

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 31 OCTOBER 1899**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

TUESDAY, 31 OCTOBER, 1899.

The SPEAKER took the chair at half-past 7 o'clock.

## QUESTIONS.

## TRANSVAAL CONTINGENT.

Mr. McDONALD (*Flinders*) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. Is he correctly reported as having said: "Generally he tendered the thanks of the Government to those patriots who had come forward so nobly in response to the invitation of the Imperial Parliament"?

2. If so, will he lay upon the table of the House all correspondence from the Imperial Parliament asking for troops to be sent to South Africa?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. R. Dickson, *Bulimba*) replied—

Not having seen the report, I cannot say.

Mr. McDONALD asked the Chief Secretary—

1. Has his attention been drawn to a paragraph appearing in the *Courier* of 27th October to the following effect:—"Some of the men enrolled have had no military training, and there will be very little opportunity of giving them mounted drill until they arrive in South Africa"?

2. Will he cause inquiries to be made as to the truth or otherwise of the above report?

3. If such report is true, how many of the contingent lack military training?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied—

1. I have seen the paragraph referred to.

2. Inquiries have already been made in this matter.

3. Not one.

Mr. McDONALD: Then it is the *Courier* that is lying this time.

## PRINTING OF SCHOOL BOOKS.

Mr. McDONNELL (*Fortitude Valley*) asked the Secretary for Lands—

1. Is it a fact that the Department of Public Instruction are negotiating with a southern firm, W. Brookes and Co., for the printing of school books for Queensland?

2. Is the Minister aware that the firm in question does not pay their employees the Union standard rate of wages?

3. Will the Minister, in making any contract for the printing of school books, etc., see that the work is only given to a firm paying such standard rates?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. D. H. Dalrymple, *Mackay*) replied—

1. No.

2. No.

3. It has not yet been determined to change the present method of obtaining school books.

## SALARIES OF FEMALE ASSISTANT TEACHERS.

Mr. McDONNELL asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

1. Do the increases in the salaries of assistant teachers apply to female as well as male assistant teachers?
2. If not, what is the reason?

## THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS

replied—

1. No.
2. The circumstances of the service do not call for an increase in the salaries of female assistant teachers.

## THE DEFENCES OF THE COLONY.

Mr. DRAKE (*Enoggera*) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. Whether his attention has been directed to the cable message in yesterday's *Courier* stating that the mobilisation of the British Naval Reserve has been ordered?
2. In view of the possibility of complications arising between Great Britain and any other first-class power, is it the intention of the Government to submit to Parliament proposals for strengthening the defences (naval and military) of Queensland?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied—

1. I have seen the telegram referred to.
2. When rumours of possible complications arising between Great Britain and a foreign power were circulated last year, the commanders of the two branches of the Defence Force were called upon to report as to what measures were necessary to render the defences of the colony thoroughly effective, and upon receipt of their recommendations orders were sent to England for all such additional warlike stores as were considered requisite. These orders are now in course of execution, and the Government are satisfied that when the guns, ammunition, and stores have arrived, the defences of the colony will be in a condition to cope with any emergency that is likely to arise.

## SHIPWRIGHTS ON THE S.S. "CORNWALL."

Mr. McDONALD asked the Chief Secretary, without notice—Are any Queensland shipwrights being employed on the "Cornwall" in connection with the fitting that is necessary to convey the troops to the Transvaal?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: Give notice. I cannot answer that on the spur of the moment. You want an exact reply, I suppose.

## PAPER.

The following paper, laid on the table, was ordered to be printed:—Correspondence respecting the supply of compressed fodder to the Queensland Transvaal contingent.

Mr. McDONALD: Is that up to date?

The PREMIER: The whole history is there.

## SUPPLY.

## RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

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

## THE TRANSVAAL CONTINGENT.

Mr. FOGARTY (*Drayton and Toowoomba*): I desire to draw the attention of the House to the intemperate language used by Major Ricardo at the banquet at the Exhibition hall the other night.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear! Oh, oh!

Mr. FOGARTY: He is reported to have said that certain statements made in this House were deliberate lies. I presume he referred to myself. If so, I hurl back the accusation in his teeth.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. FOGARTY: They are perfectly true. I sincerely regret that the Premier, who I believe presided on that occasion, did not see fit to call that gentleman to book. Major Ricardo is reported to have said that we loaf on the Opposition benches at £6 a week. I venture to say that we return much better service to the country than Major Ricardo.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. FOGARTY: He practically, in the course of his speech, admitted my statement to be

correct. On Thursday evening I stated I thought that the men whom he insulted are his equals. I will go further now, and say that they are considerably his superior.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. FOGARTY: He grossly insulted a respectable body of men in Toowoomba, and I think I should be wanting in my duty if I did not take the first opportunity of protesting against his unmanly action. I believe that the functions of an Opposition are as great as those of a Government. It is our duty to criticise all matters that are placed before the House, and Major Ricardo showed exceedingly bad taste when he said we were loafing on the Opposition benches at £6 a week. I believe the House was almost unanimous in endorsing the sending of troops to the Transvaal, and I only regret that they have not some better leader than Major Ricardo. He evidently forgot his position when he insulted the House in the gross manner reported in the *Courier*. I repeat that what I said on Thursday last was quite true, and I would like to ask the Premier, without notice, has any communication been received from the Mounted Infantry in Toowoomba in the direction of demanding an apology from Major Ricardo. If that communication has reached the Defence Office, I think the Premier should be aware of the fact. I trust that this gratuitous insult of Major Ricardo will not be allowed to go unchallenged; I hope, now that I have entered my protest, others will speak and express their opinions for or against his action. This I do know that had I been present at any banquet at which any Premier or any member of the House was insulted to the same extent as Major Ricardo insulted myself I would have defended them to the best of my ability. I trust that at a later stage I shall be in possession of copies of correspondence that I understand is already in existence as far as the Toowoomba Mounted Infantry and the Defence Force of the city are concerned. When I am in that position I hope I shall be able to show very clearly that I certainly was not untruthful when I drew attention to the fact on Thursday last. I did it in the most gentlemanly way. I should have been much more forcible had Major Ricardo been present to have an opportunity of defending himself, but as the officer was not present I simply drew attention to the matter as mildly as possible. I know there is considerable heat over the matter in a section of the community of Drayton and Toowoomba. I saw two members of the Mounted Infantry in Queen street this afternoon and they assured me that an apology had been demanded, and I hope that apology will be given—I will go further and say that the Premier should call upon Major Ricardo to make a public apology to this House.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. HAMILTON (*Cook*): I wish to refer to a matter in connection with this—something far more important than that to which the hon. member has just referred, and that is the manner in which this department is conducted. It appears to me—and I hope it may be proved that I am wrong—that this department—the Brigade Office—is deceiving the Government. I notice, for instance, in the correspondence laid on the table this afternoon Colonel Gunter states on the 23rd of October that—

Up to the present time no offer to supply fodder of any description has been recommended for acceptance. Here is an explicit statement that has been proved to be untrue.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. HAMILTON: I am not finding fault with the fodder; I think it is very good fodder

indeed, and I am not questioning the correctness of the order; but here is a statement which is untrue, and it is necessary to find out who is the man who has deceived us. Then again, in connection with Mr. Pelham, I admire him for his courage in going to the Transvaal, and I believe he is a good man; I have nothing to say against him, but I consider that Queenslanders should have the preference. Some time since I was informed on the highest authority that Captain Pelham was going as a private. A few days since I heard that it had been decided that he was going as an officer, and I was then informed that the reason why the change was made was because Colonel Gunter wrote to the Chief Secretary stating that Mr. Pelham was the only man who had the Hythe certificate which would enable a man to work the machine gun. That statement has not a scintilla of truth in it. I know two myself, and there may be more—Lieutenant-Colonel Hutchison and Lieutenant Carroll—who have Hythe certificates, who went home and qualified chiefly at their own expense. Those men both wished to go, even as privates, and they should have had the preference, but even if they should not have had the preference there is the statement made by Colonel Gunter, and on the strength of that statement that Mr. Pelham was the only man with the Hythe certificate it was decided that he should go as an officer. That statement has been proved to be utterly without foundation, therefore the reason why he should go as an officer has vanished. Colonel Gunter is on the horns of a dilemma, because he must either have made this statement knowing that it was untrue or else he must be grossly ignorant of the capacities of his officers. There is the Army List stating that Lieutenant-Colonel Hutchison has the Hythe certificate, and I cannot understand how Colonel Gunter can be so ignorant as not to be aware of the fact. I shall now give another case. There are two friends of mine, Lieutenant Walker and Captain Toll, of Charters Towers. I do not believe there are two better soldiers or better shots in Queensland. Lieutenant Walker was the man who knocked that foreigner over on Charters Towers the other day when he boo-hooed the Queen. I know these men well. Lieutenant Walker has shot for Queensland on five occasions, and both he and Captain Toll have just been selected as two of the best shots in Queensland to go to Melbourne to shoot for Queensland. It is most essential that we should have good shots in the contingent. We see in the report that the great thing is to hit, hit, hit. I must say, without any disrespect to the men who are going—they are a fine lot of men, capable men, and good men, but I say there are very few prize shots amongst them—I don't suppose there are more than thirty—I say it would be a good thing to have a few really good shots amongst them to give them hints, for they are just the kind of men who would readily profit by them. Lieutenant Walker, directly it was known that the offer had been made, sent a wire to Colonel Ricardo, offering his services in any capacity, and that was not replied to. A week or two afterwards he sent another wire, at a cost of about half a sovereign, but he still did not receive the courtesy of a reply. He applied a third time, and then got a letter in which he was told that he could not be taken, as they were already four deep. Captain Toll also made a similar offer with a like result. We know that they were not four deep; that they had not even sufficient subsequent to this refusal. Moreover, those two gentlemen not only offered to go, but to go as privates, to find their own horses, their own equipment, and everything else, and to go without pay. Yet they were not even replied to in the first two instances, and in the third

instance they were refused. Subsequently I introduced them to the Premier, and he gave them a letter to Colonel Ricardo yesterday, thinking there might be some chance, and here is a letter I received from them last night—

*The letter received from the Hon. Mr. Dickson this morning, we at once visited the Meeandah Camp, expecting to see Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo there. We were not successful in doing so. We thereupon left the letter in the hands of Captain Chauvel at the camp, and requested that a telephone message be sent us as soon as convenient. After a lot of trouble, and many times inquiring, we received a reply at a quarter past 10 this evening (having waited about the hotel all this time), to the effect that there was no possible chance of our getting berths on the same boat, and no vacancies in any shape in the contingent. The needless delay in replying to our request has subjected us to considerable inconvenience.*

The statement made to them was untrue, because I was at the camp to-day and I ascertained from officers that a number of persons were disqualified yesterday because they could not ride, and that men had been appointed to-day. So here is another statement that is untrue, and it is our duty to ascertain who is running this business. I wish also to allude to another matter. New rifles have been served out to those volunteers, out of which they have not had an opportunity to shoot. Any shooting man knows perfectly well that he would sooner shoot with his own rifle than he is satisfied with, because he knows its errors. You may be weeks before you find out the errors of a rifle; one rifle when it gets hot will cause the bullet to drop, and another will cause it to rise; one will shoot to the right, and another to the left; and if you do not know your rifle it is of no use to you. A rifle is about as hard to understand as a woman, and Solomon says that is the most difficult thing to understand in the world. Two crack shots in one of the companies told me when I went out to the camp that they were in utter ignorance of their rifles, and did not know how they would shoot, and knowing that some of these rifles shot 5, 6, 8, or 10 feet to the left or right at 600 yards, I promised to take their rifles out to the target and test them, and then get the gunmaker to shift the sights accordingly. But when Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo was asked for his permission, he said, "No, I will not allow it, as if I do every other man will want it done." If every other man wants it done, that shows that it ought to be done; but as a matter of fact it is not likely that many of the others could get volunteers to test their rifles for them and make the required correction. I thought it possible that the rifles might be tested in Africa, and if that were to be done I would have been satisfied. To-day I asked Colonel Gunter, "How do the rifles shoot, Colonel?" He replied, "Oh, fairly well"—I forget the exact words—"there are some a little out."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What is the rifle?

Mr. J. HAMILTON: The Martini-Enfield. Then I asked him, "Will the volunteers when they go ashore have a chance to test their rifles, and if they do not shoot correctly get them rectified by a gunmaker or armourer?" He replied, and in order that there might be no possible mistake about the matter I wrote down his answer—"No, that cannot be allowed now, each man will have to find out for himself how his rifle shoots." One of the gentlemen who wanted me to take his rifle and test it, said, "I am not allowed to take my old rifle, on which I can implicitly depend, and which I selected from four rifles out of the store, one shot 10 feet to the left in 600 yards, another 5 feet to the left, another 5 feet to the right in 600 yards." Yet Colonel Gunter says those men are to find out on the field how their rifles shoot. It is perfectly impossible to find that out on the field. You want a target to find that out, and then when it is found out

you want to have the sights altered by a gun-maker or armourer. But those men are to be sent out in the field with rifles they do not know, and with regard to which they have no idea how they shoot. When they go on the field they will have to ask a Boer to stand a few feet to the right or the left, or if they want to shoot one Boer they will have to aim at another one. What I am stating is an actual solid fact, and I am deadly serious in the matter. I know every crack shot in the colony. They do not like to say anything to those in authority; but they know that I am a shooting man, and that I know what is wanted, and several have spoken to me on the matter.

MR. JACKSON: Why didn't you bring this up sooner?

MR. J. HAMILTON: How could I bring it up sooner when I only heard of it on Sunday? I have brought it up now at the first opportunity. It was not three hours ago that Colonel Gunter told me that it was not intended that the rifles should be tested in Africa. It is not too late now for instructions to be given for that to be done in Africa. These men's lives are at stake, and I ask that instructions be given to Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo that when he gets ashore in Africa these rifles shall be tested, that twenty or thirty of the best shooting men be sent to the targets to test the rifles for errors, and that when errors are found the sights of the rifles shall be shifted.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Let it be done on board the steamer.

MR. J. HAMILTON: It cannot be done on board a steamer. You can shoot with a gun on a steamer, but you cannot shoot with perfect accuracy with a rifle. I have tried to shoot with a rifle on a steamer, but the vibration is so great that you cannot make reliable shooting. It is a most important thing that the rifles should be tested, and there can be no possible excuse for that not being done. Explicit instructions ought to be given to that effect. I have never seen Colonel Gunter shoot, and I do not think he knows much about it, but other officers before him used the rifle here. Colonel French always shot at the association meetings. He was a rifleman; but I do not know whether Colonel Gunter can shoot or not. But he evidently can know very little about rifles. When a rifle barrel is made, there is a block for the foresight and a block for the back sight fixed on the rifle. Then the lining machine which runs parallel with the barrel is placed on them. The foresight is filed down to the lining machine, and if the lining machine has got out of gear there is an error in the sight. Most of the prizemen here have had to take their Martini-Enfield rifles to Mr. Power or to some other gunmaker to get the sights altered, and some shot so much to the left or the right that shifting the foresight was not sufficient, and the back sight also had to be shifted. I hope the House will insist upon instructions being given to Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo to have these rifles tested when the troops get ashore in South Africa.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McDONALD (*Flinders*): It is just as well, now we are going into all these mysteries, that we should inquire into a few others. It is not many minutes ago since I got an answer from the hon. gentleman to the effect there were no men in the military department who had not had a military training. Now we are told by the hon. member for Cook that yesterday a number of men were disqualified from joining the contingent on the ground that they could not ride. I think that is sufficient proof that there must have been some truth in the rumours that prompted me to ask the question I did this afternoon, and that there must be a good deal of truth in the paragraph that appeared in the

*Courier*, stating that there were a number of men who had not had a military training.

[8 p.m.] In spite of this the hon. gentleman comes down—I am not blaming him personally, because the answers to the questions were handed to him by the military authorities—and says that there was no truth in the statement at all. While the hon. gentleman was answering that question, I was very much surprised at the way in which he answered the next one. He admitted that his attention had been drawn to the paragraph. The former question I asked was on the statement made by the hon. gentleman himself, and there was no excuse for the way in which he treated it. If he had taken any trouble at all he could have looked up the *Courier*, and found the statement in his speech. I do not know whether the statement is true or not, but he is reported to have said, in speaking to the troops—

Generally he tendered the thanks of the Government to those patriots who had come forward so nobly in response to the invitation of the Imperial Government.

What was the meaning of those words? If there was no meaning in them, why did he utter them? If there is any meaning in them, how is it that we have no correspondence in connection with the Imperial Government asking for troops?

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

MR. McDONALD: It appears to me that in this particular case there is some truth in the statement that the hon. gentleman has made—namely, that the Imperial Government had actually asked this colony in particular for troops, and on the invitation of Mr. Chamberlain the hon. gentleman was the first to rush into the breach and consent to sending these troops. We find now that a number of the men who were going to be sent have had to be disqualified at the last moment because they cannot ride. Apart from the damaging statements made to-night by the hon. member for Cook, which are very serious to the contingent personally, as well as for the honour and glory of this colony, which the Premier is always prating about, we have another serious matter. In the first place, when Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo took upon himself to refer to this Parliament he committed a distinct breach of military discipline, and in the next place he encroached a great deal upon the privileges which members enjoy in this House. If members are not to be allowed to express their opinions unfettered without threats from a military servant of the colony, I think the sooner we give up responsible government the better.

MR. LEAHY: Answer with your left.

MR. McDONALD: There are other statements which I wish to draw attention to. If the hon. gentleman really remembers what took place at the citizens' banquet—if the excitement at the time of that after-dinner speech was not so great that his memory has floated away from him altogether—I would draw attention to this statement: The hon. gentleman went on to compliment the troops upon getting ready in such a short space of time, and he said—

Although at times there was carping criticism on this side and that, the thanks of the colony were due to Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo—(applause)—and those who had assisted him, in so efficiently organising the force that within the space of seven or ten days they had been got ready to go on board the transport for service in South Africa.

Now, the hon. gentleman made that statement, I presume, in good faith; but see the flattening out he gets when Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo gets up to speak. He stated—

The wagons which they had used that day, of course, had not been built in six or seven days, nor had all the other equipments been provided, nor the work done, within the short period which had elapsed since the money was actually voted. He went to tradesmen

personally and asked them to undertake the necessary work in advance. They patriotically consented, and half the things which had been made were made long before the money was voted. (Applause.)

I really think that a statement like that must have made the Premier look very small, and rather than join in the applause I am sure the hon. gentleman would have sooner gone outside. And the supply of these wagons and other equipment leads me to ask the same question that was asked by the hon. member for Cook, "Who is running this department?" and why all this confusion, and this deliberate attempt to deceive this House in the matter? It appears to me that the military authorities were prepared to take this matter into their own hands, and not consult the Premier or anyone else. We find, according to the published statements made by Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo himself, that he had taken upon himself the ordering of most of the equipment before ever the money was voted by Parliament. Let us suppose for a moment that this House in its wisdom had refused to vote the money.

Mr. KIDSTON: It is not voted yet.

Mr. McDONALD: No, we have not actually voted it yet, but there has been a motion passed which empowers the Government to do certain things. But suppose the motion had been defeated, and the contingent had not been allowed to go, who would have been responsible for all this equipment that has been ordered by Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo? Would that gentleman himself have been held responsible by the Government? I suppose it would have resolved itself into a similar situation to the fodder question, and to save litigation the Government would have had to come down and take up the orders that had been given. We find that at the banquet the other night, the hon. gentleman, to make himself look big, spoke in very glowing terms of a patriotic citizen who sent along a cheque for £750 to pay for the fodder that has been so much talked about.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It was a syndicate.

Mr. McDONALD: And the paper says that, after three magnificent cheers had been given, he thought it was so good that he decided to go no further with his speech, and he resumed his seat. It turns out now that it was a huge syndicate who wanted to buy the fodder, and there was no patriotic citizen in it at all. Then, in spite of the hon. gentleman getting a cheque for £750 to pay for the fodder, he had to send a cheque for that amount from the Treasury to save litigation. What was the matter with the cheque which the hon. gentleman got?

Mr. KERR: It was not good enough.

Mr. McDONALD: As a matter of fact there was a mistake in the matter. The syndicate wanted, I presume, to buy the fodder and send it as a speculation to South Africa. As a speculation, I suppose, from their point of view, that was a very good thing to do, but I do not think it was a very good thing for the hon. gentleman to fall into the little trap and ask for three magnificent cheers for the patriotic citizen. And now we find that the concluding act in connection with this fodder business is that the Government send to the contractors, Messrs. E. Rich and Company, a cheque for £750 to save litigation. Taking everything into consideration, there has been a great deal in connection with this contingent that has been and is mysterious. On a matter like this, when the hon. member has got the country at his back—as he says he has—why all this mystery? Why does he not come down and tell us honestly the exact position we are in?

Mr. LESINA: He does not know himself.

Mr. McDONALD: Yes, that is what I am just coming to. It turns out now, from what we have learned from the speech of the hon. member for Cook; from what stray information we have been able to drag from the Government; and also from the reports we have been able to gather about the city—I say it turns out that the Government have been a sort of puppet in the matter. They have not been able to use their own discretion at all; they have really been run by one man in the whole show. As a matter of fact, the Premier has made statements himself in connection with this case which he is not prepared to verify now. Why is he prepared to make statements when he is not prepared to verify them afterwards, when the occasion offers? First of all, there was a distinct statement made by the hon. gentleman that the Commandant was told by a number of men that they desired to volunteer to go to South Africa. Well, not a solitary word has been uttered to show that this was the case. Then, again, the hon. gentleman said he took upon himself to make the offer to send these troops to the Transvaal; but now it appears that he was only playing second fiddle to Colonel Gunter, who was at the bottom of the suggestion. Various other statements of this kind have been made, and they are so confusing that we really don't know who is to blame or who is telling untruths, and I think it is almost necessary that a special commission should be appointed to deal with the whole matter of sending these troops to South Africa. I certainly think that the statements made by the hon. member for Cook are very serious and most damaging, not only to the men themselves, but to the Government, in having allowed themselves to be run by one department, without inquiring into these matters.

Question stated.

Mr. DAWSON (*Charters Towers*): It is rather surprising that there has been no reply from the Treasury bench to those matters. Who is the Minister for War on the other side?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: No Minister for War.

Mr. DAWSON: I know the hon. gentleman who interjects was Minister for War last night, but I want to know who is the official Minister for War. The hon. member for Cook has brought up a matter of great importance; it is not a laughing matter—it is a very serious matter; it is a matter affecting the lives of the men who are going to the Transvaal, and in another way it affects the honour of this colony of Queensland.

The PREMIER: You have not been conspicuous in trying to uphold the honour of the colony lately.

Mr. JENKINSON: The men won't have much chance if they have rifles that won't shoot straight.

Mr. DAWSON: The statements made by the hon. member for Cook certainly demand an authoritative reply from the Minister responsible for the state of affairs that has been stated to exist. Hon. members have every right to expect such a reply. What did the hon. member for Cook say? He impugned the veracity of certain documents laid on the table of the House, and on two or three occasions he has said that deliberate untruths have been told—in plain terms that somebody is telling lies. He has given "the lie direct" with regard to these public documents. He said, as near as he could, that if he saw the gentleman who was responsible for these statements in these documents sitting between Ananias and Sapphira, he would say that he was in the bosom of his family. (Laughter.) That responsible hon. member impugns the veracity of public officials,

and denies the accuracy of public documents, and I say that it is the bounden duty of the Minister responsible to make some explanation, even if he cannot make any defence. I don't know whether that Minister is the Chief Secretary or the Home Secretary; but whichever it is, he has a right to make some explanation, either to show that the hon. member for Cook is wrong, or cheerfully acknowledge that he is right, and make the corrections to prevent these lies going out before the public, and so not deceive the public. The hon. member for Cook is not a new member of this Chamber—in fact, he is one of the oldest members, and, moreover, he is holding a very responsible position in the Government. He is the Government "whip," and when that hon. member makes a statement of this kind, impugning the veracity of public officials and of public documents laid on the table of this House, that is all the more reason why the responsible Minister should acknowledge the truth, or point out where the hon. member is wrong. It is all very well for the hon. member to sit down and endeavour to look wise, when he feels that he is not wise in that he is not able to answer the damaging statements that have been made. In this connection the hon. gentleman interjected that I have not been conspicuous in trying to uphold the honour of the colony. I presume he means by that that I have not supported his proposal to send this contingent to the Transvaal. Well, if that is so, I have not been upholding the honour of the colony. I have been conspicuous in opposing it, and if I could do anything to prevent this contingent embarking for the Transvaal to-morrow I would do it. If by moving any vote to-night I could prevent the contingent or any individual in Queensland from taking any hand or part in the crime of the century I would cheerfully do it. But, as the members of this Chamber, representing the country, have come to the conclusion that it is a wise course to send this contingent to South Africa, then we should take every precaution that our fellow-citizens who are going there to fight for what is called "the flag and the Empire" should go there under fair conditions—that they should have a fairly equal chance against the men opposed to them, and not go there under the awful and fearful disadvantage outlined by such an expert with regard to their weapons as the hon. member for Cook. They should go fully equipped with weapons that they can trust in the time of danger. That is what the hon. member is pleading for. Surely if we are so patriotic that we desire that our men should go there to show the Boers and the rest of the world that they are fighting men and can hold their own against any enemy, they should be armed with weapons that they can trust. The trusty weapon is the thing the soldier depends upon; and if, as the hon. member for Cook states, they have not got a trustworthy weapon, and they are not to be permitted, by the orders of this Brigade Office, to make their weapon a trustworthy one, then I say they are being placed at a disadvantage by their own people. It is an invitation to slaughter, to massacre, and a most disgraceful thing. I say the most patriotic thing we can do, if we are going to send these men away, is to send them away so well equipped that we can reasonably expect them to come back here after fighting a good battle and giving a good account of themselves, and showing that they are the equal in fighting of the Boer, or of anybody who is fighting at the present time in the Transvaal. But if you send them there with defective weapons, they will not be able to show that at all. The Minister for War smiles.

Mr. BROWNE: Which of them? They are all smiling.

Mr. DAWSON: The Premier smiles. He thinks it is a laughing matter to send men in front of a dangerous enemy like the Boer with a defective weapon. I suppose the hon. member for Cook is the best expert in this House on that particular question. I suppose he is the champion shot of the world with one particular class of weapon, and he points out that he is not even satisfied with his own opinion, but he has gone to other experts like himself, and consulted with them, and he has got their opinion that the weapon supplied to our troops is about 10 feet out of the mark. It is not only that, but he did not know exactly on what side it is—whether it is on the left or the right side. You may aim for 10 feet on the left side, and find it shoots 20 feet to the right. I say it is not a laughing matter at all. Does the hon. gentleman sit there in cold blood, and smile at sending away a lot of his fellow-colonists with a weapon like that? That is inviting the murder of the men he is sending away, and nothing else. I say it is not a matter to smile at at all. If we are going to send men there, if we are going to run them into danger, they should at least be given an equal opportunity of defending themselves with the enemy, and this matter of a true and proper weapon is one of the most serious things that we can possibly consider at the present time. There was another question raised by the hon. member for Cook, and I give him full credit for raising this question to-night. It is one that hon. members on both sides of the House ought to very seriously consider—and that is the question as to who is running this country. Who governs this country?

Mr. LESINA: The military gentlemen.

A MEMBER of the Opposition: A military dictator.

Mr. JENKINSON: *A la France.*

Mr. DAWSON: We have been living for some time past under the impression that we were governed by the Dickson Government.

Mr. JENKINSON: You are mistaken.

Mr. DAWSON: Now we come to discover that we are governed by the Brigade Office, and that the Brigade Office is run by Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo.

Mr. JENKINSON: Who is Ricardo?

A MEMBER of the Opposition: A snob.

Mr. DAWSON: According to the evidence we have of recent date, that gentleman has been so sure of his dictatorship—so sure of his power—that he did not even think that his superior officer was even his colleague, or that the Government should even be elevated to the dignity of colleagues—that they were subservient to him; that he was the dictator, the czar, and he did what he liked, under the full impression that those who were subservient to him would carry out his dictates. That has been done right through the piece. As the hon. member for Flinders has pointed out, that was done with regard to the volunteers. As the hon. member for Toowoomba, Mr. Fogarty, has pointed out, that has been done with regard to fodder. As the hon. member for Cook has pointed out, that has been done with regard to the weapons. It has been done with regard to all the orders that have been given in connection with this matter.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: And the Maxim gun.

Mr. DAWSON: And the Maxim gun. I have a very strong objection to military dominance.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: If there is one reason more than another why I object to sending these troops to the Transvaal, it is on account of the military dominance that is gradually growing in strength

and power in this colony of Queensland. If there is one thing that has made the British people great and that clearly distinguishes the British Empire from the Continental nations, it is that the civil power absolutely dominates the military.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: And the military is subservient. On the Continent, on the contrary, the civil power is under the dominance of the military. The way we are going on in Queensland, it appears that we will entirely do away with the power that has made the British Empire great, and adopt the policy which has made the Continental nations weak. At any rate, so far as this particular instance is concerned, from the very commencement right up to the present date it has been an absolute dominance of the military power over the civil, and the hon. gentleman sitting at the head of the Government has acquiesced in that without any protest. Nay, he does more than that—he agrees with it—he encourages it—he cheers it.

Mr. GIVENS: He cannot help himself.

Mr. DAWSON: Before sitting down, I will refer to the matter that was introduced by the hon. member for Toowoomba, Mr. Fogarty—that is, the intemperate remarks that were delivered by Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo at the Exhibition Building. I believe there was a great crowd there. I may say I saw some of the troops, and I asked them about the cheers and the hoots, and they said they had been so starved in the camp, and that was the first chance they had of having a square feed, that they were too busy eating to notice what the cheers and groans were about. I am quite in accord with the hon. member for Flinders that the intemperate remarks of Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo were not only a breach of military discipline, but they were a distinct breach of the privilege of this House. But I do not wish to go into that matter, because, being one of the persons concerned, I have no desire in the slightest degree to claim privilege. At the same time, this eternal swagger only encourages me to go on in my determination to oppose any military dominance. If the military man is going to be the great authority in this colony, then it means that before a civilian dare open his mouth, he has first got to square the military person.

Mr. MAXWELL: Or square with his left.

Mr. DAWSON: And, if he chances to be a person with the temperament of Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo, he will have to square him pretty often.

A MEMBER of the Opposition: What about his left?

Mr. DAWSON: I believe he is the gentleman who boasted on that occasion that he had a dexterous or a heavy left, and that he felt inclined—and I particularly mention this now, as the matter has been interjected—that he always felt inclined, when any reflection was cast upon a military man, to answer that reflection with a dexterous left. Now, I may say that Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo, with his subordinate, Major-General Gunter, was sitting in the lobby when I addressed my remarks to this Chamber. Immediately after the close of my remarks I met General Gunter, and he and Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo adjourned to my room. Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo asked to be introduced to me. He shook hands with me in a very cordial manner, and we had a drink and half an hour's pitch, and he never said anything about his heavy or dexterous left. He waited until he got to the Exhibition Building to talk about his wonderful left.

Mr. GIVENS: He got some Dutch courage there.

Mr. DAWSON: At any rate I may say that he did not say it here. He said that [8.30 p.m.] some men preferred to grow pumpkins at £1 a week, and that is a most deliberate insult to the farming population of this colony.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: That is a worse insult than my wildest words about the Defence Force who did not volunteer.

The PREMIER: I am glad you admit they were wild words.

Mr. DAWSON: It was a most disgraceful thing coming from a commandant. That is the gentleman who is going out in command of the contingent to represent the colony of Queensland at the Transvaal war. He was around canvassing for volunteers—after the Premier, from his place in this House, had told us that the volunteers had asked him to make the offer—he was out and he went to a place called Toowoomba, where I suppose the members of the Defence Force are as manly and brave as in any other part of the colony.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You do not think that of any of them.

Mr. DAWSON: The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken, and I defy him and challenge him, or any other member of this House, to show that I ever said one word, either directly or by inference, about the members of the Defence Force of this colony. I know there has been any amount of misrepresentation and lying about it.

The PREMIER: You have just admitted that you used wild words.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That was against the volunteers.

Mr. DAWSON: I know, and I say that the statement made at Toowoomba, and admitted by Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo at the Exhibition Building, was a deliberate insult, not only to the farming population of Queensland, but to the whole of the members of the Defence Force who did not volunteer to go to the Transvaal.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: It was a clear and unmistakable insinuation that the men who did not volunteer after Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo had paraded them, were cowards, who were only fit to grow pumpkins at £1 a week, instead of going to fight for 30s. a week in the Transvaal, and to take part in the crime of the century.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is a misinterpretation.

Mr. DAWSON: It is not a misinterpretation. It is the clear and logical deduction from the remarks which Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo made, and every member of the Defence Force, I say, has a perfect right to resent it. I hope that, what has been communicated to us by the hon. member for Toowoomba, Mr. Fogarty, will be strictly carried out, and that there will be an apology demanded from those in authority for the unwarrantable insult. Then, of course, he went on to say that others preferred to loaf on the Opposition benches and fill *Hansard* at £6 a week.

Mr. GIVENS: He would not be game to say it anywhere else.

Mr. DAWSON: So far as I am concerned, I think he might have concluded that by saying that there are certain military gentlemen who loaf upon the taxpayers of this colony at £12 a week and do nothing; the only thing we know of is a fine of £2 for using bad language.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. GIVENS: As the hon. gentleman at the head of the department is not inclined to reply, I would like to have a word or two to say about it. I want to know what all the fuss is about?



The PREMIER: Hear, hear! That is what we all want to know.

Mr. GIVENS: I want to know whether this House is prepared to criticise Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo, considering that when he was publicly banqueted the other night he openly insulted this House, and the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, the leader of this House, was present and did not resent the insult? I fail to see why we should protect the hon. gentleman against Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo under the circumstances.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: He said it of the Opposition benches.

Mr. GIVENS: It does not matter; it was a deliberate insult directed against the honour of this House, as the honour of the House is involved in the honour of the Opposition benches. If the Opposition benches have a right to be insulted in this way, the House as a whole has a right to be insulted. The leader of the House failed in his duty and proved himself to be a poor, mean-spirited leader.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. GIVENS: When he would not get up to defend the honour of the House, of which he was the leader, when its honour was attacked in the way it was by Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo on Saturday night last. It is not only the honour of the House that is attacked, but the honour of the constituencies that return the members of the House, and the honour of the colony as a whole.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. GIVENS: When we find the leader of the House sitting calmly by and allowing the House to be wantonly and deliberately insulted by a man of the position and calibre of Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo, I say it is time the House entered its protest, and I do not see why we should be particular about defending the Government against the action of the Brigade Office and Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo, when the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government thought so little of the House that he would not enter even the mildest protest against that deliberate insult to the honour of the House. Another matter I would like to refer to is that when members on this side of the House are accused of being loafers—for that is practically what the statement has amounted to—I do not care whether it is Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo or the General, or anybody else—I say that the man who says that is a deliberate liar.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. GIVENS: And if Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo desires to reply with his left, that he seems so fond of talking about, he will get ample opportunity to do it, and he won't have to go very far to look for it either. (Laughter.)

Mr. BROWNE: The warlike feeling is spreading.

Mr. GIVENS: I like to hear men like Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo blowing at a banquet when they get primed up with Dutch courage, but I suppose he knew there was nobody there with pluck or spirit enough to resent it.

Mr. STEWART: Hear, hear! He knew his company.

Mr. GIVENS: If the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government had any spirit at all in him—

MEMBERS of the Opposition: He had—too much. Three star.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. GIVENS: If he had any he would have protected the honour of this House, and would never have consented to listen to such damaging statements made by a public servant of this colony. I contend that, having failed to do so—having failed to protect the honour of this House, or to protest against its honour being assailed in the manner in which it was assailed

by Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo -- the hon. gentleman cannot claim much protection from this House when Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo usurps his functions, for that is practically what he has done. We were told a short time ago that no expense had been incurred by Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo or anybody else, that the honour of the colony was not pledged in any way until the vote for the contingent was passed. At that banquet on Saturday night last, at which the Premier was present, Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo said boldly, plainly, and unmistakably that he had given some sort of sporting orders to several tradespeople to supply different things. It is well known that a man who accepts a sporting order of that kind expects extra remuneration for the risk. These orders have been given and filled, and it is a certainty that this colony will have to pay for the extra risk. All the goods, wagons, and everything else ordered by Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo on these sporting terms will have to be paid for—

Mr. STEWART: With 100 per cent. added.

Mr. GIVENS: It is a distinct breach of faith for the Government if, after telling us that no expense was incurred, they allow this thing to go without protest or without bringing Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo up with a round turn for it. It is almost certain that this colony will have to pay 25 or 30 per cent. more for all these articles because they have been obtained upon certain sporting orders, involving a risk, because it is a well-known fact that in commercial life as well as in other life the element of risk has always to be paid for. I should like to hear an explanation from the Premier, who is at the head of this department, that is if any explanation is possible; and if the hon. gentleman does not give us an explanation, the reason—I will conclude, and the country will conclude—is that it is because no satisfactory explanation is possible.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Hon. gentlemen who have all along been opposed to the sending of this contingent to the Transvaal are taking this opportunity of belittling those who have worked indefatigably in the sending of the troops.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: No, no!

The PREMIER: It is not so much a question of what was said at the banquet on Saturday night as an endeavour to disparage the action of the Government and the patriotism of those men who have come forward to risk their lives in the noble work in which they are engaged. It also lends support to the position that they have all along taken up, although they did not openly avow it, that they are opposed to the sending of this contingent. But the public will perfectly understand it; they will not be hoodwinked by what has been said to-night. All this grandiloquent language which has been used by the leader of the Opposition will fall flat before the fact that he has, with other hon. members opposite, endeavoured to disparage the action of the Government in sending the contingent, and the motives which have actuated these men in coming forward and volunteering for this service. The only portion of the debate which really has any bearing is that which was addressed to us by the hon. member for Cook, Mr. Hamilton. I will freely admit that if what the hon. gentleman stated is strictly accurate—(Opposition laughter)—it should at once demand consideration. At the same time, the hon. gentleman and the country will perfectly well understand that, I presume, the military authorities know their own business in this matter; but if the hon. member imagines that these rifles should have been sighted before they were handed over to the contingent, he has

only to address a communication to me, and I will ask the Commandant his opinion in connection with the matter. From a casual conversation I had with him in the train this evening I understood it was not usual for it to be done. Then, again, there is another matter which must be borne in mind. That is, that when the troops are landed in Africa they will be under the control of the Imperial authorities, and it is not at all likely that the contingent sent from Australia will be allowed to go into the field with defective weapons. So altogether there is no occasion for the fear that the hon. the leader of the Opposition has indulged in. I am quite convinced, as I have already stated, that the military authorities know their own business thoroughly, and that this contingent will go forth with efficient arms; and certainly if the rifles are not sighted, all that is necessary to be done will be done in South Africa.

Mr. DAWSON: The hon. member for Cook said distinctly that Colonel Gunter objected to that.

The PREMIER: Colonel Gunter, in my presence, said it was unnecessary to have them sighted. They have all been sighted and tested, I presume.

Mr. DUNFORD: They are defective.

The PREMIER: I do not profess to be able to argue with regard to a military weapon like the hon. member for Cook, who, we know, is a practised rifle shooter and marksman, and, as such, is entitled to some credit. I do not care to say anything to disparage the views which he holds; but, at the same time, I can discriminate what may be required. I contend I would have been taking on myself a very grave responsibility if I had departed from the Commandant's recommendation in this connection. I am not a military expert, and I think that for any layman to take on himself the responsibility of insisting on certain things being done that the military countermanded, would have been a very serious and grave responsibility, and a thing I am not prepared to do. I think there has been a little unnecessary heat introduced into this debate. With regard to anything which was said on Saturday night, I am not here to defend it or extenuate it.

Mr. FISHER: Did you cheer?

The PREMIER: I am not prepared to say what I did. (Opposition laughter.) Except that I thoroughly enjoyed the meeting, and I for one felt proud to see such a fine body of men volunteering their services in connection with the British army in Africa. It was a very noble and grand demonstration. Perhaps soldiers are better in the field than as orators. Perhaps they are not altogether as discreet in their utterances as they might be; but, at the same time, it is not for me to enter into a condemnation of what was said, as a good deal that was said in this House may require more apology than what was said there. A great deal was said in this House—

Mr. DAWSON: You admit that there was something said there that wants apologising for?

The PREMIER: No. I said there was a lot more said in this House that wants apologising for.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I think quite enough has been said on this matter, and that we had better proceed to business. The time cannot be protracted indefinitely, and if we are to indulge in these side issues, I do not know when we shall get to business.

\* Mr. COWLEY (*Herbert*): I only want to say a few words. There are a great number of experienced marksmen among the contingent, and each one of them has in his possession a rifle with which he is thoroughly acquainted.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: He has not shot out of them yet.

Mr. COWLEY: The hon. member is very impetuous. I wish he would restrain his impetuosity. I said that each one of the men has a rifle in his possession with which he is thoroughly acquainted. The object being to put men into the field with weapons which will enable them to kill as many men as possible with the least possible loss to themselves, and as these weapons happen to be of exactly the same description, and take exactly the same sized cartridge as the one which the Government are giving them, I think it would have been wise and judicious on the part of the Commandant to have allowed them to take their own weapons. We know that if there is one thing the Boers excel in it is marksmanship. They are at home, in their own country, and know the atmospheric conditions, which are far different from those here. In that respect our men will at first labour under a disadvantage when they get on to the uplands. The distances on the coast appear much farther than the distances on the mountains. I say that knowing the country as I do. I know that when I have been shooting, after travelling 200 or 300 miles inland from the coast, on the highlands, I have been awfully deceived in the distances. Our men have that to contend against, but that could be soon explained to them, and overcome, if they only knew the weapons they have to deal with. There are many first-class marksmen among our contingent. I know that because I have been a humble member of the Defence Force for the last ten years, and have come into contact with a good many of them who are really first-class shots. I have no doubt that the British Government, in accepting their services, have taken the fact into consideration that they would be good bushmen and good marksmen, quite a different style of men from the British troops, and that they could be used for different work from that for which the Imperial forces would be used. If the Chief Secretary will, as he has promised, bring the statement of the hon. member for Cook prominently before the Commandant, with a request that he will allow all the men who possibly can to take their own weapons with them; he would be doing a very good service indeed to the country. I do not wish to say more upon that question. It is a very serious question, and one which, I hope, will receive attention. There is one other matter about which I should like to say a word—the action of Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo at the banquet the other night. I will not attempt to defend his action, and I have no doubt that in his calmer moments he is sorry for having used the words he did. But Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo is only human. He has been goaded on by members of this House, and, an opportunity occurring, he, in the excitement of the moment, retaliated. We all do so, and are sorry for doing it afterwards. I have known Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo since 1875. I was living on a station adjoining his for two or three years. We were bachelors and were constantly visiting at each other's houses, and I say that, so far as I know of him, though he is impetuous on certain occasions—and what good soldier is not?—he is as honourable and upright a man as any I have ever known in Queensland; and I am glad to have the opportunity to stand up here and say so. I do not apologise for him. I believe he was wrong, and that he regrets having made the statement he did, but in judging him we must take into consideration the treatment he has received in this House, and the treatment the men under him have received from members of this House. Those men have been vilified

for doing their duty and upholding the honour and integrity of Great Britain. We can easily understand that Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo, in the excitement of the moment, probably said a great deal more than he intended to say.

Mr. LESINA : If he says things like that on the battlefield it will be a bad job for him.

Mr. COWLEY : I believe that when Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo goes on a battlefield he will fight and not talk, and that every member of the contingent will fight. The Chief Secretary has stated, and stated very truly, that we do not expect our soldiers to be orators. Unfortunately many of our best fighters have not had the practice which hon. members here have of controlling their tongues properly at the right moment—although I do not think we excel in that particular virtue. I merely rose to say that I am very sorry indeed that this debate has occurred, with the exception of what has fallen from the hon. member for Cook, because that really is a vital point. I regret exceedingly the attacks that have been made upon the officers and men of the contingent, for I believe it will do a great deal to disparage them in the eyes of people living at a distance when they come to read them. They should be praised rather than blamed, considering that most of them, and especially the officers, have joined the contingent at a great disadvantage to themselves. I sincerely trust we shall have no more attacks on them in this House, but that the House will join in wishing them God-speed, and a safe return to our shores.

MEMBERS on the Government side : Hear, hear !

Mr. J. HAMILTON (*Cook*) : With the permission of the House I should like to say a few words.

The SPEAKER : The hon. member has already spoken. He can only speak now with the permission of the House.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

Mr. J. HAMILTON : With regard to what the Premier has said, I trust he will take my statement that there is an error of from 1 foot to 10 feet at 600 yards in many of those rifles. I agree with the hon. member for Herbert that it would be desirable to let the riflemen have their own rifles. One of the best shots in the contingent told me the other day that he has a rifle out of which he has fired 1,000 cartridges. He thoroughly knows that weapon, but he says he is utterly ignorant of the capacity of the one he is taking with him. I would suggest to the Premier that he should ask General Gunter to allow each man to take his own rifle with him. It will not be too late to do so now, otherwise each man will have to find out the capacity of his new weapon for himself. In that case I would ask the hon. gentleman to instruct General Gunter to request Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo to inform the authorities directly he lands that none of those rifles have been tested, so as to get them tested at once. It would then be immediately seen how far the rifles are out, and what the error is. It does not require an expert to know that when rifles have the extent of error which I have stated, that it is most necessary to correct it. The cartridges are the same for the Lee-Enfield used in the army as for the Martini-Enfield used by our contingent; the latter is employed here because it is considered by our authorities that magazine attachment of the Lee-Enfield is likely to get out of order when carried by mounted men.

Mr. BROWNE : The Premier has only replied to one of the many statements that have been made. He spoke of the vilification of the contingent by this side of the House, and he did it in a way which shows he is an adept at vilifying those who sit on these benches. Then he

said the only gentleman worth answering was the hon. member for Cook, and he only answered the last part of the charge which

[9 p.m.] that hon. gentleman brought forward. I am sure that hon. gentleman deserves thanks for bringing the question of the rifles up; but before he came to that he made some very serious charges, which I do not believe he would have made unless he was correct in his statements. He has impugned the veracity of the answers given by the Commandant to questions asked by the Premier. He showed that Colonel Gunter stated that there was no man in the colony, with one exception, that held the Hythe certificate, and the hon. member proved distinctly that he was wrong, and that he could hardly have been ignorant of the fact, having the *Naval and Military Gazette* and everything at his command. Then a good deal has been said about patriotism and what these men are sacrificing. I acknowledge that some of them may be sacrificing a good bit, and I wish they may have good luck, but when it comes to a question of this being done out of pure patriotism, I will draw attention to the statement of the hon. member for Cook, which we know is correct, that two officers, Captain Walker and Captain Toll, who are admitted to be as good, to say the least, as any men in the contingent, offered to take their own horses and equipment, and give their services without pay, and the services of those men were declined; yet we have pure patriots going who are not only to get extra pay as soldiers, but are to get their pay as Civil servants of this colony while they are away. This is what it says in the paragraph that has been alluded to in the *Telegraph* and also in the *Observer* to-day—

In regard to officers in the public service who have received permission to proceed with the contingent to South Africa, the Chief Secretary has decided that they shall be granted six months' leave of absence, with the possibility of that period being extended if necessary. That I thoroughly agree with. Then it goes on to say—

He has also decided that in the case of any public servants belonging to the contingent who are in receipt of remuneration from the Government which is greater than that which they would receive for service with the contingent, their military pay shall be supplemented during their absence by the amount of the difference, while those whose salary from the Government is less than the amount of their military pay, will be paid according to the rank they hold in the contingent.

If this is pure patriotism, how is it that the services of trained soldiers who have offered to go for nothing, and provide everything they require, have been declined?

Mr. LEAHY : Did they pass the medical examination?

Mr. DAWSON : Foster, at Charters Towers, was rejected because he was forty years of age.

Mr. BROWNE : The hon. member for Cook made the statement in this House—and I am certain he did not speak without being sure of his facts—that after those men were refused there were men disqualified, and others had to be got to make up the number. When these statements are made, and when the veracity of the Commandant is impugned, I think the Chief Secretary should take some notice of that. To get up and try to make people believe that everybody on this side is unpatriotic, and wishes some harm to happen to these men, is simply electioneering and beating the wind. I say that a direct misstatement was made at that banquet by the Chief Secretary himself—

The SPEAKER : Order !

Mr. BROWNE : Well, I will say "misrepresentation," Mr. Speaker, and it was repeated in this House again to-night. The hon. gentleman said that all this trouble about the fodder and

Colonel Ricardo was being raised by a little section who were dead against the troops going at all. The hon. members who felt most aggrieved about the question of the fodder were the representatives of the farmers on the Darling Downs and other places. The two hon. members for Dreyton and Toowoomba both announced their intention of voting for the contingent going, and the hon. member for Rosewood, who made the greatest fuss over the fodder question in the House, not only voted in favour of the main question of sending the contingent, but also voted against the amendment of the leader of the Opposition and with the leader of the Government; yet the Premier is trying to throw it broadcast over the country that it is raised by hon. members on this side who are opposed to the contingent going. The hon. member for Cook cannot be described as being opposed to the contingent going or as having any special down on the military men, and serious charges made in good faith by that hon. member deserved an answer from the Chief Secretary when he was on his feet.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): There have been two or three things said to which I would like to refer. First and foremost, the Premier pointed out with an air of assurance that the Opposition desired to disparage the patriotism of the volunteers. I notice that every time we get up to criticise the administration of the military department in connection with the sending away of the contingent the Premier or someone behind him eternally harks back to this word "patriotism." It seems to me to be the stock excuse for every kind of iniquity committed, and it reminds me of that blessed word "Mesopotamia." They get it off their chest regularly. It is also pointed out that if the troops are allowed to go away in possession of the rifles which have been given to them here, and which have been pointed out by one hon. gentleman to be defective, that the English authorities will not allow them to go into the field with defective weapons. Unfortunately history gives that the lie, because English troops were allowed to go into the field in many of the early Soudan wars armed with bayonets that curled up like corkscrews when they came in contact with the bones of the Arabs they were attacking, and if English troops are allowed to wage deadly conflict against enemies armed with weapons made in Germany which curl up like corkscrews when they come in contact with a bone or a hard muscle, it is just as likely that they will let our contingent go into the field armed with the weapons placed in their hands by the military department here. In the speech delivered by Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo at the Exhibition Building he is reported to have said—

He did not want to boast, but he knew from the start that he would get the command, for the reason that over 100 of the men told him that the one condition on which they would go was that they should be led by their own officer.

That statement is tantamount to mutiny, but it was loudly applauded. Those military persons are gradually making their way into our political affairs, and are beginning to exercise a dominant influence in the councils of the country, as the military do in France, and they have done things in connection with this matter that the Chief Secretary, as Minister for War, is ignorant of. It is time that they were stopped from dominating the councils of the country in this way, and if it cannot be stopped by the Ministry of the day, then the Opposition will certainly have to take up that duty, and see that our interests are defended and our privileges maintained, and that the welfare of the country is preserved. Every effort should be made to see that these men, who are paid man-killers, do not dominate the administration of the country.

If the country is to be dominated by men who are paid so much a day to kill other men, then it is just as well that we should put our foot down on their influence at once. When Captain Chauvel was out the other day obtaining recruits for these volunteers he told the men, according to his speech as reported in the *Courier*, that "this will be a grand picnic, it will be a fine trip free of expense, we may arrive there too late to take any part in the war, you will be nothing out of pocket, there is very little risk, and there is very little chance of your being shot." And yet we are told of the patriotism of those men who are going to the Transvaal. Where is the patriotism in men who would volunteer under those circumstances? It is surprising to me that some of the gallant gentlemen on the other side, who belong to the military force, have not volunteered to go with the contingent. But they are tame banquet heroes who fight with their jaws, and not with a rifle for 4s. 6d. a day. During the course of this debate it has struck me that either the head of the military authorities or the head of the Government is misleading the country and misleading this House. Either the Premier knows what is being done or he does not know; and if he does not know, then I ask who runs the country? The truthfulness of the correspondence laid on the table of this House has been impeached by the Government whip. That hon. member has impeached the veracity of many of the statements contained in official documents laid on the table for the information of hon. members, and I would ask how is it possible for the House to form an intelligent opinion as to how the affairs of the country are being conducted if the documents placed before it contain misstatements? Either the Government are telling an untruth, or the officers who sent in this correspondence are telling an untruth, or the Premier is telling an untruth. How are we to judge; how are we to arrive at a correct conclusion when we have different statements from those three parties? Some men, it is said, have been disqualified because they cannot ride. In the country where they are to engage in war, they will be kept on horseback for hours and hours; therefore those men who have been dragged into this volunteer movement should have been examined to see if they possessed the necessary qualifications. But it is only now that it has been discovered that some of those men cannot ride expertly, or are given horses that they cannot ride and rifles with which they cannot shoot. And then we are expected to throw up our hats and hurrah for the contingent. Blunders have been committed by the Ministry, and by the head of the military, whose chief fighting seems to be done at banquets at the Exhibition Building. Fancy sending men out to a country like the Transvaal with rifles which will shoot as many as 10, 12, and 14 feet wide at 600 yards to fight with men who are world-famous for their skill as marksmen! I know several men in the contingent; I have many personal friends from Charters Towers and from Brisbane in the contingent; and I know many of the men well. I know that some of them are married men who will leave their wives and children behind them with no one to depend upon while they themselves are maintaining the honour of the good old flag. In several cases no provision has been made for the wives and children of those men. Fancy one of those men, who is the husband of a wife and the father of several children, whom he has left behind dependent upon public charity or the charity of friends, or dependent upon their own poor weak exertions to obtain a livelihood, fighting in another part of the world with a rifle that won't shoot and a horse he cannot ride, with the

gallant Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo leading on the gory van! That man will be expected to shoot the first Boer who shows his head above the surrounding landscape, but when he fires his rifle it will shoot 20 feet away, and he will stand a very good chance of being potted himself. Then his wife will be left a widow and his children orphans. Will those gentlemen who attended the banquet at two guineas per head, drank wine and cheered for the flag, be ready then to show their patriotism in a practical form? It is a very nice thing for those arm-chair heroes to talk about battle, when they have never even seen the smoke of battle. But though they do that with much satisfaction to themselves, they will not assist to give those men decent rifles and horses to preserve their lives when fighting against men who cling to their rifles as they do to their own families. It is practically sending those men as lambs to the slaughter. It has been admitted by the Premier that some of those men are untrained.

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. LESINA: I understood the hon. gentleman to admit that; but even if they had previous military training, that training was on foot and not on horseback, and these volunteers are expected to sit a horse and do almost all their work in the saddle, and not in an arm-chair. It is in an arm-chair that those fierce speeches and fierce leading articles are composed by persons who never by any manner of means know what it is to go to war. Those persons merely urge other people by their eloquent and patriotic speeches, and by their eloquently written leading articles to go to war, and do not give them rifles that will shoot or horses that they can ride. If they will not do that they are merely sending men into the field who will find a billet for every bullet that is sent. There is another matter that requires a little attention. That is with respect to the contradiction between the Premier's statement and Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo's statement in reference to these wagons; the one stating that they had been got together in an incredibly short space of time, and the other that he had given orders for them some considerable time previously. Now, if Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo told the truth at the banquet the Premier did not.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LESINA: Well, if the Premier told the truth Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo did not. It is not at all to be surprised at, if under the circumstances we view other statements that have been made with suspicion. I will not make any reference to the remarks of Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo about members loafing on the Opposition benches; but I would merely say that under all the circumstances it is nothing wonderful to discover that the person making that highly patriotic offer about the fodder should turn out after all to be a mere sordid speculator who, by accident as it were, has been exalted by the Premier into a patriotic Queenslander who sends in a cheque for £750; and the gentlemen present at this banquet, filled to the neck with patriotism and other things—chiefly other things—are called upon by the Premier to rise in their places and cheer vigorously a patriotic person who sends in a cheque for £750, and after all turns out to be a sordid speculator in horse-feed. The blundering of the Government, the blundering of the military, the blundering over the fodder, the blundering of everyone over everything from start to finish, arise to a great extent from the fact that the gentlemen opposite will persist, when we criticise, in waving the flag and cheering for patriotism instead of listening to reason.

Question—That the Speaker leave the chair—put and passed.

#### COMMITTEE.

Question—That the sum of £1,802, balance of vote, be granted for His Excellency the Governor.

The PREMIER: The vote showed an increase of £152. The gatekeeper at the lodge was a new appointment at £112 a year. Formerly the lodge-keeper had been drawn from the Police Force, but as it took the man away from barrack life it was deemed desirable that the lodgekeeper should be a Defence Force veteran, and consequently that arrangement had been introduced for the first time this year. Sergeant Woods, who had for many years acted as lodgekeeper, had been allowed to retire on pension. The only other increase was £12 to the senior orderlies.

Mr. McDONALD: The Governor had gone away, and it was pretty well understood that he would not return.

The PREMIER: Oh, yes, he will.

Mr. McDONALD: It would only be for a very short time if he did, because after the expiration of his leave he would only have about nine months to serve to the end of his term. He wanted to know what position the Lieutenant-Governor was in? They knew he drew the handsome salary of £3,500 a year as Chief Justice. What additional pay did he get, if any, as Lieutenant-Governor, and was the additional pay, if any, deducted from the Governor's salary, or was the Governor on leave with full pay?

The PREMIER: The principle was that His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor drew half the Governor's salary and half that of the Chief Justice.

Mr. KERR: Does the Governor draw full pay?

The PREMIER: No, he only drew half pay.

HON. G. THORN asked how it was that the President of the Legislative Council did not get the position of Acting or Lieutenant-Governor? He was aware that in the other colonies the Chief Justices performed the duties of Acting Governor, but that was no reason why they should choose the Chief Justice in this colony. So far as his preference was concerned, he gave it to the President of the Legislative Council. So long as the elective system was not in existence, he was the gentleman who should fill the position. In his opinion the Acting or Lieutenant-Governor should be elected by the people every three or five years. He did not think the Chief Justice should have all the perquisites. He was aware that that gentleman was very anxious to wear the third-class Windsor uniform instead of fourth-class, and he had no doubt that before very long he would have his ambition gratified. He did not think it was too late even now to bring about the election of the Acting Governor by the whole people. Would the Premier let them know how it came about that Sir Hugh Nelson was elbowed out of the position of Acting or Deputy-Governor?

The PREMIER: It was during the tenure of office of his predecessor that the matter was considered, and His Excellency was informed that the Government approved of the dormant commission and also the commission to act as Administrator of the Government being held by the Chief Justice of the colony. The other colonies had adopted a similar procedure, and it was deemed advisable to come into line with them. He might inform the hon. member for Fassifern that they were hardly able to deal with the matter of the election of the Acting Governor, though doubtless under federation there might be some change in the position of matters.

HON. G. THORN: The lawyers look after themselves.

Mr. McDONALD asked if it was necessary to vote the sum of £500 for travelling expenses of His Excellency the Governor. Was the Deputy Governor going to New [9.30 p.m.] Guinea to have a look round and see how things stood there? He wanted to know what was done with this £500? The Governor and his staff when on tours of inspection were supplied with special trains, or they could go by ordinary train, and in many cases the "Lucinda" was placed at their disposal. So that he did not think this vote was necessary. In the event of the Governor using this £500 or any part of it, did he send in vouchers to the department?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: When the Governor travelled, he paid his own expenses, and even when he travelled on the "Lucinda" he paid the cost of provisions and so on. The Governor's expenses were exempt from audit.

Mr. McDONALD: He had been seven years in the House, and this was the first time that he had heard that the Governor's expenses were exempt from audit.

Mr. LEAHY: It is the same with the judges.

Mr. McDONALD: Above all others the Governor's accounts should be audited, and it would be setting a good example. He quite understood that the judges were entitled to draw a certain amount of expenses, and a nice scandal occurred some years ago through this, when expenses were drawn which amounted to a great deal more than a judge's salary, in providing champagne suppers and so on. But he was pleased to know that this sort of thing had been stopped, and it was time it was stopped with regard to the Governor's expenses. If this £500 had been spent, there should be vouchers.

Mr. STEWART: Only £450 was spent last year.

Mr. McDONALD: If only £450 had been spent, that showed that there must have been some system of audit; at any rate, he thought there should be some audit. With regard to the £300 for the Governor's country residence—a matter which had come up every year—he wanted to know if that had been spent every year.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If His Excellency did not use his country residence, the amount would not be expended: the same remark applied to the £500 for travelling expenses. He understood the Lieutenant-Governor was very likely to occupy a country residence on the Downs.

Mr. DAWSON: This seemed rather a peculiar system. If any hon. member of this House wished to travel to his constituency, he had to send in his voucher to the Clerk of the Assembly before he could even get his fare, and yet they were not to know what part or whether the whole of this £800 for the Governor was spent.

Mr. LEAHY: It is the same in the other colonies.

Mr. DAWSON: That was no justification. The question was whether the principle was right or wrong, and he thought it was wrong. The Governor might only go to Southport for a fortnight, and he might claim all the expenses, or he might go away for the whole summer. The Governor was not entitled to claim one shilling more than he was out of pocket. As it was now, they did not know what he claimed.

Mr. STEWART: You must take his royal word for that.

Mr. DAWSON was not inclined to take any royal word for it.

The PREMIER: You must trust to his honour.

Mr. DAWSON: But the hon. gentleman did not trust to the honour of the hon. members when travelling, say from Brisbane to Townsville. Vouchers were required in that case.

Mr. LEAHY: The Act requires that.

Mr. DAWSON: But before the Governor was entitled to any money out of the pockets of the ratepayers, he should render an account. Of course, £800 for these purposes seemed a very small matter, but it was a very large thing to a man who got work for only four months in the year, and who earned about 5s. a day. He objected to it.

Mr. STEWART: It was exceedingly to be deplored that a gentleman occupying one of the highest judicial positions in the colony should also act as Administrator of the Government. His impression had always been that a judge should keep himself apart. The judges were paid these high salaries to keep them beyond the reach of ordinary temptation; they were surrounded with every security, and when they were disabled from old age or illness, they were provided with allowances. All that was to provide for their absolute impartiality. When the Chief Justice was taken off the bench, and was placed in the position of Lieutenant-Governor, it was bringing him into contact with society. He would mix with society and hold levees, receptions, and all that sort of thing, and when the people with whom he had come in contact had occasion to come before him in his judicial capacity, he might be unconsciously biased in their favour. For that reason, if for no other, it was extremely undesirable to allow the Chief Justice to occupy the position of Governor, even temporarily. There was another reason. While Sir Samuel Griffith was acting as Lieutenant-Governor, they had no Chief Justice. Well, if they could do without a Chief Justice temporarily, they could do without so many judges all the time. If it was necessary to have so many Supreme Court judges two months ago, it was necessary to have the same number now; and, if it was not necessary now, it was not necessary at any time, and they were spending the taxpayers' money without cause. He could come to no other conclusion than that it would be much better in the interests of the colony at large, in the administration of the colony, and also in the administration of justice, that their Chief Justice should keep himself entirely to his judicial position, and that, when they required a Lieutenant-Governor, they should look for him in some other direction.

Mr. KERR (*Barcoo*): In reference to the Chief Justice filling the dual positions of Chief Justice and Lieutenant-Governor, they must not forget that Sir Samuel Griffith had on one occasion adjourned the trial of the Queensland National Bank directors through pique that he had not been appointed Lieutenant-Governor at that time. The hon. member for Rockhampton North had touched on a very vital question. The Chief Justice should not hold the dual positions. He might have to meet, when on the bench, people whom he had met in his capacity of Lieutenant-Governor under very different circumstances. It was not fair that the Chief Justice should also hold the position of Lieutenant-Governor.

The PREMIER: It is done in New South Wales and Victoria.

Mr. KERR: Allowing that it was done in New South Wales, the hon. gentleman could not point to one instance in which the Chief Justice of New South Wales had adjourned the Court because he had not been appointed Lieutenant-Governor. Sir Samuel Griffith, in doing so, had put the country to great expense. All the officers of the court had to be paid for that one day, and witnesses had to be paid. Then the defendants would have to give refreshers to their counsel for another day. And all on account of the pique of the Chief Justice. If he acted in that way he was not fit to hold the position of Lieutenant-Governor, and the hon. member for Fassifern

was quite in order in drawing attention to the matter. In the past the President of the Legislative Council had occupied the position of Acting Governor, and the present President was quite fitted for the position. He entered his protest against the Chief Justice being the Lieutenant-Governor.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*) also objected, and joined in the protest of the hon. member for Barcoo. He remembered the wave of indignation which had spread through the country at the action of the Chief Justice in adjourning the court in a spirit of pique because he was disappointed at not being made the temporary occupant of the Lieutenant-Governorship, thereby putting a number of litigants to considerable expense. The fact of a man of his capacity and talents being willing to use his position for the purpose of putting other people at a disadvantage, merely because his vanity had been touched, showed that he was a man who was not qualified at any time to fill that position. He thought the President of the Legislative Council was the proper person to act as Lieutenant-Governor. He was qualified by position and generally by long political experience, and he trusted that in future the President of the Council for the time being would fill the position. With regard to the expenses, he supposed the vote covered the household expenses. While the sum of £500 was voted for His Excellency's travelling expenses, the vote was largely expended in holding levees at Government House, at which the *crème de la crème* of society—the big bugs—the gilded plutocrats—attended, and regaled themselves on champagne and stuffed chicken at the public expense, while the unemployed slept in the adjoining domain in the wind and the rain. It was an outrage on civilisation that such things should be while they were dipping their arms to the elbow into the public Treasury in connection with all sorts of Quixotic enterprises. It might not be the custom to talk of those things in that fashion. People were very largely influenced by conventional sentiments, but his sentiments revolted at that kind of thing. Whether he would be doing his duty to his constituents or not he did not give a hang; but he would not be doing his duty to his conscience, which he valued more highly than his constituents or anybody else, if he did not protest against that lavish expenditure at the public expense in feeding the society people of Brisbane, who ought to be able to pay for their own grub. Another thing was that the gentleman holding that position should at least employ white people, and should purchase his vegetables from a white gardener, instead of from a filthy Mongolian. He had seen a dirty evil-smelling chow driving his cart up to Government House, and money was provided by the taxpayers of the colony to enable the gentleman temporarily occupying the position of Governor to purchase his vegetables from a chow while white gardeners were starving. There must be something rotten in the State of Denmark when that sort of thing could go on. When they had a white Government they should have a white Governor, and not a man with a yellow heart who bought his vegetables from a yellow chow.

The PREMIER very much regretted the tone of these remarks, which was so very different from what they had been accustomed to in former years. They had been accustomed to treat the Governor with respect, and not to indulge in the language used by the last hon. member who had spoken, in dealing with the domestic arrangements of Government House.

Mr McDONALD: It was brought up here before, years ago.

The PREMIER: He gave an emphatic denial to what the hon. gentleman had stated, because

the Lieutenant-Governor did not reside at Government House in a domestic sense at all, but officially. There was no man in the colony more desirous to employ white people, and to keep them here.

HON. G. THORN had listened to the Premier showing how Sir Hugh Nelson had been elbowed out of his position as Acting or Lieutenant-Governor of the colony, and he would like the hon. gentleman to explain how it was that the Lieutenant-Governor was not present at the banquet the other night. He had heard it said that it was because he had taken the huff at the Premier jumping his position as chairman of the banquet. On such an occasion it was the proper thing for the Lieutenant-Governor to have put in an appearance and taken his proper position, and he would like to know from the Premier why he had not done so. He knew the Premier was able to give an answer, and the public outside were anxious to hear the reason for it.

The PREMIER could give no answer as to the reasons which induced the Lieutenant-Governor to remain away except the reason that gentleman had himself alleged, that he had forgotten a previous engagement. The hon. member talked about the Lieutenant-Governor occupying his proper position there, but he was not at all aware that that would have been his proper position.

Mr. McDONALD: It should have been the mayor.

The PREMIER: It should have been the mayor, and when he had himself received the invitation to preside he had been somewhat surprised, and had in fact delayed his reply until he had ascertained that the mayor did not intend to preside. He did not think it would have been proper for the Lieutenant-Governor to have presided at the banquet, though he might have been there as a guest.

Mr. McDONALD: The Premier had said that that matter of Government House expenditure had never been brought up in the House before.

The PREMIER: Not in the same terms.

Mr. McDONALD: It had been repeatedly brought up, and the statement had been made that it was a common thing to see a chow going up to Government House with vegetables. The hon. gentleman had gone on to say that no one had done more to make Queensland a white Queensland than the present Lieutenant-Governor, but the fact was that no one had done more to make the black curse so strong in Queensland as it was. That gentleman, after he had got the assistance of the people of the colony to keep the black man out of it, had recanted on all his previous political professions, and had allowed Queensland to be ridden by the black curse as it was at present. The Premier knew that because that hon. gentleman had also been a supporter of the kanaka. It was a well known fact that if it had not been for the recanting of Sir Samuel Griffith they would have very little of the kanaka in Queensland at the present time.

The PREMIER: You would have had the sugar industry extinct.

Mr. McDONALD: The hon. gentleman had no warrant for saying that, as the fact was that at that particular time the industry was in trouble through heavy mortgages over almost the whole of the estates, and when they got into other hands, it was placed on a better footing. It was not a question of black labour at all. There was a good deal in the various statements made in discussing that vote. Of course, they knew that the Governor was only a figure-head called upon to furnish two reports—one private for the Secretary of State, in which he acted as a kind of spy on the colony and its loyalty, and the other for publication. At the present time, when they



were paying the Governor £5,000 a year, he thought that was quite sufficient without saddling the taxpayers of the colony with the additional £2,000 provided for in this vote.

Question put and passed.

#### EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

The PREMIER moved that £869 be granted for the Executive Council. He said [10 p.m.] the amount was precisely the same as last year.

Question put and passed.

#### LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

The PREMIER moved that £1,510 be granted for the Legislative Council. The amount was £65 more than last year. The salary of the Clerk Assistant was increased from £300 to £350, that officer (who also occupied the position of Usher of the Black Rod) having had his salary reduced in 1893 from £400 to £350. Increases were also provided for the messengers from £150 to £155, £120 to £125, and £70 to £75.

Mr. McDONALD did not disagree with the proposal to increase the salaries of certain officers, because they worked very hard, and, as a rule, deserved them; but he wished to point out that the unfortunate office-cleaner got only £50 a year, and no attempt was made to give him a rise. While the Government were giving increases to various officers in this particular branch of the service, they might have given the office-cleaner a small rise too.

The PREMIER: The Estimates for the Council were prepared by the President; but if the Committee chose to give the cleaner an additional £10 the Government would not offer any objection. The Government did not generally increase the Estimates; they were rather inclined to prune them. The cleaner of this House received the same remuneration as the cleaner of the Council.

Mr. JENKINSON (*Wide Bay*) understood that during the year an official of the Council—he thought his name was Kelly—had died.

The PREMIER: Yes.

Mr. JENKINSON: Did the Premier propose to make any provision for his widow? Kelly had been in the service of Parliament for some years; he had not been in receipt of a large salary, and he had been, he understood, a very faithful servant. It would be well for the hon. gentleman to see if some provision could not be made in this case.

The PREMIER: The hon. member was right. By the death of Mr. Joseph Kelly the Council had lost a very old and faithful servant, and Mr. Lane had been appointed in his place. But no recommendation had been made by the President of the Council in the direction indicated, and it was understood that the President looked after the interests of the officers of that House. He did not know whether anything had been done in the matter; but since the hon. gentleman had brought it before him, he would make inquiries into Kelly's position and ascertain whether the circumstances were such as would demand favourable consideration.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. STEWART (*Rockhampton North*): He did not altogether agree with the principle enunciated by the hon. member for Wide Bay. What particular claim had the widow of a servant of Parliament upon it? If the widow of a servant of Parliament had a claim, every widow in the colony had a claim on the colony; and until provision was made for every widow, he should object to provision being made for any particular widow, unless when the husband lost his life in the service of the State. The fact that a man had been a servant of Parliament and had come in contact with members of Parliament, and

Ministers perhaps, did not form any reason why those he left behind him should receive any special consideration. As a matter of principle, he objected to these grants unless they could be given all round.

Mr. McDONNELL disagreed with the hon. member for Rockhampton North, and contended that Kelly's case was worthy of some consideration. Before 1893 he was getting £175 a year; but his salary was reduced to £150, and he was the only one of the staff of both Houses, he thought, whose salary had not been increased. He understood that the late Premier (the Hon. T. J. Byrnes) had promised that his salary should be restored on the recommendation of the President of the Legislative Council, and as Kelly's salary had been reduced by £25 a year in 1893, and considering his long and faithful service, his case should receive some consideration at the hands of the Government. He hoped the Chief Secretary would be able to see his way to allow something in the way of a grant to the widow, because, although Kelly lived a very quiet and retired life, he had not been able to save a great deal out of his salary. Although the Upper House did not meet so frequently, or sit so late, as the Assembly, Kelly had to be constantly in his place there, especially in the time of Sir Arthur Palmer.

Mr. LEAHY: Sir Arthur Palmer was only there about once a month.

Mr. McDONNELL: Kelly had always to be on the look-out for him, and to be on the spot when he came. At any rate the case was deserving of consideration, and he hoped that a gratuity for the widow would be placed on the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. McDONALD: The application for a gratuity in that particular case was one more instance showing the necessity of having a system of State insurance in the colony, under which every Civil servant should be compelled to insure his life or take the consequences. The abolition of the Civil Service superannuation fund was a great mistake, and no doubt the majority of the Civil servants now recognise the mistake they made in urging its abolition. The Government had already recognised the wisdom of State insurance in connection with the Transvaal contingent, and it would be very easy to extend it to all Civil servants. The idea was not new. The system had already been established in New Zealand, although under it the insurance of the lives of Civil servants was not compulsory, and the terms of insurance were lower than those offered by private enterprise. It was high time to initiate similar legislation here, but he would go a step further, and make it a condition that, on entering the service, Civil servants should insure their lives in that or some similar institution.

Mr. KERR said it was admitted that Kelly had been receiving a salary of £3 per week, which he considered a very fair one. Indeed the majority of the electors in his constituency did not earn nearly so much, and on their deaths their widows had no chance of getting any gratuity from Parliament. He agreed with the suggestion of the hon. member for Flinders that a State life insurance institution should be established in which Civil servants should be compelled to insure their lives. That would put a stop to the incessant applications for gratuities to the widows and families of men who had died from natural causes while in the service of the State.

Mr. STEWART said the Civil servants were in a much better position than any other class in the community. They were better paid, and their employment was more certain, and they had no broken time. The Civil servant whose case was now under discussion had been receiving £150 a year, and for a number of years he had



been receiving £25 more than that, which gave him an average salary of between £3 5s. and £3 10s. per week. A very large proportion of the working men of the colony did not get half that, and yet the State was to be called upon to make a gratuity to his widow. Civil servants should be given to understand on entering the service that the State would not give any gratuities except under the exceptional circumstances he had indicated; such, for instance, as when a man had lost his life in the service of the country. In that case it would be not only admissible but necessary that a gratuity should be given, but in ordinary cases, when a Civil servant died and left a widow, he did not think any claim should be made on the State. The working classes in Queensland were much more heavily taxed than the working people in any other part of Australia, and they had enough to do to keep the pot boiling, while the Civil servants lived in clover with high wages and constant employment. He saw no reason why the families of Civil servants should be provided for at the expense of the State, while the families of the mass of the wage earners who found the taxation to pay the salaries of Civil servants, were left utterly unprovided for by the State. If gratuities were to be given to the widows of Civil servants, they should be given to all the widows in the colony.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): In connection with this matter that was engaging the attention of the Committee—

The CHAIRMAN: I may point out that this discussion is somewhat irregular. There is no amount put down for a gratuity in the vote under consideration. It has merely been mentioned in reply to a question put to the Chief Secretary.

Mr. LESINA said he would let that drop. He noticed that in the distribution of favours the tendency was always to grease the fat sow. The man with a big salary was given a bigger one, and the person who got £1 a week was allowed to keep on for the remainder of his natural life at £1 a week if he lived to be as old as Methuselah. He would like to see salaries and wages as high as possible, but he objected to the practice of giving increases being abused by singling out those who already had high salaries. Possibly the office cleaner had escaped the attention of Sir Hugh Nelson, and he hoped the salary would be increased from £50 to at least £60 per annum.

Question put and passed.

#### LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

The PREMIER moved that £1,911 be granted for the Legislative Assembly. The increase was only £46. The Clerk Assistant received an increase from £400 to £450, and there had been a readjustment in the salaries of the messengers.

Question put and passed.

#### LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

The PREMIER moved that £6,632 be granted for Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly. This estimate showed a decrease of £96. The salary of the sub-librarian was increased from £200 to £220, and he was sure every hon. member would approve of that.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: The messenger had been increased from £130 to £150. In the reporting staff there had been an adjustment of salaries and an additional member appointed, the increased amount being £280. Owing to the death of Mr. Earle there were now only five members of the staff drawing £320. The gentleman appointed to fill Mr. Earle's position received only £300 a year, and a new appointment had been made on

the recommendation of the President and the Speaker. Including the increase for the messenger the additional amount required for the reporting staff was £284.

Mr. JENKINSON: There is an increase of £80 for keeping the grounds in order. Why is that?

The PREMIER: The sum previously voted for repairs, keeping grounds in order, planting, etc., had always been found insufficient. The £500 for reprinting library catalogue disappeared this year.

Mr. McDONALD: What is the nature of the employment for which that £250 is asked?

The PREMIER: Keeping the grounds in order, including the sward in the quadrangle.

Mr. McDONALD: Is the mud-gravel—in the front included?

The PREMIER: He thought the grounds were very creditably kept and added to the attractiveness of the building.

Mr. HIGGS (*Fortitude Valley*) wished to know what method was pursued in [10.30 p.m.] the selection of shorthand reporters.

If *Hansard* was to be a record—and he thought it was looked upon throughout Queensland as a record—it was very necessary that it should be a correct one. He was aware that hon. members had an opportunity of revising their speeches before the official record was bound; but there was issued to the public a proof-copy of *Hansard* which might contain a number of misreports and many errors which would do hon. members considerable damage.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: You get proofs.

Mr. HIGGS: Yes, but they did not get them in time to stop these misreports being circulated through the colony. You do not get much opportunity in many cases of correcting these reports. It was possible to get shorthand writers fully competent to take down the fastest speakers in this House correctly, and that had been done until recently. But when vacancies occurred a few weeks ago a certain appointment was made which he did not at all agree with, and which he thought should not have been made. There were two appointments made—one was the appointment of a very capable gentleman from Rockhampton; he did not suppose that appointment could have been bettered in any way. The gentleman referred to had had great experience, and was well known as a capable reporter, and he was sure he would do justice to his position and be a credit to those who appointed him. But the other appointment was the appointment of an incompetent man. He did not feel very comfortable in having to make that statement, but he made it in the interest of hon. members, in the interest of the public generally, and also as a protest against the fact that a duly qualified reporter, well known in Brisbane and throughout Australia as a competent man, made an application for the position, and did not even receive a reply to his application. He thought the Premier should take steps to have that mistake remedied. He had no doubt that the incompetency of the reporter to whom he referred was, to some extent, remedied by the endeavours of another member of the staff.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: What grounds have you for the statement that he is incompetent?

Mr. HIGGS: The grounds he had he was not prepared to state.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: That is very manly!

Mr. HIGGS: But he had it on the best authority that he was incompetent.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: An anonymous authority.

Mr. HIGGS: It appeared to him that the appointment had been made as a matter of pure friendship, and he should like to know what was Mr. Speaker's own opinion as to the appointment of the gentleman under review. He was aware

that most of them, perhaps all of them, had something to thank the reporters for, because if they were to report the speeches of hon. members exactly as they were uttered there would be considerable superfluity about the reports, and considerable dismay among hon. members. At the present time he thought the reporters should be the very best that could be obtained in Queensland, and that the positions on the *Hansard* staff should be the prizes of the profession. The salaries were very generous ones, and they should require generous capacity. It was an injustice to Mr. Collins, of Rockhampton, that he should be placed on the same level at £300 a year as the gentleman who was incompetent.

Mr. J. HAMILTON (*Cook*): The hon. member who had just spoken had stated that one of the men lately appointed was incompetent, and when challenged to give evidence of his incompetency, said he was unable to do so—that some anonymous individual had made the statement to him. There were two men appointed; one was Mr. Collins, who, he believed, was a very capable gentleman, and the other was Mr. Gilligan, son of the chief of the *Hansard* staff. He was appointed to do Government work long before Mr. Collins was thought of, and he was appointed to fill the late Mr. Earle's place. With regard to his competency, he had excellent testimonials as a reporter from the editor of the *Observer*, the editor of the *Courier*, and the editor of the *Bathurst Advocate*, and he had done good work on the Cairns paper. He thought that Mr. Givens, the hon. member for Cairns, would say what he knew about him. Some time ago he reported the proceedings of the Printing Commission, and he (Mr. Hamilton) had been informed by one of the members of that commission that he did good work. Mr. Gilligan did the whole of that work himself, though as a rule such work is done by three or four reporters, and he did it in a highly satisfactory manner. He was now engaged on another commission with other reporters. That was the reply to the hon. member's assertion that he was incompetent.

Mr. HIGGS: If the hon. member for Cook wanted evidence of his incompetency he could obtain it by allowing that gentleman to be submitted to a test, and he ventured to say that he would not be able to write 150 words per minute.

Mr. HAMILTON: What is your evidence?

Mr. HIGGS: The evidence was that Mr. Gilligan, senior, had to assist the reporter, and the further evidence was that the Government Printer did not get his reports with the usual promptness.

Mr. HAMILTON: Mr. Gilligan has informed me that that is utterly untrue.

Mr. HIGGS: The hon. member had not seen Mr. Gilligan since he (Mr. Higgs) got up to speak.

Mr. HAMILTON: No, but I heard that you were going to make the charge.

Mr. HIGGS: Then it was very evident that the matter had been discussed before he got up to speak in that House. As far as Mr. Gilligan's competency on the Cairns paper went, he believed that Mr. Givens would be able to inform hon. members that Mr. Gilligan wrote an article stating that there was no agricultural land at the back of Cairns, and he had to go.

Mr. CALLAN: What has that got to do with his shorthand?

The PREMIER was sure they would all agree that it was highly desirable that the staff of *Hansard* should be thoroughly efficient, and he had always understood that the two gentlemen lately appointed were first-class men in their profession. It was news to him to learn that one of them was not up to the mark, and he should certainly deem it his duty to make due inquiry. He could assure hon. members that that was the first time he had heard of the matter. He had

had conversations with the President and Speaker, with whom rested the appointments, and they expressed themselves satisfied with the work of both men. He had always understood that they were a decided acquisition to the gallery, but after what the hon. gentleman had stated he would deem it his duty to inquire and ascertain if there was any weakness. It was news to him to learn that either of the two gentlemen was in any way incompetent.

Mr. J. HAMILTON (*Cook*): Instead of going nosing about to ascertain whether one reporter did his work and another did not, the hon. member for Fortitude Valley should bring forward his authority. He knew the hon. member was going to speak on the subject, and he went and saw Mr. Gilligan. The proper way was to judge by *Hansard*. Would the hon. gentleman say that they were not as well reported now as they were formerly? Mr. Gilligan was responsible for the reporting, and so long as they were satisfied with *Hansard* what did anything else matter to them? If such a thing did occur as Mr. Gilligan sitting up twenty-three hours out of the twenty-four, what they had to look at was merely whether the speeches were reported properly, and when hon. members could show that that was not so that was the proper time to complain.

Mr. GIVENS (*Cairns*) believed his name had been mentioned in the discussion, and he would like to say a word or two. His name had been brought up without his sanction or authority, and without his being consulted.

Mr. ANNEAR: It was not mentioned unkindly.

Mr. GIVENS: No, he did not say it was, but if any statement was made on his authority then he gave it an emphatic denial, because he gave no one authority to make any statement whatever about the young man who was engaged in the gallery. As far as he knew, the young man was a competent shorthand writer. He had always heard he bore that reputation, and why he ceased his connection with the Cairns newspaper was a matter he had no knowledge of. As far as his knowledge would lead him to form a conclusion, he would say that the paper in question did not offer a fair opportunity for the abilities of any man, and instead of it being a reflection on anyone's ability to leave it, it would be the other way about.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: Because he had a better offer.

Mr. GIVENS: He was a newspaper man himself, and it was a sort of position he would not like to occupy—any position on the literary staff of that particular Cairns paper.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What paper was it?

Mr. GIVENS: The *Cairns Argus*.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Was it your paper?

Mr. GIVENS: It was not. He had no connection, either remote or otherwise, with that paper. He must say that, as far as he could judge from experience, and he had considerable acquaintance with young Mr. Gilligan while he was in the position of editor of the *Cairns Argus*, he believed the reports he gave were fair reports. He did not think he need mention anything about his comments in the paper on the reports; but the reports themselves were fair reports, and he must say that he had heard nothing against the young man since he had been on the *Hansard* staff. As far as he knew, his reporting was as fairly reliable as the reporting of any other gentleman on the *Hansard* staff. The reporting right throughout was fairly decent. He had nothing to complain of. If any gentleman had anything to complain of, by all means let him complain, but he objected to his name being used.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): As a newspaper man for some years and one who had done both reporting and general journalistic work, he had been very satisfied with the reports as they had appeared in *Hansard*. He had spoken many times and covered a considerable number of pages of *Hansard*; he had also done a large amount of reading and correcting, and had discovered very few errors. During that time the young man referred to must have taken his turn, and in looking through *Hansard* generally he had been struck by its clearness and the absence of those errors which one generally found in the best conducted papers. As far as he was concerned, as a member of the House and as a journalist, the work was well done. Whether the young man took his share or not he did not know, but to his mind there was nothing that could be cavilled at. If there was any member who had a grievance he could call the Speaker's attention to the subject, and then when the complaints were made they would be able to ascertain who was responsible for the errors and the person concerned would have to leave the gallery. He had heard no complaint inside the House or out of it, and in only one instance had a complaint been made by the hon. member for Croydon.

Mr. BROWNE: It was not a complaint.

Mr. LESINA: One little error was pointed out. Although he was not in the possession of the information in the hands of the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. Higgs, he was satisfied that there was very little room for improvement on the *Hansard* staff. He was satisfied with the work—that was done well; and the hon. member for Cairns, Mr. Givens, was satisfied also.

HON. A. MORGAN (Speaker, *Warwick*) would like to say a few words in reply to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who introduced the subject, the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. Higgs. The recent appointments to the *Hansard* gallery were made on the recommendation of the President and himself, after conference with the Premier upon the financial aspect of the question. The gentlemen appointed were Mr. Collins and Mr. E. J. Gilligan. He had not the pleasure of the acquaintance of either gentleman, but he knew Mr. Collins's work, having had an opportunity of forming a judgment upon it; and so far as he was concerned he had no hesitation whatever in joining in the recommendation for his appointment. He thought he would amply justify his appointment. With regard to Mr. E. J. Gilligan, the President and himself were in possession of a recommendation from the chief shorthand reporter, who reported Mr. E. J. Gilligan as thoroughly competent for the work. He had had no opportunity of judging of Mr. Gilligan junior's work, but the recommendation came from the chief of the staff. That recommendation was endorsed by the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the management and working of the Government Printing Office, who said in concluding their report—

To Mr. E. J. Gilligan, shorthand-writer to the commission, we have to express our warm acknowledgment of indebtedness for the capable work performed.

That report bore the signature of Mr. A. J. Stephenson, a member of the House and an experienced journalist, and also the name of Mr. W. H. Groom, who was also a newspaper proprietor and an experienced journalist. With the testimony of the chief of the staff, and the added testimony of two members of this House, experienced journalists, who had seen Mr. E. J. Gilligan's work, and were in a position to speak of it, he had no hesitation, when his recommendation was

made as a thoroughly competent man, in endorsing the recommendation for his appointment. He believed the work in the gallery was as well done to-day as it ever had been, and he could only say, as a sort of negative endorsement of the action he and the President had taken, that since the changes had been made the complaints had been, if not fewer, certainly not more numerous than ever they were before. He believed that on the whole the reporting in the gallery was admirably done. There was only one other matter in the hon. member's speech that he thought it was necessary to refer to, and that was the statement that there was a third applicant for the position vacant in the gallery. He believed that was so. He believed the third applicant was a competent stenographer, but he also believed that he had very little gallery experience, and, however good a newspaper reporter he might be, he would have had to undergo a period of probation in the gallery before he became familiar with the manners and customs of hon. members.

Mr. DAWSON: What experience has Mr. Collins had in the gallery?

HON. A. MORGAN believed he had none.

Mr. DAWSON: Then what is your argument worth?

HON. A. MORGAN: Mr. Collins was, in the judgment of the President and himself—and in the judgment of members of the Committee who had had opportunities of judging of his work—the very best man available for the position.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: You talked about a man needing to have experience in the gallery, and he has had none.

HON. A. MORGAN: The hon. member was mistaken. He said that the third applicant was a competent newspaper reporter, but he had had no experience in the gallery. He hoped he did the gentleman no wrong, but he understood he was not a member of the gallery staff of either of the metropolitan newspapers.

Mr. McDONALD: He is.

HON. A. MORGAN: However, there was no reflection upon him by reason of his non-appointment. They thought that the two gentlemen who had been appointed were the most competent of the three applicants, and upon those grounds, and upon those grounds only, the appointments were made, and he thought they were justifiable.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. STEPHENSON (*Ipswich*) was not in the Committee when the vote had been proposed, but he understood that some exception had been taken by one hon. member, at all events, as to the competency of one of the occupants of the *Hansard* gallery. From what had been said by the hon. member for Warwick, it would have been learned by the Committee that the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the working of the Government Printing Office in their report had unanimously expressed their approval of the manner in which one of the gentlemen referred to—Mr. E. J. Gilligan—had done his work as shorthand writer to the Commission. He was bound to say—having, as the hon. member for Warwick stated, some little knowledge of that particular subject—that he had drafted that sentence in the report with a full knowledge of the responsibility which was entailed in so drafting it, and he was pleased to think that it had met with the unanimous approval of the members of the Commission. Seeing that Mr. Gilligan was so young a man, he had himself, at the time he was first appointed as shorthand writer in attendance on the Commission, some doubts as to his competency, but he had not occupied that position many days before he felt fully satisfied on the point, and

he felt more and more satisfied as the days passed by, and the authorities, in appointing him to the *Hansard* staff, had been fully justified by the results. So far as the *Hansard* staff generally were concerned, he believed they would compare favourably with any similar number of men in any of the other colonies. He very rarely troubled the reporters, but he was bound to say that he had always, since he had had the honour of a seat in that Chamber, been most accurately reported, and that what faults had occurred in connection with his speeches they had been faults which had been due to himself, and certainly not to the reporters. If hon. members would not endeavour to make themselves clear, they could not blame the reporters for that. If the gentlemen who were frequently employed in the gallery for so many hours did not occasionally report hon. members verbatim—and there were very few of them who could stand being reported verbatim—it was most unfair and unjust to throw the onus of any errors that might occur on the reporters instead of taking it on their own shoulders. For his part, he had much pleasure in bearing testimony to the capable work done by the reporting staff generally, and he believed that the appointment of Mr. E. J. Gilligan had been already fully justified, and would be more fully justified in the future.

Mr. BROWNE (*Croydon*): As his name had been mentioned in the debate by the hon. member for Clermont, who alluded to his making a complaint about mis-reporting, he wished to say that he distinctly denied that he had made any complaint. The hon. member was not familiar with the forms of the House, but so far as the *Hansard* staff were concerned, and the reports in *Hansard*, that was the seventh session that he had been in the House, and, although he had made many scores of speeches during the whole of that time he had only returned proofs with corrections three or four times, which showed that he had been pretty well satisfied with the way he had been reported. The correction to which reference had been made was made last week. He spoke on the Friday, and there was no opportunity of correcting the proof. Croydon and Georgetown had been spoken of, and what might easily happen—the reporter substituted the word Croydon for Georgetown. It was a very venial error; but, of course, it altered the sense of the speech altogether. Having no opportunity of correcting the proof, he had got up and made the correction in the House. Whether it was good luck or anything else, there was no hon. member in the Committee who was more grateful to the *Hansard* staff than he was. He had made hundreds of speeches during the seven years he had been there—if they were all reckoned up; and, seeing he had only had occasion four times at the outside to make a correction, that showed that he was satisfied with the reporting.

Mr. HIGGS (*Fortitude Valley*) was very sorry that he had mentioned the name of the hon. member for Cairns. He certainly had not the hon. member's authority for doing so, but he had only said that the hon. member might possibly be able to substantiate the statement that Mr. Gilligan had left Cairns because he said there was no agricultural country at the back of it. He hoped the Premier would not be dissuaded from making an inquiry into the matter by anything that had been said that evening. There were some hon. members here who could bear him out that the appointment was not looked upon as a good one by many members of the Committee. As to the courteous remarks of the hon. member for Cook about "nosing" about, he begged to say that he did not go nosing about for that information at all. If some hon. members did go nosing about, there was no doubt

they would have found considerable reason for supporting the motion of the hon. member for Dalby that there should be some inquiry into the condition of the parliamentary buildings.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: Give some reasons.

Mr. HIGGS: The reason that the hon. member opposed that motion so strenuously should in his (Mr. Higgs's) opinion have been sufficient for the carrying of it.

Mr. HAMILTON: Be manly, and give your reason and not insinuations.

Mr. HIGGS: What about the hon. member's insinuations that he had gone nosing about to see that information? He had brought that matter before the Committee in the interests of the *Hansard* staff—although he had not consulted a member of the staff—and in the interests of that House and the Civil Service generally—

Mr. J. HAMILTON: Where did you get your information?

Mr. HIGGS declined to answer the hon. member, and in the interests of the Civil Service, which he thought should be kept as capable as possible. When the Speaker spoke of the testimonial received from the chief of the staff and Principal Shorthand Writer, the chief of the staff and Principal Shorthand Writer was Mr. E. J. Gilligan, junior's, father.

Mr. MORGAN: He is a responsible man, you know.

Mr. HAMILTON: Is he not a reliable man?

Mr. HIGGS: The chief of the staff, so far as he knew, was a very capable shorthand writer, but at the present time he was overworked because he had to work up his son's stuff.

Mr. HAMILTON: Not correct. There is not an atom of truth in it.

Mr. HIGGS hoped the Premier would investigate the matter and would subject Mr. E. J. Gilligan to a test. He was satisfied that the other members of the staff would be willing to submit to a test if required, and if Mr. Gilligan, junior, was what hon. members who supported him that night said he was, he would not be unwilling also to submit himself to a test. If hon. members would secure that, and would come to the House with a certificate that Mr. E. J. Gilligan was capable of doing 150 words a minute, he would apologise to him for having made those statements there that evening.

Mr. J. HAMILTON (*Cook*): The hon. member had given a lot of insinuations, but was not manly enough to give his reasons. He had also insinuated that he (Mr. Hamilton) had objected to the motion moved by Mr. Bell, but if it came to that the majority of the House objected to it. The hon. member suggested that he had objected because as Government whip he held a room, but the leader of the Opposition had a room and Ministers had rooms and all of them objected. Let the hon. member be man enough if he had any charges to make them. The hon. member could be as bold as a lion when attacking opponents behind a newspaper hedge under some circumstances, but he would not make plain statements to one's face.

Mr. HIGGS: I do not think so. If I know anything about you, I will say it quick enough.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: Then you admit you don't.

Mr. CALLAN: Whether it is true or not.

Mr. KERR (*Barcoo*): If the shorthand staff was done with, there was a matter he wished to refer to. When the money of the taxpayers was being voted there should be some protection for white people, and they should see that they had the expenditure of that money. What he had risen about was the caterer of the refreshment-rooms obtaining his vegetables from a Chinaman. On previous occasions in that House reference had been made to the Governor getting his vegetables from a Chinaman, and he had

discussed the matter with His Excellency at the Gatton College on one occasion, and had pointed out the effect of high officials in the colony patronising a chow, or any of those aliens, which some of them during the whole of their residence here had been trying to get out of the country. Here the taxpayers' money was used to the extent of £750 to subsidise the parliamentary refreshment-rooms and the caterer got his vegetables from a Chinaman. That could not be got over, as any morning hon. members could see the Chinaman's cart at the back of the building. It was time hon. members protested and raised their voices against that; and so long as he was a member of the House he would protest against subsidising a refreshment-room that patronised a Chinaman. He had pointed out to His Excellency, when he had discussed the matter with him, that many of them had been living in the back portion of the colony with their wives and families, and had gone for months without vegetables because they objected to purchase them from Chinamen, and they had been at the expense of getting their vegetables from hawkers from Toowoomba and Charleville and those places, because they did not think it right to purchase vegetables off a chow or any other alien.

The TREASURER: Nobody else grows them.

Mr. KERR: Any amount of white persons grew vegetables and brought them into that town. He knew of one man who had been in his employ at Tambo, and who came to Brisbane and got a piece of land from the hon. member for South Brisbane, Mr. Stephens, on which he went into the gardening industry. To his knowledge that man was for over twelve months growing vegetables at South Brisbane; but unfortunately he had to give up through the competition of Chinamen, because persons in high official positions purchased their vegetables from chows.

Mr. LEAHY: I know that many white men who bring vegetables into town have purchased them from Chinamen before they brought them in.

Mr. KERR knew nothing about that. It was possible, but as he pointed out to His Excellency the Governor, a person selling those goods as white-grown vegetables could be prosecuted for selling an article which was not what he represented it to be. On behalf of his electors he protested against the caterer of the refreshment-rooms purchasing vegetables from chows, and as a protest he moved that the amount for the refreshment-rooms be reduced by £5.

Question—That the item £750, catering, waiting during session, and incidentals be reduced to £745—*put.*

Mr. MAXWELL (*Burke*) said he should support the amendment not so much because Chinamen supplied the refreshment-room with vegetables as because he thought the refreshment-room was conducted on a wrong system. He believed that if tenders for carrying it on were called for the work could be done more economically, and with greater advantage and satisfaction. Of course he had no desire to see the table supplied with vegetables grown by Chinese. It had been said that white men could not grow vegetables around Brisbane. They were able to do so in North Queensland, where labour was much dearer. He objected to spending the taxpayers' money in patronising the chow.

Mr. DAWSON said he sympathised with the hon. member for Barcoo in the matter. It was a grave reflection on the white people of the colony that they were not able to grow vegetables, and were compelled to rely for a supply of them on the Chinese. In the centre of the very finest farming district in the colony—it was called the garden of Queensland—in the heart of Too-

woomba, there were three Chinese gardens in which vegetables were grown for the farming population of that part of the Darling Downs.

The PREMIER said it was no doubt always preferable to use vegetables grown by white men, but as a matter of fact the gardens around Brisbane were chiefly cultivated by Chinamen. White men seemed to have entirely given up garden cultivation. When he came to the colony in the early sixties there were a number of German settlers at German Station who supplied the town with vegetables. That was a thing of the past. In the district in which he lived, Breakfast Creek, there was not a single white man's market garden—all the vegetables were grown by Chinese. If they restricted the caterer to getting his supplies of garden produce from white men, the tables of the refreshment-room might fare very badly. He agreed with the hon. member for Barcoo, that if they could get a continuous supply grown by white men it would be advisable to get them from white men; but he did not think they could, and he could not see why they should prevent the caterer from getting a regular supply of good vegetables for the refreshment-room table.

Mr. DAWSON said it was no doubt a very difficult matter to discover whether the vegetables had been grown by Chinamen or not, but the Committee ought certainly to express its desire that the caterer, who was subsidised to some extent by the taxpayers of the colony, should purchase his vegetables from white men. There was a profit in the sale of the produce to the purchaser, and he should like to see that go into the white man's pocket. Let the white hawker get that profit instead of the Chinese hawker.

Mr. GLASSEY: Suppose the vegetables were grown by the white hawker?

Mr. DAWSON: Then he would get his profit as grower as well as seller. The very least they could ask for, where a public department was concerned, was that the white man, and not the Chinaman, should receive the profit. He had not purchased anything from a Chinese hawker for the last ten or fifteen years.

Mr. CALLAN: You don't know what your wife does.

Mr. DAWSON: He knew very well that nothing was purchased from Chinamen at his house, whether he was there or not. He contended that hon. members should indicate their objection to the Chinese hawker coming here selling vegetables, and that they would be much better pleased if they were obtained from a white hawker.

The TREASURER: Even if grown by Chinamen.

Mr. DAWSON: Of course there was no means of knowing for certain whether they were grown by Europeans or not; but it was certain that if they were bought from a Chinese hawker the Chinese hawker made the profit on the sale.

The PREMIER: The Chinaman might hire a European to sell his vegetables for him.

Mr. DAWSON did not know whether the hon. gentleman had any experience of Chinamen employing Europeans.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: They are employed by Chinamen in the tobacco-fields at Killarney.

Mr. DAWSON: If that was so, it was because there was not an unemployed Chinaman in the district. A white man would overlook his own countrymen if a coloured man was cheaper, but a Chinaman would never employ a white man if he could get a yellow man.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: He will if he can get him cheaper.

Mr. DAWSON: He never could get the white man cheaper.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Yes.

Mr. DAWSON : All he could say was that if white men were cheaper than Chinamen they must be Ministerial supporters.

Mr. GIVENS (*Cairns*) : This discussion had done good by showing that in the early "sixties" vegetables were grown and carried round by white men, and now they were grown and carried round by Chinamen. There could be no stronger testimony than that of the evil done by Governments in the past. And, according to the hon. member for Lockyer, there were Chinamen employing white men in the electorate of the hon. member for Cunningham. If that went on, white men would become the inferior race and Chinamen the superior race.

Mr. LEAHY : I saw kanakas employing white men on the Tweed two years ago.

Mr. GIVENS : The hon. member supported such a policy, or he would not sit on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. LEAHY : I think the Tweed is in New South Wales.

The CHAIRMAN : I must ask the hon. member to come back to the vote before the Committee, and not discuss the question of coloured labour.

Mr. GIVENS thought he was entitled to discuss the evils which had accrued from the encouragement of alien labour.

The CHAIRMAN : The hon. member is not in order in discussing the question of coloured labour. The question before the Committee now is the reduction of the vote.

Mr. GIVENS said the hon. member for Barcoo had moved a reduction in the vote as a protest against vegetables being purchased from Chinamen by the caterer of the refreshment-rooms, and he thought he was entitled on that vote to discuss whether it was desirable that Chinamen should be encouraged in the growing of vegetables. Coming from an electorate that was to a considerable extent overrun with Chinamen—

The TREASURER : They kept the place going for years.

Mr. GIVENS : That was a decided misstatement, and he would prove it up to the hilt. A little while ago, when the central mill on Freshwater Creek—

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE : What has that to do with the vote ?

Mr. GIVENS : He could reply to the interjection.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE : No.

The CHAIRMAN : The hon. gentleman can speak on the vote, but he must keep in order.

Mr. GIVENS objected to the money of the taxpayers being used to encourage the growing of vegetables by Chinamen, and it was a libel on the white farmers in the Southern part of the colony to say that they could not grow sufficient vegetables not only for the refreshment-rooms, but for the whole city of Brisbane.

Mr. CALLAN : Why don't they do it ?

Mr. GIVENS : Because the Chinamen were encouraged, and white men had to compete against the Chinese growers at all times.

Mr. CALLAN : To what extent ?

Mr. GIVENS : No matter how infinitesimal the extent, the principle was there [11.30 p.m.] just the same. They had it, on the authority of the Premier, that when he came to Queensland the white farmers were growing the vegetables which were consumed in the Southern part of the colony ; and they had it, on the same authority, that they had been completely run out by Chinamen. That was the greatest commentary and the most convincing evidence they could possibly have of the system by which the colony had been governed for the last thirty or forty years.

Mr. J. HAMILTON (*Cook*) : He agreed with hon. members that no encouragement should be given to Chinamen if vegetables could be obtained from white men, and he thought every hon. member was of the same opinion. While the hon. member for Barcoo was speaking he (Mr. Hamilton) went and saw the son of the caterer, and he informed him that nearly all the vegetables which were used in the refreshment-room were grown by his father or bought from white men. Occasionally some carrots and turnips, that could not be got from white men, were purchased from Chinamen ; but he always preferred to buy from white men when he could.

Mr. BROWNE (*Croydon*) : He had been a member of the Refreshment-room Committee, and no complaint had come to him about the vegetables used there being procured from Chinamen. If there had been, he should have taken steps to have stopped it. He wanted to refer to the Premier's statement that white men could not do this sort of thing.

The PREMIER : I did not say couldn't, but do not do it.

Mr. BROWNE : He was sorry the Secretary for Agriculture had left the Chamber, as he had been very active in doing what he could for the agricultural industry. They had experts for all sorts of things—from the looking after of bugs and the rest of it that affected the sugar-cane, up to the growing of coffee—and if it was a fact that white men could not grow vegetables for the white population, what was the Agricultural Department doing that it had not an expert to teach them how to do it and keep the Chinamen out of the field ? If the white men in the South of Queensland could not grow vegetables, by all means let them be got from the Chinamen ; but it could be done in other parts of the colony, and it was a disgrace for the farmers' representatives to come here and say that the white men could not compete with the Chinamen in growing what was a necessary of life for the whole community. But if it was a fact that the growing of vegetables in the South had passed into the hands of the Chinamen and other coloured aliens, one of the greatest things the Government could do—especially as they were bringing immigrants out to the colony to settle on the land as market gardeners and farmers, and all the rest of it—was to appoint an expert market gardener, a man who knew how to grow vegetables, so as to show that the British race could hold its own, even in the growing of cabbages and the despised pumpkin, and that they could be better grown by white men than by Chinamen.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (*Lockyer*) : The hon. member for Croydon was not likely to go into a duffer claim if he had a good one, and if he was a farmer he would not be likely to go in for the raising of vegetables if he could grow something which paid him better. The growing of vegetables was a finicking game, and the farmer could do better at something else. If the hon. member had visited the Government agricultural farms and the college he would have seen that the experts there were doing everything they possibly could to illustrate the proper methods of growing vegetables ; and although it was only a couple of years since the college was established, it had been the means of affording an immense amount of information, and furnished an object lesson to the farmers who chose to take advantage of it. Were hon. members going to apply this principle to the fruit supplies to the refreshment-room as well as to the vegetable supplies ? The fruit supplies, at any rate one portion, came from the North. They were grown practically by Chinamen, and came from the district of the hon. member for Cairns. Later on they would see another tropical fruit—the mango—coming down from those districts.

The hon. member for Croydon stated that the state of vegetable-growing in the South was a disgrace to the farmers' representatives. He (Mr. Armstrong) was going to say that it was an absolute disgrace to gentlemen representing those constituencies in the North that the Chinese were established in the North. These were the very men who were supporting the Chinese. He should prefer the product of Europeans, where it was possible to get it. One knew how they were grown, and the modes by which they were produced by the Celestials. After the member for Cook had stated expressly that the vegetables were got from Europeans, the question should be settled, and the vote allowed to pass.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*) believed that the caterer did his very best to secure vegetables grown by white men for the consumption of hon. members who patronised the refreshment-rooms, but at the same time thought it should not be necessary to purchase carrots and turnips grown by Chinamen. He had now been living for some months in Brisbane, and had not yet laid his hand on vegetables grown by Chinamen. He lived next door to a man who grew vegetables and sold them to him, and in every direction he looked from his place he found white men growing vegetables and fruit, and in many instances they grew them for sale. It was a reflection on the ability of their white humanity to say that they could not supply themselves with the various vegetables they consumed without having to resort to the assistance of Chinamen. Hon. members opposite had talked about this dominating nationality which could build empires, carve statues, paint pictures, and uphold the honour of the flag in South Africa, and yet said white men could not grow cabbages in competition with Chinese. No wonder that gentlemen like the Premier and Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo sneered at the pumpkin-grower.

The PREMIER: You are making a misstatement; I never sneered at the pumpkin-grower.

Mr. LESINA admitted that the hon. gentleman had not denounced the pumpkin-grower, but the hon. gentleman had stated that when he came into the colony in the early sixties he saw vegetables brought in by the farmers for the consumption of the people in the city, and he asked, "Where now is the vegetable-grower of thirty years ago?" And the hon. member for Lockyer pointed out that he had seen white men working for Chinamen in the Cunningham electorate—that the despised white had given up employing himself and gone to the more despised alien for assistance. That was a disgrace, and what had brought it about? The cause of it was that white people would not purchase vegetables from white people when they grew them, and he held that they should not encourage, either directly or indirectly, any person who used vegetables grown by Chinese gardeners.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. D. H. Dalrymple, *Mackay*): It was not a question of what a white man could do, but of what it paid a white man to do, and the statement of the Premier that thirty years ago white men were growing vegetables in the neighbourhood of Brisbane only showed that at that time the remuneration for white labour generally was worse than it was to-day. Whereas at the present time a married couple in the bush would get from £50 to £75 a year, thirty-five years ago they would only get about £30 per annum. Therefore the fact that white people no longer occupied themselves in growing vegetables merely showed that it was a poorly remunerated employment, and that white men had something better to do. As for the statement that

the caterer should, under no circumstances, buy anything but what was grown by white persons, that was rather a surprising statement.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: No, we say he should give the preference to vegetables grown by white men.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Then this debate need not have taken place, because it had been explained that whenever it was possible the caterer got vegetables grown by white men.

Mr. DAWSON: Then why do you continue the debate?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Because hon. members opposite would continue talking on the subject, though it was now admitted that there was nothing to talk about. With regard to the statement that white men worked for Chinamen, he would point out that everybody here more or less worked for coloured men. It was a matter of creed with some members that they must not deal with coloured men for anything they produced, yet they had dealt with Chinamen for years in the Northern towns, and having then got up an agitation and hunted him out they afterwards metaphorically went down on their knees to get him to come back. Under no circumstances hon. members opposite said were they to buy anything that was not grown by white labour. Were hon. members going to do without shirts? Did not the whole of the cotton out of which those shirts were made come from Egypt, and India, and America, and was grown by black people?

Mr. GIVENS rose to a point of order. He was speaking about black labour and was pulled up. Was the hon. gentleman in order in pursuing a course that he was pulled up for?

The CHAIRMAN: I have pointed out before that a general discussion upon black labour is out of order.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Hon. members had been for an hour and a-half on a vote which had strictly to do with the caterer, and on that they had been airing their opinions on coloured labour and posing as opponents of the Chinese. The leader of the Opposition was quite satisfied with the statement made half an hour ago, and had said that there was nothing to take exception to in the vote, but hon. members would pursue the question of coloured labour.

Mr. McDONALD (*Flinders*): Statements had been made during the debate which he did not think would tend to encourage white vegetable-growers at all. The hon. member for Lockyer said vegetable-growing was a finicking industry, which no ordinary farmer would take up.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I said they went in for something which paid them better.

Mr. McDONALD: Now, what were the facts? Supposing a man had the best possible piece of ground on which to grow wheat, and say he obtained a yield of thirty bushels to the acre, worth 4s. a bushel; that would mean about £6 an acre.

Mr. T. B. CRIBB rose to a point of order. What had the growing of wheat to do with the vote before the House?

The CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with it. The question is a reduction of the proposed vote for the refreshment-rooms.

Mr. McDONALD: So many other hon. members had been allowed to wander from the subject that he thought it only fair that the same rule should apply all round. Concerning the growing of vegetables, he knew of a white man in the Stanthorpe district who could knock the chow out any time. He not only sent large supplies to Brisbane, but also to the Northern towns, and many a wheat farmer would be only too glad to have the income he made out of growing



cabbages. On one acre of land he could grow 10,000 head of cabbage. They were told that the white man would not grow them. He denied that statement, and maintained that the white vegetable-grower was engaged in a far more profitable occupation than many another farmer. They were actually importing people to settle on the land and grow cabbages, as well as other things, for the whole community, and yet the Premier admitted that all the people who used to grow cabbages in the old days had given place to the Chinaman, and the hon. member for Lockyer said it was work carried on only by chows. Seeing they were spending the taxpayers'

[12 p.m.] money they should set an example in regard to the purchase of vegetables from white men. In the district where he lived there were enough white people growing vegetables to supply, not only the refreshment-rooms, but many other places which were at present supplied by Chinamen.

Mr. BROWNE (*Croydon*) said that since he had been a member of the Refreshment-rooms Committee he had never heard a complaint about vegetables being got from Chinamen. The hon. member for Lockyer had criticised Northern members on the fact that the Chinese there grew vegetables and everything else, and sent their produce down here. Speaking for himself, he had fought against coloured labour, while the likes of the hon. member had forced it on them. He was always ready to stand up for the white man doing anything that the coloured man could do, but he was sorry to say the hon. member for Lockyer was not. The hon. member for Lockyer had also twitted the hon. member for Cairns about bananas being grown in his electorate by Chinese. Well, some hon. members had complained lately about the bananas which had been supplied in the refreshment-rooms; so that if those bananas were grown by Chinamen, as the hon. member said, it was evident that some hon. members were not satisfied with them. If any complaint was brought before the Refreshment-rooms Committee, he would refuse to endorse the paying of any accounts that were due to the caterer—even if he was the only one on the committee who would take that stand—while those vegetables were being used. There were many finicking gardeners who were at present trying to get labourer's work in Brisbane, because they could not get a living at their trade. If no one else would set an example to the people of the country to buy vegetables from white people, then that Committee should set that example.

Mr. T. B. CRIBB (*Ipswich*) was quite as strongly opposed to the Chinese as any hon. member on the other side, and his firm and family took no vegetables that were grown by Chinamen. They believed that the vegetables grown by white men were more to be relied on, and were better in every way. Still, he had frequently seen vegetable carts owned by Chinese at doors of ardent Labour sympathisers. As to the statement of the hon. member for Charters Towers that they should give the preference to vegetables distributed by white men, there was a great deal in that, but he would rather give the preference to vegetables grown by white men and distributed by Chinamen than to vegetables grown by Chinamen and distributed by white men.

Mr. DUNSFORD (*Charters Towers*) said that there was a considerable amount of latitude allowed in connection with the debate, and if they were to get through the Estimates this side of the year 1900, they would have to stop that kind of thing. However, the discussion would do some good, and in view of that he suggested that the amendment might be withdrawn, and allow the matter to remain as at present. Here in the city there were plenty of shops in which

vegetables were kept by Europeans, who would only be too glad to supply the refreshment-rooms. He had no doubt that this matter would be attended to by the Refreshment-room Committee, and he hoped at this late hour the hon. member would withdraw his amendment.

Mr. KERR never thought this colony, and more especially the Brisbane district, was in such a state until he heard the Premier say that it was not possible to get white men's vegetables. He was under the impression that a number of people in the Logan and other places could grow vegetables by white labour. And why should they not be sent to Brisbane? He had moved the reduction of the vote as a protest that it was not necessary for the caterer to purchase his vegetables from the Chinese, because he believed he could purchase them from white people. The discussion had done some good, and as he had attained his object, he asked leave to withdraw his amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Original question stated.

Mr. McDONALD: There was another matter concerning the wages of the girls and other servants in the refreshment-rooms, and he thought something ought to be done with regard to a minimum wage in this respect. He hoped the Committee would take this matter into consideration.

Mr. DAWSON thought the Committee should be furnished with some information with regard to the expenditure of this money.

The PREMIER: There is a report.

Mr. DAWSON: That report was very meagre. It did not give the public any idea of how much money had been expended in this respect. He had been a member of this committee one year, when not a single penny of the £750 voted was spent, the balances from previous years had accumulated to such an extent that they were quite sufficient. This was unfair to the caterer, because he appeared before the public as receiving this £750 every year, but he did nothing of the kind. He believed that the caterer did not receive £50 out of the vote for last year, and in order to give fair play to the caterer there ought to be an account kept of what was actually paid to him. Although the caterer drew so much every month, there was unexpended balances to be taken into account—balances which had accumulated to a very large extent, and which were not used as he had expressed.

Mr. McDONALD: This was one of the most extraordinary things he had ever heard of since he had been in the House—that these unexpended balances had been held over by the Refreshment-rooms Committee. He did not know what the Auditor-General had been doing to allow such a thing, and some explanation should be given by the Treasurer on the matter. There was probably some mistake, and a slur had been cast on the Auditor-General in that that amount of money had been allowed to accumulate from year to year. They knew that all their unexpended balances had to be returned to the Treasury at the end of the year and they lapsed. They were told in connection with that vote that though the money was not used, it did not lapse, and that was an extraordinary statement which should be cleared up before they went home that night.

Mr. BROWNE pointed out that on the same question last year the hon. member for Herbert, who was then Speaker, had explained that the surplus from those votes was retained by the Refreshment-room Committee; but there had never been a year when the vote had not been drawn on, and he thought the leader of the Opposition must have made a slight mistake as to that. In *Hansard* for the 7th September of



last year, hon. members would find that the late Speaker had explained the matter at length, and had stated —

He had not got the figures for 1893-4, but he had those for the succeeding years. In 1894-5 the amount expended was £562 18s. 4d.; in 1895-6, £687 15s. 3d.; in 1896-7, £627 18s.; and in 1897-8 £668 11s. There had been a balance every year—in 1894-5, £187; in 1895-6, £82; in 1896-7, £122; and in 1897-8, £81; so that hon. members would see that the whole vote in any one year had not been actually expended.

The facts, so far as he could gather them, were that there was a small surplus from last year, but with the billiard-rooms, visitors-room, and everything else he anticipated that that little surplus would be ate up this year, and there would probably have to be a bigger vote made.

Mr. McDONALD wanted to know what had been done with the money which had not been expended from the vote for the refreshment-rooms every year. The extraordinary statement had been made that one year the committee had a large amount to their credit, and so far as he could see that could only have occurred through a voucher having been sent to the Auditor-General to say that all the money had been spent when it had not, and the Auditor-General must have been deceived. That was a dangerous state of affairs for the House to allow to exist, and they were entitled to some explanation of the matter from the Premier or the Treasurer.

The PREMIER: Hon. members knew that any balances of votes unexpended during the financial year could only be brought forward by Executive authority. He was not prepared to give any fuller information than that. That vote was not exempt from the supervision of the Auditor-General, and the Auditor-General's report would show what the expenditure from it had been for the year, the amount, if any, carried forward, or the amount which had lapsed. He was not prepared at that moment to say what amount had been expended last year from the vote.

Mr. DAWSON did not wish to prolong the discussion, but he had drawn attention to the loose system on which that matter was conducted, and to the fact that it was calculated to mislead the public, because they were given to understand that it cost the taxpayer £750 every year to carry on the catering for that establishment. It did not cost anything like that, and the accumulated surplus had one year amounted to so much that the committee had not drawn a single 6d. from the vote. He drew attention to the matter because the public should know exactly what it cost to run that department. For exactly the same reason he had always called attention to the vote of £10,000 for deep sinking on the Mines Estimates. The public looking at the Estimates came to the conclusion that there was £10,000 expended every year on deep sinking, when, as a matter of fact, the department did not spend £2,000 a year. The balances in that case did not accumulate as they did in connection with the refreshment-room vote. The hon. member for Barcoo, who had been on the committee, had had the same experience of the vote as himself.

Mr. FISHER (*Gympie*): The Treasurer must have been as surprised as other hon. members to hear that those balances accumulated, because, so far as they could find from the documents, there had been no accumulations at all. There was no mention of any money being [12.30 a.m.] in the hands of the Refreshment-rooms Committee. Quite recently they had had an experience of the inefficiency of the audit in a certain department, and the statement of the leader of the Opposition was a revelation in the same direction. According to the Auditor-General's report, the entire £750 was received and expended every year; yet

according to the leader of the Opposition only £50 of the amount was drawn from last year's vote. It was evident that the Auditor-General did not inquire into the way the money was expended. The last report of the Refreshment-rooms Committee indicated that the expenditure last year was about £630, which, of course, might have been spent from the accumulated funds.

The TREASURER said that in other departments the balances unexpended at the end of the year lapsed, and he saw no reason why the Refreshment-rooms Committee should be treated differently from any other department of the public service. Perhaps the Auditor-General did not think that the accounts of a parliamentary committee ought to be audited at all. In any case he would speak to Mr. Deshon about it.

Mr. KERR said that when he was a member of the Refreshment-rooms Committee the £750 voted was paid into the bank to the credit of the committee, and any money left over at the end of the year did not lapse, but remained to its credit in the bank. Mr. Radford prepared a balance-sheet, and two members of the committee were appointed to audit it.

Mr. LESINA said there was an item, "groom, £104; stable help and labourer, £94," to which he wished to refer. He wanted to know what the stable was for, who patronised it, whether it was necessary—

The CHAIRMAN: I would remind the hon. member that a later item has been discussed, and that he cannot go back to that.

Mr. McDONALD said he had always understood that when a motion had been withdrawn they were in exactly the same position as before that motion was moved.

The CHAIRMAN: Standing Order 313 says—

After a question for omitting or reducing an item has been disposed of, a motion shall not be made nor debate allowed upon any preceding item.

The question raised by the hon. member for Barcoo was disposed of by the withdrawal of the motion.

Mr. McDONALD (*Flinders*) thought it ought to be common knowledge on the part of every hon. member that when a motion was withdrawn they were in the same position as if the thing had not been moved. If what the Chairman had said was going to be his ruling, he would move that the ruling be disagreed to. He thought it would be an extraordinary—an outrageous ruling.

Mr. DAWSON (*Charters Towers*): The words "disposed of" in the Standing Order quoted by the Chairman obviously meant "disposed of by decision of the Committee." It could not be disposed of unless the Committee had expressed an opinion on the matter by going to a vote or allowing the thing to go on the voices. There had been no question put from the chair that had disposed of a single item in the vote. There was a proposed amendment which had been withdrawn, and that left them in the same position as if the amendment had not been moved at all.

Mr. McDONALD (*Flinders*): To show the absurdity of the position as the thing stood now he could move the same amendment as the hon. member for Barcoo had withdrawn. Apart from that it had been the rule to have a general discussion on the vote; and even if he could not move an amendment on any item preceding the one on which an amendment had been moved by the hon. member for Barcoo, he could discuss it till he was tired, and there was no authority to prevent him from doing so. He hoped in the interests of the Committee that such a ruling as had been indicated by the Chairman's reference to Standing Order 313 would not be given.

Mr. FITZGERALD (*Mitchell*) pointed out that when the clauses of a Bill were being considered in committee it frequently happened that an amendment proposed, say, in the 5th line of a clause was withdrawn to allow an amendment to be moved, say, in the 3rd line of the clause. The position now was practically the same. The hon. member for Barcoo had withdrawn his amendment, and surely the Committee could go back.

Mr. T. B. CRIBB (*Ipswich*) had always understood that when an amendment had been proposed, and put from the chair in the way this amendment had been put from the chair, if it was withdrawn the same amendment could not be moved again. He considered that the view taken by the Chairman was quite correct.

Mr. FISHER (*Gympie*), referring to the instance cited by the hon. member for Mitchell, said that a proposed amendment was frequently withdrawn to allow another hon. member to move an amendment in a preceding part of a clause, and after that was disposed of the amendment that had been temporarily withdrawn was again proposed, and that was perfectly in order.

The CHAIRMAN: I have not given my ruling in this case specially, but I am prepared to give a ruling in the direction I have indicated, and I think I should be supported by our Standing Orders and also by "May's Parliamentary Practice." On page 583 of "May" I find—

The rules framed for the guidance of the Committee of Supply have been enforced by the following decisions from the chair. In dealing with the items of an estimate, it has been ruled that items must be dealt with separately, and that an amendment including more than one item cannot be proposed by way of reduction of an item, but must be moved as a reduction of the whole grant. The rule which prohibits any return in debate to an item prior to the item upon which debate has arisen, or a question has been proposed, remains in force, after the withdrawal of the motion on which that question was founded.

That is the rule observed in the Imperial Parliament. Our Standing Order is in accordance with that, and I think I would be perfectly safe in giving it as a rule that we cannot go back to an item preceding an item that has been under discussion on which an amendment has been proposed and withdrawn.

Mr. McDONALD: It had been repeatedly done. He remembered the Chairman, at his instigation, withdrawing his motion to allow him (Mr. McDonald) to move one previously. The fact that the whole question had been discussed did not prevent him from discussing any item from the top to the bottom. The effect of a motion being withdrawn was to leave them in exactly the same position as they were in before, and he was going to move, to show that that question had never been dealt with, that the item of £5 be knocked off the vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I can accept the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for Flinders, because it does not go back to the previous item the same as the previous amendment suggested. Does the hon. member make that as a motion?

Mr. McDONALD: He wanted to show that the withdrawal of a motion was the same as if none had ever been moved, because no question could be brought forward twice in the same session. The fact that a motion had been withdrawn proved that it had not been dealt with; and the fact that the Chairman was willing to accept an amendment from him (Mr. McDonald) on exactly the same point went to prove that the withdrawal of a motion did not prevent the discussion of the whole question before the Committee.

Mr. FISHER: If a debate took place on any item, and the motion was withdrawn, and the Chairman ruled that hon. members could not go back, the purpose for which members were

there—namely, to debate and discuss—would be defeated. It would leave it within the province of any member who wished to block another to move a motion, have it discussed, and then withdraw it.

Mr. FITZGERALD (*Mitchell*): Until there was a definite decision one way or the other, the Committee was in *statu quo*, and the whole thing would have to be commenced *de novo*. That had been a rule since he had been in the House, and he hoped it would not be departed from.

The CHAIRMAN: That is when the Bill is before the House. This is a rule specially framed for the guidance of the Committee when in Supply. As hon. members know very well, when our rules are silent we take the rules laid down by the Imperial Parliament as our guide. This rule which is laid down by "May" for the guidance of the Committee of Supply specially mentions that in cases of withdrawal they cannot go back to a former item, and I think language cannot be plainer than that. So if there is considerable debate on a motion, and it is withdrawn, according to this rule, you cannot go back to any previous item. What the hon. member for Flinders is referring to was a question of time. That was with reference to a longer or a shorter time, and I gave way to him because he intended to move a shorter time. The hon. member will doubtless remember it.

Mr. McDONALD: No. It was a question of the Estimates.

The CHAIRMAN: I have to be guided by the procedure of the House of Commons, and it is clearly laid down that that is the proper procedure.

Mr. McDONALD maintained that for the past seven years it had been the practice to allow a discussion of the whole vote when

[1 a.m.] an amendment to reduce a particular item had been withdrawn. On one occasion the Chairman himself endeavoured to forestall hon. members on that side by moving an amendment in the last or nearly the last item of the vote for the Government Printing Office, but that amendment having been withdrawn, he (Mr. McDonald) moved an amendment in the second item on the list, and that amendment was accepted. No motion had been decided in connection with the vote at present before the Committee, and he held that he could move a reduction of the first item in the vote if he so desired.

Mr. FITZGERALD argued that if the opinion of the Chairman was correct, then all that anyone who wished to stop a discussion on the increase in the salary of the sub-librarian, or the amount proposed to be granted for the refreshment-room, or any other of the previous items in the vote, had to do was to move that the last item of £500 for printing the library catalogue be reduced by £5, and that would block all discussion.

Mr. McDONALD would like to emphasise the argument of the last speaker by pointing out that if immediately the question was put he moved the reduction of the last item by £5, and someone got up and spoke on it for a minute or two, and he then withdrew the amendment, all discussion would be stopped, and the Chairman would have no alternative but to put the question to the Committee.

Mr. FISHER pointed out that May laid it down that, "After a question has been proposed from the Chair for the reduction of the whole vote no motion shall be made for omitting or reducing any item," and held that if such a rule was enforced it would practically put a stop to all discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: The case suggested by the hon. member for Flinders is one in which no

debate would practically have taken place, which is very different from the present case in which a proposal had been made to reduce a vote and then after about two hours' debate on the matter it has been withdrawn. I certainly shall have to stand by what I have said, and in that I am supported by the practice of the House of Commons.

Mr. McDONALD : If that was going to be the ruling, then discussion on a big vote, like that for the military of £26,000, might be prevented by a proposal to reduce the last item in that vote by £10, even though that motion was immediately afterwards withdrawn. The point which had been raised was a very serious one, and he would suggest that the Chairman give no ruling, but that the matter be allowed to drop—at any rate until they had had time to give it full consideration. He appealed to the Premier to make some attempt to get the matter postponed. The House of Commons rule was—"After a question has been proposed from the chair for a reduction of the whole vote no motion should be made to omit or reduce any item." They had always understood that position. If a question had been dealt with they could not go back upon it. He maintained that when a motion was withdrawn they were in exactly the same position as if it had never been put.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. R. Dickson, *Bulimba*) : It appeared to him that the rule, according to "May" was very clear. He had been studying the language of the clause, and at present, upon it, he could do nothing but support the Chairman's view. He was prepared to admit that they had not been following that rule strictly in previous years, but he could not go with the hon. member for Flinders in saying that they should ignore the House of Commons rules. The matter was a very serious one, and he thought more time should be given to its consideration. The better plan, therefore, would be to let the debate terminate. Before they resumed Committee of Supply it would be as well to ascertain definitely whether that rule was to apply.

Mr. Dawson : Move the Chairman out of the chair.

The PREMIER thought they might pass the vote before them.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*) : When the point of order cropped up he was addressing himself to the question of lighting in the stables and various rooms occupied by members who used the Houses of Parliament as a lodging-house. He found, however, that he was not in order, according to the Chairman's ruling.

The CHAIRMAN : The hon. member would be quite in order in discussing the matter on the item, "Gas for Parliamentary Buildings."

Mr. LESINA : Yes ; and he had intended to change his tactics and discuss it under the subdivision. He wanted to know why the public of Queensland should find money for lighting and heating rooms, furnishing and upholstering them for the use of private members of Parliament? Certain members got rooms in that building who were in a position to pay for them themselves in the many numerous lodging-houses which were kept by widows and other persons who made that their business ; and he protested against any portion of that vote being expended in providing bedding, heating, lighting, and furnishing of rooms with pictures on the walls and carpets on the floors, for persons who had no more right to them than every other member of the House. If that sort of thing went on he intended to apply for a room, furnished, lighted, and heated at the expense of the country. Why should one member have it more than another? Why did they not pay for their lodgings outside like any

ordinary, decent citizen, instead of loafing on the country for their needs? It was a scandalous state of affairs that the Parliamentary Buildings should be turned into a free boarding establishment—a home for the hopeless and incurable. It was a kind of socialism in our time that he did not believe in. He understood that under certain circumstances portions of the building should be set apart for the responsible head of the Government and his Cabinet, and for the leader of the Opposition and his Executive. That only facilitated the government of the country, but he saw no reason why private and non-official members of Parliament should be provided with the kind of accommodation to which he referred.

Mr. J. HAMILTON : Who is the unofficial member you refer to?

Mr. LESINA : He referred to the Hon. A. H. Barlow, M.L.C., and also to the hon. member for Cook, Mr. J. Hamilton.

Mr. J. HAMILTON : He has an official position as Government "whip."

Mr. LESINA : What did the suffering country owe to those two persons that it should provide them with accommodation?

The PREMIER : Mr. Barlow has no room here.

Mr. LESINA was glad to hear it ; there was so much more room left for someone else. With respect to the hon. member for Cook—the Government "whip"—he would like to know why he should be provided with a bedroom?

Mr. J. HAMILTON : I have a perfect right to one, just as Ministers have.

Mr. LESINA : The hon. member was paid £500 a year, which should enable him to pay for his own accommodation. He (Mr. Lesina) was sent there because of his suspicious-mindedness to look into those things on behalf of his constituents, and to find out what claims the hon. member had upon the country. He would like to bring his wife and family there, and turn Parliament House into a lodging-house. He entered his protest against that thing ; and he hoped other hon. members on that side would also enter their protests against a continuance of the practice. The *Worker* and other papers representing that big section of public opinion—as well as some other papers not connected with the Labour party—had frequently referred to the growing nuisance, and it was time something was done to stop it.

Mr. DUNSFORD (*Charters Towers*) did not agree with the hon. member for Clermont. He looked upon the Government "whip" as an official, and he was perfectly justified in having a room in the building. He went further and suggested that the Parliamentary Buildings might be turned into a club-house for the convenience of hon. members. It would be a great convenience to hon. members who came from a distance to have rooms to which they could retire after sitting there till 2 or 3 in the morning. He would be quite willing to pay for the use of a room. The Parliamentary Buildings could be put to a better use than being left in the possession of cockroaches and mice. He not only thought that the Government "whip" should have a room, but he also thought that the leader of the Opposition and the Opposition "whip" should be provided with rooms.

Mr. JENKINSON (*Wide Bay*) suggested to the Premier that if there was a spare room in the building it might be placed at the disposal of the leader of his party, who was as much entitled to a room as the Government whip or the leader of the Labour Opposition. He asked the Premier if there was any room that could be given to the leader of his party?

The PREMIER : I have nothing to do with the rooms.

Mr. JENKINSON: The hon. gentleman was in charge of the Estimates, and [1.30 a.m.] therefore he had asked him if there was a room. He thought the request a very reasonable one. He again asked the Premier if there was not a room that could be set apart for the leader of the Independent party.

The PREMIER: Although he was in charge of these Estimates, he was not in charge of the rooms in the Parliamentary Buildings. If the hon. member wanted a room for his leader, an application should be made to the Speaker, who would see if any accommodation could be found for him. With regard to the occupancy of the room by the hon. member for Cook, it was absolutely essential that he should be in the Parliamentary Buildings, and it was evident that he occupied the room at some inconvenience to himself, because as soon as the session was over, he took flight to some other part of Australia. He had been requested to be available at any time, as Ministers had to communicate with him frequently. The occupancy of a room by the hon. member for Cook was quite legitimate—it was absolutely indispensable for the business of the Executive. He approved of the leader of the Opposition having a room; but after that, he thought all the rooms were occupied.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed; the CHAIRMAN reported progress, and obtained leave to sit again at a later hour of the day.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: I beg to move that this House at its rising adjourn till 6.30 p.m. to-day. I regret the necessity for this delay, but owing to circumstances over which the Government have no control, the holiday has been postponed till to-day, so that the public may witness the embarkation of the troops for South Africa. The "Lucinda" will be placed at the disposal of hon. members as arranged, and will leave the wharf at 2.15 this afternoon, and will return so that hon. members will be able to attend to their legislative work at 7 o'clock. I trust that the leader of the Opposition will agree with this proposition. I think it would be a graceful act on the part of the hon. gentleman to agree to this short delay, with a view to enabling hon. members to witness the departure of the troops, and so fulfil the object for which the House adjourned yesterday. I trust the leader of the Opposition will agree to this.

Mr. DAWSON: I say at once that I am not willing to fall in with the request made by the Premier, because I think it is a most scandalous thing to adjourn till the hour stated this evening. Here we are almost at Christmas, without having done any business at all, and yet the Premier calmly asks us to adjourn and delay public business, although he knows we are pressed for time. I mentioned the other night that the hon. gentleman should make up for lost time by sitting until the small hours of the morning, and yet instead of meeting at the usual hour this afternoon and getting finished at 10.30 we are kept here till twenty minutes to 2 in the morning. That is on the last adjournment, and what will happen after this adjournment is that we will have to again sit up until the small hours of the morning. I say this is not only a scandalous but a shameful thing. We have a lot of business to do, and but a short time to do it in. The hon. gentleman wants to curtail that time, and I object to it. Let the public go to see the contingent off, if it is any pleasure to them, but I ask the Premier and those supporting him to sacrifice their pleasure by staying away and doing

their duty here in this House as they ought to do by meeting in the ordinary way and transacting public business. If the hon. gentleman thinks there will not be a quorum, we will find a quorum, and run the show on our own, if he does not like to turn up. We have the public accounts to go through, electoral reform, the Railway Committee Bill, and a great many matters of urgency to deal with, and an extremely limited time in which to deal with them. Every hour taken off that time is a serious matter for the public of Queensland, and the hon. gentleman should sacrifice his own pleasure to his public duty. I protest.

Mr. BROWNE: I want to say a few words in support of the leader of the Opposition. I have been against the contingent going to South Africa, but now that they are going there I would like to see the general public give them a good send-off, and I hope the arrangements will be better than those for the parade on Saturday last, when I was ashamed of the reception the men got. I have protested against these continual adjournments ever since I have been in the House. The real business of the country has been put off from time to time, and we have only made a start with the Estimates to-night. For the last six years the average time their discussion has taken has been nineteen and a-half sittings, and we devoted one day per week to them. But if we devote two days a week to them from to-day, even without allowing ourselves any Christmas holidays, it will take us until the 10th January to get through them. In addition there are seventeen Bills, many of great importance, which the Premier is pledged to introduce, not one of which has yet passed through its first stages. I enter my protest against the proposed adjournment.

Mr. T. B. CRIBB (*Ipswich*): Hon. members opposite talk a great deal about self-sacrifice. I think we on this side have shown an enormous amount of self-sacrifice in listening to long speeches from the other side, and refraining from replying to them in order that we may get some business done.

Question put and passed.

The PREMIER: I move that the House do now adjourn. The business, when we resume, will be the consideration in committee of the University Bill, to be followed by Supply.

Mr. DAWSON: I will again ask the hon. gentleman when it is his intention to proceed with the Electoral Reform Bill.

The PREMIER: I think I may safely say that it will be brought on early next week—either on Tuesday or Wednesday.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at four minutes to 2 o'clock.