and through grog many of them eventually reach the insolvent court, whence they become dirty, degraded, bedraggled wretches, and are eventually hauled from the gutter to be incarcerated in a retreat for the reformation of inebriates. Why not bring forward a Bill that would try to prevent people from becoming inebriated? This is nothing but the purest sham in the world. What is drink? So much grog that is manufactured, not for the good of human beings, not for their improvement, not that it does any good to either man, woman, or child. It is no use to the suckling babe to try and make it healthy. If it is diseased it does not improve it an atom. It does not help it in its youth; it certainly is not any improvement to it in manhood; it is no use in old age; it is no use to the dying—even the greatest of drunkards scorn and loathe it in their dying hours. It is a curse to humanity, and yet all our Governments live upon it and flourish upon it, and then they bring forward a hypocritical arrangement like this Bill. There are certain hon. members who can easily refute anything I have said upon that matter, although I am speaking at length and am quite sincere. I do not say those hon. members are devoted to drink, but they believe in it more or less. There are few men who move about in public who do not like to be surrounded by drink, who have a strong tendency towards it. Drink is good in certain respects. I have already proved that rum is a somewhat efficacious cure for bald heads. Until quite recently I could not speak from experience. It never passed my lips until I became a member of Parliament. Then I found that a large proportion of learned men believed in it; a large proportion of members appreciated it, commercial men liked it, clergymen approved of it, and I thought "I am a poor sort of man, a very common man, a very inferior man," so inferior in many respects that I looked around to find out what I was deficient in, and I thought it was grog. I took to tasting it inwardly. Then my hair, through having to take such a deep and absorbing interest in public affairs, was falling off, so I took to applying it outwardly. Inwardly I found it was an absolute failure, outwardly I have found it of some use to those who retain any conceit about them, and desire to maintain the strength of their hair. It has restored my bald head, and I advise hon. members who are becoming permanently bald to try good old Mackay rum and test the virtue of it outwardly. If they use it only as a specific for the hair, they are never likely to become one of the persons described in this Bill as being unable to take care of themselves, and of whom the legislature has to take charge. The Bill also deals with those who indulge too freely in opium. If that is so, the Government will have to prepare a place for Chinamen, because they indulge very freely in it, and the blacks also when they can get it. That brings us, of course, in direct conflict with the alien races generally. If we take into consideration that Chinamen come under this Bill, and can be forced by legal means into these institutions, then the hon. gentleman will have to provide separate apartments for them. I see that the hon. gentleman intends licensing certain persons to keep these houses. Why not look the matter squarely in the face and set apart a place in each city or centre of population where you can set up the whole paraphernalia and run it as a joint stock concern? Take first the brewer. He manufactures it. It is pure water when it comes into his hands. He boils it and stirs it about; he adds certain materials to it—hops and malt-

also arsenic and strychnine and other chemical concoctions which the law prohibits the sale of. Although there is a law prohibiting their sale they are sold every day in large quantities, imported wholesale for the purpose of assisting the brewer in the manufacture of that horrible swash that goes out in large casks and small bottles, and is sold right under the nose of the Colonial Secretary, and right under the nose of the Premier. For all I know both those gentlemen may be interested in the trade—shareholders in breweries. It is not so long since we had an hon. member in this House who was deeply interested in the trade, and who was called XXX. We know that these places are established right under the nose of the authorities—established for the purpose of brewing malt liquors; and we know that whole hogsheads of horrible poisons are sent out from them. I have not sufficient knowledge of chemicals to go into the matter deeply and tell you what is in them, but what I say is a positive fact, and it is known that the law is evaded throughout this small colony, and throughout all Australia. It is also known that a number of people in very high society, and it is believed—I do not cast the imputation—that members of the Government have shares in breweries. I say if any member of the Government, or any Government supporter, has any shares in breweries—

The SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the Bill before the House. He appears to me to be wandering entirely away from the subject, and I would ask him not to introduce discursive matters.

Mr. HOOLAN: Very well, I will confine myself strictly to the Bill. Why not set alongside the brewery the public-house from whence the people derive the liquors whereby they become in a fitting position to be received as inmates in inebriate retreats? Why not establish these retreats alongside the public-houses, and alongside the retreats the undertaker with a hearse? They go hand in hand. It is the most ridiculous thing in the world to attempt to establish an institution for what, in my opinion, is a crime, but what they call a disease, when you also legalise right throughout the State every means for the increase of that crime. How do we derive our revenue? By means of public-houses and the wholesale manufacture of wines, spirits, and beer. Is it possible that we can do without that revenue? If it is possible, then we should do without it, and put a stop to the drink curse. If it is not possible, then it is hardly probable or possible that you will do any good by this Bill. Whoever drafted it must have been well aware that it was for one class only—that is for persons of wealth and substance, who were wasting that wealth and substance in drink. Those persons are in the minority, but if this measure is good for them, and it is necessary to cure a particular disease or a particular crime in one section of the community it is necessary to take legislative steps to cure that disease or crime in the whole community. Most decidedly no effort like this should be made unless it includes all classes. What is injurious to one section must be injurious to another section. People follow by force of example. Drink leads to drink, and although the poorer section of the community may not be so strongly addicted to drink as the upper classes—and I do not believe they are—still a great deal of their drunken habits is due to the example set them every day in the week by their so-called betters. Therefore steps should be taken to serve all alike, and without making it a very heavy charge on the State it is hardly possible to take those steps. Is it not possible for the hon. gentleman to introduce some self-supporting measure? The Bill provides the

ways and means of forcing those persons who are able to pay the cost of their maintenance in these institutions, but if the hon. gentleman will give the least attention to the subject he can easily devise means to make the whole thing self-supporting. The persons who are addicted to drink are not the diseased kind—not the helpless kind. Most unfortunately they are of the very strongest kind; and if the disease, or crime, or pursuit, or danger, or whatever it may be called, is to be arrested or prevented, it must be arrested in time. It is not fitting that adult persons of both sexes, who are highly valuable to the State, and for whom, in many instances, we have paid large sums to bring them to the colony, should be allowed to drift into such a state before being taken in hand by the legislature. If a measure of this kind is passed at all it should be made as drastic as possible; we should not tiddly-wink with the question—putting one set of persons under restraint, while others are not interfered with—but should embrace the whole of the community in its provisions. It is the very mildest possible restraint that is proposed with a certain amount of Government espionage under trained servants, and there is no reason why it should not apply to all persons who are addicted to alcoholic liquors, and make them in some measure support themselves—give some return by their labour for the money that is expended on them. That is the proper thing to do. The Bill may be a very good experiment; if it is intended as an experiment on persons capable of paying for the treatment it provides, it is a very wise and commendable legislation. But if it is intended as a piece of legislation to act as a kind of sop to the temperance people, to the clergy, and to certain classes in the community, then it is a piece of tomfoolery unworthy of the House, and unworthy of the gentleman who introduced it to this Assembly.

Mr. BRIDGES: I cannot let this opportunity pass without entering my protest that the Bill does not go sufficiently far. I am with other hon. members that prevention is far better than cure. I am sorry to have to admit that we have a nursery even in this building from which, no doubt some inmates of these inebriate asylums will have to go. That is certainly very unfortunate, and I would like to see that nursery removed as a first step, so that we shall not have to enlarge our asylums. I congratulate the Colonial Secretary upon having brought in this Bill. It is very unfortunate that we have to see men and women rolling about our streets in a state of intoxication. Still, to those who think the matter out, it is far worse for us to place temptation in the way of the weak. The revenue we derive from drink is practically the price of blood, and we shall never be prosperous or honoured whilst we make so much out of it. Perhaps I may hold extreme views on this question, but I take it that this is one of the most important questions that could come before this honourable House. I am sorry the House is not so full as it was when we considered as to how many hundreds of pounds a year we ought to get; but I believe that this Bill is of much greater importance than the one we have just been considering. If we do not all drink we ought to be thankful, seeing that we cannot get to this House from the railway station without passing many places of temptation. We have all had mothers and fathers, most of us have sisters and brothers, and a great many of us have wives and sons and daughters; and if there is one thing that we would not see rather than another, it is that one of our sons or daughters should become a fit subject for one of these asylums. I shall certainly support the Bill. It is a grand thing to try and cure these people,

but a far grander would be to remove the temptation from the way of weak people, and to place our children in such a position that they will not have to pass the temptations that come in our way. I trust that in years to come we shall have legislation on these lines. Although I hold that all intoxicating liquors are bad, I believe a good deal of drunkenness is caused by bad drink, for we know that in drink there is bad and worse. Even spirituous liquors are adulterated and made worse, and I trust that we shall soon have legislation in this direction. I trust also that it will not be long before people are not allowed to drink together. If we get away from this system of people "shouting" and encouraging one another to drink, we shall be taking a step in the right direction, and there will not be need for so many of these asylums. With these few remarks, and promising, whilst I am in the House, to do all I can to help to put down this terrible evil—drink—I beg to say that I intend to support the Bill.

Mr. STEWART: I am glad to find that the Government is waking up to the necessity of dealing with the question of drunkenness. There can be no mistake that nothing so militates against the prosperity of this country as the unfortunate drinking habits of the people. It is apparent, also, that a very large proportion of our citizens are partially incapacitated from carrying on the business of life by reason of drinking habits. It is very desirable, therefore, that some effort should be made to alter this unfortunate state of affairs. Some people think that drunkenness is a crime. I believe that in the earlier stages it perhaps is a crime—it is a fault at any rate; but in the later stages I have not the slightest doubt that it is a disease, and that it should be treated as such just as we treat typhoid, smallpox, or any other disease. But while I agree with the Government proposal to establish institutions and retreats for inebriates, I think that they ought to begin at the beginning. Although I am a prohibitionist, I realise that total prohibition is an absolute impossibility here. People will drink. Unfortunately, the habit has become so ingrained in them that they cannot eradicate it at once. That being the case, we ought to take the next best step, and try to ensure that only drink of the very purest quality shall be supplied to the public. I am not in the habit of sampling alcoholic liquors very much, but I have it on the very best authority that the great bulk of the alcoholic liquor sold in Queensland is the most utter rubbish imaginable. It is rank poison—nothing more or less. In the interests of the public health, of which the Government are custodians, they should see that only pure liquor is supplied.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Pure tea.

Mr. STEWART: I quite agree with the hon. member. Tea drunkenness, of which there is a great deal, is bad both morally and physically, although it may not be so bad in its immediate effects as whisky-drinking. The Government should also see that we get pure tea. One means which the Government might adopt, which would in a great measure do away with the amount of drunkenness that exists, would be to encourage the consumption of Australian wines. In the wine-drinking countries of the south of Europe, where people grow the grape and make and consume their own wines, there is very little drunkenness. It is only in the countries in the north of Europe, where people drink rank spirits, that you find much drunkenness. If matters could be so arranged in Australia that people drank less whisky, less rum, less brandy, less of that hogwash—colonial beer—and more wine, there would be a good deal less drunkenness. And not only would people become more sober, but they would be promoting a colo-

rial industry, so that they would be doing themselves a double benefit. The duty on colonial rum is 12s. a gallon; on foreign rum, brandy, and whisky, 14s. a gallon; and on wine, 10s. and 6s. a gallon. I think the duty on whisky, brandy, and rum might very well be raised, if we must take revenue.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is now wandering away from the subject. I can hardly see that his remarks are relevant to the Bill, they would more appropriately apply to a revision of the tariff.

Mr. STEWART: I was trying to show that the consumption of Australian wine would promote sobriety, and I take it that that is the object of the Bill under discussion. If I have erred I bow to your ruling; but that was my intention. With the hon. member for Burke, I believe that if we are to establish these institutions they should be made self-supporting. A great many of our dipsomaniacs are men who, when sober, are the very best workmen in the community, and I fail to see why they should not be set to some useful employment during the period of their confinement. Indeed, if they are to be cured, it is absolutely necessary that their minds and bodies should be employed during the time they are under treatment. Therefore I submit to the Colonial Secretary that he should embody in the Bill some machinery to carry that out. Again, I believe that the consumption of opium, chloral, and other drugs is doing a very great deal of harm in the community—a great deal more than we lay people have any idea of. A very large number of men and women in good circumstances are victims to these drugs, and we know that Chinamen and aboriginals are victims to them. Severe restrictions should be imposed upon the sale of these drugs, as I do not think half the care is taken that should be taken in this matter. I know that many people persistently try to evade the law, but the law should be continually upon their track, and their punishment, when found out, should be so severe that they would hardly run the risk of again evading the law. I will give my support to the second reading of this Bill. I believe in the principle of it, and I trust the Government will make it a workable measure, and that when it is passed the colony will derive substantial benefit from it.

Question put and passed; and the committal of the Bill made an order for Tuesday next.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

##### SUPPLY OF PRINTED DOCUMENTS.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move that this House do now adjourn. I take advantage of this motion to refer to a little matter that took place in regard to the supply of printed documents from the Government Printing Office. For the information of hon. members, some of whom are here for the first time, I may state that documents sent from this House to the Government Printing Office are in the charge of the officers of the House. An hon. member stated last night that the Government Printer had adopted some unusual course in refusing to supply twelve copies of the Federal Enabling Bill. That Bill was presented to the House by the Government and was ordered to be printed, and the Government Printer does what this House orders. He has no right to take it upon himself to distribute Bills except through the authorised channels of the House. If there are any special documents which hon. members require from the Government Printing Office, the usual course is to send the requests for them to the Colonial Secretary. Hon. members have not done that very often, but the requests ultimately come to me, and I am very glad in nearly every instance to supply their wants. This little incident of the refusal of copies of the Federal

Enabling Bill came under my notice quite incidentally, but I at once gave directions that the twelve copies asked for by the hon. member should be supplied. If hon. members want any information, assistance, or work that can be done by the Government Printing Office they have only to ask for it through the proper channels, because we cannot give too wide a discretion in these matters to the Government Printer. The hon. member for Enoggera will clearly understand that no discourtesy was intended to be offered to him or to any other man, as in what he did the Government Printer acted in the usual manner. The first business to be taken on Tuesday will be the Federal Enabling Bill; and on Tuesday also I hope to be able to present the Bill dealing with malignant diseases in stock, and have it read a first time.

Mr. GLASSEY: I am very glad the Colonial Secretary has referred to this matter of members applying to the Government Printing Office for documents they may require. I recollect when I first became a member of the House the Government Printer had a good deal of discretion in treating with members, and it prevented them having to humiliate themselves by having to apply to the officers of the House or the Colonial Secretary. It is not a great time ago since I had occasion to go to the Government Printing Office for some document I wanted, and I had to stand there for some twenty-five minutes until a message was sent round to the Colonial Secretary's office to ask whether the Colonial Secretary would kindly permit this document to be given. I think hon. members will have to rise to the occasion, and decline to stand "cap in hand" waiting for some Minister to give them orders for papers that they may require in the discharge of their duties. I do not like it; I wish to have the fullest privileges that I am entitled to, not that I wish to abuse them, but I object to have to ask some public officer to grant me my rights. The Colonial Secretary is always courteous and obliging, but it is humiliating for hon. members to have to get written permits to obtain the papers they require. Another thing I may mention is this: At one time hon. members had the right to go to the printing office and get Bills, and amendments to Bills that they wished to submit to the House, printed. But now it seems that all that is changed, and before we can get an amendment printed we have to go through several channels. The officers of the House are always courteous, but the time has arrived when hon. members should rise to the occasion, and insist upon their rights in regard to any printing they may require to be done. Hon. members who intend to introduce Bills wish to keep their contents private; they do not want them to pass through the hands of a number of other persons. I do not think it is fair or reasonable that hon. members, who all stand here upon equal terms, should have to apply to other persons to get their work done. I object to it, and hope all hon. members will insist upon their rights in this direction.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at six minutes to 10 o'clock.