

Bourke and The Bogan. I can assure them that I will do all I can to obtain for their districts a supply of water. I did all I possibly could to assist the hon. member for The Bogan to obtain a supply of water for Coonamble. I called for tenders, and accepted one; but owing to unforeseen and unfortunate circumstances the contractor was unable to carry out the work as speedily as possible. We have had great difficulty in obtaining contractors for those works, and therefore I was compelled to accept one contract for Nyngan and Coonamble, and the contract terminates at the end of two years. Until that time expires it is impossible for me as Minister to interfere with the contractor. The House would not expect me to do a wrong to a contractor who I am sure is doing his best under unfortunate circumstances to carry out the work.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH, in reply: Hon. members have touched upon a number of subjects varying from pugilistic encounters in gaols to the erection of barriers on Circular Quay, and I am sure it is not expected I should deal with all of them. One hon. member, I am sure, can scarcely expect me to sympathise with his complaint about the Russian Jews after the account of my persuasion given by the hon. member for West Macquarie the other night. Therefore he will have to apply to a minister of a different creed to myself on this question. With regard to the barriers, I think it would have been well to have delayed that question until the Colonial Treasurer was appointed, as it rests entirely with him. Until he is appointed it is impossible to say whether he will have heard the various speeches that have been made to-night. The Premier has told us that the Colonial Treasurer will be appointed to-morrow, and I shall have much pleasure in conveying the sentiments that have been expressed on the subject to him. If I happen to be Colonial Treasurer those gentlemen who have drawn the attention of the House so many times to the question to-night, will find that to do so once would be much more effectual than eight times. I will submit the matter to the Colonial Treasurer, and I have no doubt something will be done eventually that will give satisfaction to the House.

House adjourned at 12:30 a.m. (Friday).

## Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 18 August, 1891.

Sydney Hospital—Fruit Markets—Lane Cove Road—Postal and Telegraph Rates—Tubular Railway Cars—Suburban Railway-stations: American Locomotives—American Engines and Ironwork—Hares: Molong—Bombala Bridge—Adaminaby Park Road—Election Deposits—Twin-screw Hopper Dredge—Sydney Water Supply: Engines and Pumps—Wife Desertion—Forestry Bill—Thomas Suffield—Glebe Island—Pyrmont Bridge—Reserves, County Macquarie—Test of Targets—Probate Act—Summer Hill Railway-station—Australian Agricultural Company—Loans: Securities—Contractors Lien Bill (No. 2)—Pastoral Holdings: Financial Institutions—Committee of Elections and Qualifications (The Hastings and Manning Election)—Centennial Park: Toll-bar—Ministerial Statement: New Ministers—Australian Banking Company of Sydney Bill—Secretary for Public Works—Members Inaudible—Adjournment (Water Rates on Mineral Lands)—Daily *Hansard*—Wentworth Electorate Sub-division Act Amending Bill—Marble required for Public Works—Adjournment (Post Office Stables—Private Business—Cost and Conveyance of *Hansard*—Newspaper Supplements—Financial Institutions—Director of the Botanic Gardens).

Mr. SPEAKER took the chair.

### SYDNEY HOSPITAL.

Mr. E. M. CLARK asked the COLONIAL SECRETARY,—(1.) What was the cost of the present unfinished portion of the works of new hospital in Macquarie-street? (2.) How long has it been allowed to remain in its present unfinished condition? (3.) Is there any intention on the part of the Government to complete the work without further delay?

Sir HENRY PARKES answered,—(1.) £69,218 1s. 3d. (2.) Since 31st December, 1883. (3.) Steps have already been taken to complete the building.

### FRUIT MARKETS.

Mr. E. M. CLARK asked the COLONIAL SECRETARY,—As the original grant of the George-street site to the City Council was for purposes of general markets, will he take steps to urge upon the City Council the necessity for at once re-building fruit-markets on that site, or, failing that, in view of the importance of the fruit-growing industry of the colony, and the great loss and inconvenience now resulting to fruit growers through the want of convenient and central market accommodation, will he take steps to recommend to the

Government the necessity for resuming the site for the purpose of erecting markets?

Sir HENRY PARKES answered,—I believe the Municipal Council of Sydney have it in contemplation to erect markets on this site. I have had a communication from his Worship the Mayor of Sydney on the subject, and I am to see him again to consider it further.

#### LANE COVE ROAD.

Mr. E. M. CLARK asked the SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS,—(1.) Is it a fact that a large portion of the Lane Cove Road between Milson's Point and Chatswood is in a dangerous condition? (2.) Is it a fact that metal has been used upon the said road which is unsuitable for the purpose? (3.) Is it a fact that the road superintendent has no stock of metal on hand, and that he has borrowed small quantities from the borough council of Willoughby? (4.) Is the department responsible for damages should an accident occur upon the road through its present condition; and, if so, will he cause the proper officer to at once report to him on the matter with a view to immediate improvement?

Mr. BRUCE SMITH answered,—(1.) The supervising engineer reports that the road is in bad order, but not dangerous. (2.) No; excepting a short length in Walker-street, which is being strengthened. (3.) There is none actually in stock, but a supply has been ordered, and used as delivered. I am not aware that any metal has been borrowed, but inquiries are being made respecting the matter. (4.) This is a question of law, and can only be settled on the merits of each case. A full report is being obtained on the state of this road, and any action necessary will be taken.

#### POSTAL AND TELEGRAPHIC RATES.

Mr. McCOURT (for Mr. KIDD) asked the COLONIAL SECRETARY,—Is it the intention of the Government to introduce bills this session (1) to reduce the postage rates on letters; (2) to reduce the rates charged on telegrams?

Sir HENRY PARKES answered,—I have already, in reply to another question, stated that the policy of reducing the postage on letters is under the consideration of the Government. I will have the other question considered.

[Mr. E. M. Clark.

#### TUBULAR RAILWAY CARS.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked the COLONIAL TREASURER,—(1.) Who are the contractors for the new tubular cars required by the Railway Department? (2.) Is it a fact that the ironwork for these cars is being imported, and that much of it is cast-iron of inferior character, instead of being wrought-iron? (3.) Is it a fact that the pull-rods of these cars are square, instead of being rounded at the ends? (4.) Are some of the wheels of these cars of cast-iron; if so, are cast-iron wheels likely to stand a continuous strain of 30 tons? (5.) Is it a fact that some of these cast-iron wheels may now be seen at Hudson's works in a broken state, after having been tested with a hammer? (6.) Is it a fact that this imported ironwork has to be altered; and, if so, is it an economical proceeding for the Government to import work which has to be altered in the colony? (7.) Was any inspection of this ironwork made when it arrived in New South Wales; and, if so, by whom was the inspection made?

Mr. BRUCE SMITH answered,—(1.) Messrs. Hudson Brothers are the contractors, they having secured the right to import or manufacture tubular waggons in the colony. (2.) It is a fact that the ironwork is being imported, but it is not cast-iron of inferior character. The materials referred to are of good quality, made of malleable cast-iron, which is a feature in the patent. (3.) This question is not understood. (4.) The wheels are chilled cast-iron, and the eight wheels under each vehicle will carry 30 tons. (5.) One wheel may be seen at Hudson's works in a broken state. It was broken purposely by the inspector, for testing purposes. (6.) Some of the imported ironwork had to be altered to suit our ordinary side-buffers and brake-gear. The contractors imported as designed for the use of railways in America, knowing that the alteration would have to be made in the colony. As a rule, it cannot be considered an economical proceeding to import work which has to be altered in the colony, and it would not be done if it could be avoided. (7.) The ironwork is inspected at the contractor's works during the work of erection, in the ordinary manner, by the properly authorised rolling stock inspectors.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Who is he?

Mr. BRUCE SMITH: If the hon. member will give notice of his question for tomorrow, I will inform him.

**SUBURBAN RAILWAY-STATIONS:  
AMERICAN LOCOMOTIVES.**

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked the COLONIAL TREASURER,—(1.) Are the suburban railway-stations being altered to accommodate the imported American engines; if not, what is the meaning of the extensive alterations now being made at certain suburban railway-stations? (2.) Is it a fact that the boys employed at Eveleigh railway workshops were recently engaged picking out the putty from holes in the engines imported from America? (3.) Is it a fact that one of these engines had to be left at the Newcastle railway workshop after the first trip?

Mr. BRUCE SMITH answered,—(1.) The platforms at several suburban stations were slightly modified, at a cost not exceeding £50, in consequence of their not being to gauge. The extensive alterations which are going on are the works in connection with the duplication of the line. (2.) No instructions were given to the boys employed in the Eveleigh railway shops to pick out putty from the holes in the engines imported from America. (3.) It is a fact that one of the new engines which was cut for a trial trip before being reported as fit for traffic, had to undergo a slight repair at Newcastle. One of the motion-pins seized, for want of oil and proper attention, and had to be removed and replaced with a new one, at a cost of £3 12s. 9d.

**AMERICAN ENGINES AND IRONWORK.**

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked the COLONIAL SECRETARY,—In view of the statements which have been made with regard to the engines recently imported from America, and the ironwork imported for the new tubular cars, will the Government consent to the immediate appointment of a select committee of this House to inquire into these statements?

Sir HENRY PARKES answered,—This is a matter which will require to be submitted to the Cabinet, and I must ask the hon. member to give fresh notice for, say, Thursday.

**HARES: MOLONG.**

Dr. ROSS asked the SECRETARY FOR MINES AND AGRICULTURE,—(1.) Is he aware that hares are becoming a great pest and nuisance to farmers in the Molong district, and will he see that some effectual steps are taken to have this increasing evil suppressed, in order to save the farming industry from ruin and destruction? (2.) Has he lately received any petitions from farmers in the Molong district complaining of the hare pest or nuisance; if so, will he state for the general information of the public what steps (if any) are being taken for the suppression of this increasing evil?

Mr. S. SMITH answered,—(1.) Yes; but any action taken towards their destruction rests with the local board. (2.) Yes; and these petitions have been referred to the Molong Pastures and Stock Protection Board, with a view to an increased rate of bonus being offered, or such other steps being taken as the board may deem necessary. The necessity for taking active steps to stay the rapid increase of hares has for some time been urged upon all the boards in the colony. I may add that the department is assisting in the establishment of an export trade in frozen hares, of which there is a fair prospect, and which would, of course, materially aid in keeping the pest within bounds.

**BOMBALA BRIDGE.**

Mr. DAWSON asked the SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS,—When will tenders be called for the erection of a bridge over Bombala River, at Cunningham's Point?

Mr. BRUCE SMITH answered,—In about a fortnight.

**ADAMINABY PARK ROAD.**

Mr. DAWSON asked the SECRETARY FOR LANDS,—Has he any objection to lay upon the table of this House all papers in connection with closing of road through Adaminaby Park?

Mr. BRUNKER answered,—No, if moved for in the usual manner.

**ELECTION DEPOSITS.**

Mr. WALL (for Mr. H. MCKINNON) asked the COLONIAL SECRETARY,—Have any defeated candidates who forfeited the

£40 deposit had the amount refunded; if so, who were they, and upon what grounds was the refund in each case made?

Sir HENRY PARKES answered,—This question does not specify the time of the supposed forfeitures. As far as I know, there has been no refund arising out of late elections. If any definite information is required as to former occasions I shall be glad to lay a return upon the table giving it.

#### TWIN-SCREW HOPPER DREDGE.

Mr. HOYLE asked the SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS,—(1.) Has the Government ordered a twin-screw hopper dredge from Messrs. W. Simmons & Co., of Renfrew, Scotland? (2.) If so, were any tenders invited for its construction (a) in the colony; (b) in England or other places? (3.) If no tenders were called for, what was the reason why tenders were not asked for in the usual way? (4.) Were colonial manufacturers afforded an opportunity to tender for this work; and, if not, for what reason? (5.) What is the contract price of the dredge delivered in Sydney?

Mr. BRUCE SMITH answered,—(1.) Yes. (2 to 5.) A special type of dredge was required for deepening bars exposed to the sea waves and ocean swell. A novel type of machine, suited for this kind of work, was successfully tried on the Mersey last year, and, recognising the great value of such a dredge for improving the exposed bars of the northern rivers, the Engineer-in-Chief for Harbours and Rivers recommended that on this occasion the custom of the department should be departed from, and one of these special type of dredges imported by way of experiment, as they could then serve as a sample for any future machines of the kind. I approved of the recommendation of the engineer-in-chief, and the dredge was ordered through the Agent-General, after correspondence with Sir John Coode. The cost of the dredge will be about £19,500, the cost of sailing her out, insurance, &c., about £1,500, or a total of £21,000.

#### SYDNEY WATER SUPPLY: ENGINES AND PUMPS.

Mr. HOYLE asked the SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS,—(1.) Is the Water and Sewerage Board calling for drawings and

[*Mr. Wall.*

specifications for engines and pumps for the Sydney water supply? (2.) Are they calling for such exclusively in England? (3.) Are there no men in the colony capable of designing or specifying for such pumps and engines? (4.) Is the board also calling for tenders for the construction of the same in England, or is it proposed to do so? (5.) Will he make such arrangements as will permit engineers and manufacturers in New South Wales having an opportunity to carry out the proposed works?

Mr. BRUCE SMITH answered,—I am informed that the recommendation made and adopted by the board was that a specification should be prepared, and competition for designs invited in England, as well as in the colony, but the recommendation of the board has not yet reached the Department of Public Works.

#### WIFE DESERTION.

Mr. MELVILLE (for Mr. T. WALKER) asked the MINISTER OF JUSTICE,—(1.) Will he take any steps to ascertain how many of the prisoners now in gaol for wife desertion are actually unable to obey the order of the magistrate for maintenance? (2.) Will he consider some means of employing such prisoners at union wages to enable them to support their wives whilst incarcerated?

Mr. GOULD answered,—(1.) I am unable to see how I can interfere in the manner desired in such cases. The law provides that the justices must be satisfied that the husband is able to maintain his wife, or contribute to her maintenance, before making an order of court directing him to pay such maintenance. If the husband feel aggrieved at the decision he may appeal to the court of quarter sessions to have such order quashed or varied, or he may apply to the bench to have the order varied. (2.) It would be impracticable to employ such persons in the manner suggested. Under the regulations I am informed that a prisoner serving a sentence of imprisonment only cannot be employed at other than light labour; but if he maintains himself he cannot be compelled to work. His civil rights while in gaol are suspended. If employed, as suggested, at wages, the question might be raised as to the competition of prison with

free labour, which has frequently been under discussion in this House, and the undesirableness of which has been commented upon.

#### FORESTRY BILL.

Mr. MELVILLE (for Mr. T. WALKER) asked the COLONIAL SECRETARY,—When will the Government introduce the bill to deal with the question of forestry in New South Wales?

Sir HENRY PARKES answered,—The Government will introduce a bill to effect this purpose as soon as other business will admit; but we cannot introduce it to interfere with the course of other business.

#### THOMAS SUFFIELD.

Mr. KELLY asked the MINISTER OF JUSTICE,—(1.) Has his attention been officially called to the case of Thomas Suffield, sentenced by Judge Windeyer at the circuit court, Maitland, in April last, to ten years' penal servitude for alleged attempt to commit a rape? (2.) Is it a fact that the evidence upon which Suffield was convicted was of a most contradictory character? (3.) Is it a fact that complaint was made of the manner in which the preliminary inquiry before the police magistrate at Lambton was conducted towards Suffield? (4.) Is it a fact that respectable and competent witnesses clearly established an alibi in Suffield's favour, plainly proving that he could not have been near the scene of the alleged outrage, either at or about the time the outrage is said to have occurred? (5.) Will the Minister cause a judicial commission of inquiry to be instituted into the whole facts of the case, with a view to Suffield's prompt release, should he be found to be innocent of the charge against him?

Mr. GOULD answered,—(1.) No official or other representations have been made to me in reference to this case. (2.) It is not within my province as Minister of Justice to offer any opinion on the nature of the evidence offered at a criminal trial. The evidence in this case was submitted to the jury for their consideration, whose duty it was to determine the value of the same. (3.) No. (4.) The whole of the witnesses for the defence in support of an alibi were, it is presumed, examined at the trial, and the jury, whose duty it was to value that evidence, found the prisoner

guilty of the charge preferred against him. (5.) If any doubt or question existed as to Suffield's guilt, or any mitigating circumstances in the case, or any portion of the evidence therein, is submitted on the petition of the prisoner, or some person on his behalf, addressed to his Excellency the Governor, duly supported by declaration or other evidence, representing such doubt or question, I will carefully consider whether the evidence so submitted is sufficient to justify me in recommending that an inquiry be held in accordance with the provisions of the 383rd section of the Criminal Law Amendment Act.

#### GLEBE ISLAND—PYRMONT BRIDGE.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked the SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS,—(1.) What are the dimensions of the proposed new bridge connecting Glebe Island with Pyrmont, and will provision be made to enable steamers to pass under? (2.) When will tenders be invited for same; and does he intend to invite tenders only in the colonies?

Mr. BRUCE SMITH answered,—(1.) The dimensions of the bridge are not yet determined, as it may have to be designed to carry a railway as well as wheel traffic. An opening span will be provided to pass vessels through. (2.) When all requisite conditions are decided upon, competition will be invited for designs.

#### RESERVES, COUNTY MACQUARIE.

Mr. CHANTER (for Mr. H. MCKINNON) asked the SECRETARY FOR LANDS,—(1.) Have portions of reserves Nos. 73 and 152, parish of Stewart, county Macquarie, been surveyed and reported on some months ago, with a view to their being revoked and opened for settlement? (2.) Is it his intention to so revoke and open these portions at an early date; if so, when?

Mr. BRUNKER answered,—No report has as yet been received from the district surveyor, who will be called upon to expedite the matter.

#### TEST OF TARGETS.

Mr. ALLEN (for Mr. NOBES) asked the COLONIAL SECRETARY,—(1.) Did the commanding engineer on Saturday, 1st instant, conduct a test of targets on the cadet section of the Randwick Rifle Range? (2.)

If so, how many of the targets entered in the authorised competition were tested? (3.) Were members of the board on targets, and other persons interested, notified that such test would be made? (4.) If only one target was tested, was that one entered in the name of an employee of the Military Works Department; and did it comply with all the conditions laid down by the board on targets, in a circular dated 21st March, 1891? (5.) Is Colonel De Wolski, the commanding engineer, interested in any targets entered in such condition, or was he ever in any way so interested? (6.) When is it the intention of the authorities to decide upon the pattern of targets for use (a) on the general range, (b) on the cadet range?

Sir HENRY PARKES answered,—The following information has been supplied by the Major-General Commanding the Military Forces:—

(1.) Yes. (2.) The two targets tested are stated by the commanding engineer to be improvements on targets entered for competition. (3.) No. (4.) The commanding engineer reports that the targets tested were designed by the officer-in-charge of the range, and complied with all the conditions. (5.) Yes, but not commercially. (6.) The general officer commanding will be prepared to give a decision on receipt from the commanding engineer of the report of the board and his remarks.

#### PROBATE ACT.

Mr. DANAHEY asked the MINISTER OF JUSTICE,—(1.) Under the present Probate Act, is it necessary for executors and trustees to file their accounts annually, especially in cases where the receipts and disbursements are large, and continue from year to year? (2.) If so, does the Department of Justice see that the act, or the provision of the act, is being so carried out? (3.) Is there any provision in the present Probate Act for the remuneration of trustees and executors out of estates? (4.) If so, is the act, or provision of the act, being so administered as to remunerate trustees and executors holding such onerous and responsible positions?

Mr. GOULD answered,—(1.) It is necessary by the rules promulgated, under the provisions of the Probate Act, that executors and administrators should file their accounts within twelve months from the date of grant of probate or administration, but it is not necessary that trustees should file their accounts in the

[*Mr. Allen.*

Probate Office, as they are only amenable to a court of equity. (2.) It is the duty of the Registrar of Probates under the act to call upon executors and administrators in default to file their accounts; but no case has arisen where that officer would be called upon to perform that duty. (3.) The 57th section of the Probate Act provides that "it shall be lawful for the court to allow to any executor, administrator, or trustee such commission for his pains and trouble as shall be just and reasonable," provided that accounts are filed within the time limited by the rules or any order of the court. (4.) Answered by paragraph 3.

#### SUMMER HILL RAILWAY-STATION.

Mr. DANAHEY asked the COLONIAL TREASURER,—(1.) Have the railway commissioners accepted a tender for the erection of station buildings at Summer Hill? (2.) What is the amount of said tender? (3.) Is it correct that the successful tenderer has been asked to submit an amended tender for the erection of the buildings of wood? (4.) Is it the intention of the commissioners to erect wood or brick buildings?

Mr. BRUCE SMITH answered,—(1.) Yes. (2.) £8,204 10s. 1d. (3.) Yes, for a portion of the structure. (4.) A part will be of brick and a part of wood.

#### AUSTRALIAN AGRICULTURAL COMPANY.

Mr. WILLIAMS asked the SECRETARY FOR LANDS,—(1.) Is there any agreement in existence between the Australian Agricultural Company and the Government of New South Wales under which said company was granted 1,029,451 acres 1 rood 32 perches for agricultural purposes? (2.) If so, what were the conditions specified in that agreement? (3.) Have those conditions been complied with?

Mr. BRUNKER answered,—No; the lands were granted in pursuance of acts of the Imperial Parliament, passed in 1824 and 1829. A copy of the deed of grant will be laid upon the table if moved for in the usual manner.

#### LOANS: SECURITIES.

Mr. DIBBS asked the COLONIAL TREASURER,—In what form and what security was deposited with the London banks for the loans made to the colony, and referred

to in the paper laid upon the table of this House on Thursday last, 13th August?

Mr. BRUCE SMITH answered,—There is no record in the Treasury of any security having been deposited with the London banks in connection with any of the advances made to the colony. I find, in one of the Agent-General's communications of June, mention of a probable deposit of inscribed stock, with one bank, in this month (August), as security for advance of £200,000 made in June; but, even regarding that, there is no definite record that it has been actually deposited.

Mr. DIBBS asked the COLONIAL TREASURER,—Has he ascertained since his appointment to the Treasury if any loan has been placed upon the London market; and if such loan has been sold, or any part of it, at 97, as stated in the *Herald* paper of Thursday last?

Mr. BRUCE SMITH answered,—No loan whatever has been placed upon the London market since July, 1889.

#### CONTRACTORS LIEN BILL (No. 2).

*Resolved* (on motion by Mr. NEILD):

That this House will, on Tuesday, 22nd September, resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the expediency of bringing in a bill to give contractors and others employed in performing labour and furnishing materials for improving land, by erecting, altering, or repairing houses, buildings, or other improvements thereon, protection against loss by reason of such improvements being effected.

#### PASTORAL HOLDINGS: FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

*Ordered* (on motion by Mr. MELVILLE, for Mr. T. WALKER):

That there be laid upon the table of this House,—

(1.) A scheduled return showing the names of all incorporated or chartered banks and other financial institutions registered under the Companies Acts holding leases direct from the Crown, and paying rents thereto for pastoral holdings in New South Wales, with the name of each holding so held respectively.

(2.) A scheduled return giving the name of every other pastoral holding in New South Wales held by any of the abovementioned financial institutions by way of a registered deed of mortgage, other than as direct holdings from the Crown.

#### COMMITTEE OF ELECTIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS.

THE HASTINGS AND MANNING ELECTION.

Mr. F. B. SUTTON presented the report of the Committee of Elections and

Qualifications upon the petition against the return of Mr. H. McKinnon as a member for The Hastings and Manning.

Report read by the clerk as follows:—

The Committee of Elections and Qualifications, duly appointed on the 16th July, 1891, to whom was referred, on the 29th July, 1891, a petition from Walter Hussey Vivian, alleging "that at the last general election of members to serve in the Legislative Assembly of this colony petitioner was one of the candidates duly nominated for the electoral district of The Hastings and Manning, when a poll was demanded; that the petitioner was duly qualified to be elected; that the returning officer certified to the return of James Henry Young and Hugh McKinnon as duly elected; that at several of the polling-places in the electorate votes were declared informal which were not informal, and which should have been counted in favour of petitioner and against the said Hugh McKinnon; and praying that the petition may be dealt with according to law, and that the return of the said Hugh McKinnon as a member of the said Legislative Assembly for the said electoral district may be declared null and void for the reason aforesaid; that a scrutiny of all ballot-papers should be made by the Committee of Elections and Qualifications; that for the reason aforesaid it may be declared that the said Hugh McKinnon was not lawfully elected, and is not such member of the said Legislative Assembly for the said electoral district; that it may be declared and determined that petitioner was duly elected at the said election to serve and be a member of the said Legislative Assembly for the said electoral district of The Hastings and Manning, and is entitled to take his seat accordingly in the said Assembly; and that such further or other order and determination may be made in the premises as may be just," have determined and do hereby declare:

1. That Hugh McKinnon, Esquire, one of the sitting members, has been duly elected as a member for the electoral district of The Hastings and Manning.

2. That the petition of Walter Hussey Vivian, Esquire, is frivolous and vexatious.

3. That the sum of £15 be awarded to the sitting member, towards his costs and expenses, such amount to be paid by the petitioner to the sitting member.

4. That the further sum of £10 be paid by the petitioner to the Clerk of the Assembly, as a penalty, in accordance with the provisions of the Electoral Act.

F. B. SUTTON,

No. 1 Committee Room, Chairman.  
Sydney, 18 August, 1891.

#### CENTENNIAL PARK: TOLL-BAR.

Mr. ALLEN: I desire to bring under the notice of the Secretary for Public Works a hardship which some persons are being subjected to. Carriages are allowed to go through the Centennial Park without paying a cent, but a poor man with

a van cannot go through the park, but must take the main road, and pay the toll. It is a great injustice to labouring men and others to be required to pay the toll while other persons are allowed to drive through the park. I would ask the Minister to take the question in hand, and see that justice is meted out fairly.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH: This matter is connected with the Randwick Toll-bar, and the hon. member knows it is a mere accident, owing to the continued existence of that toll-bar, that the rich man's carriage happens to be allowed in the park and the poor man's cart has to go round by the main road. He knows, as I explained to him, that the toll-bar cannot be abolished until some means is found for liquidating the very large advance which was made on the strength of the tolls collected there. I have already informed the hon. member several times that it will require an act of parliament to substitute some new method of raising this money in order to pay those who lent it on the strength of the tolls. That measure will, of course, take some time to prepare and introduce. I can only tell the hon. member that this great hardship to the poor man, and this great privilege to the rich man, will be disposed of as soon as the state of public business will permit.

Mr. CRICK: Why not make the carriages go through the toll?

Mr. BRUCE SMITH: They will not go through the toll; the carts cannot go through the park.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

##### NEW MINISTERS.

Sir HENRY PARKES: I have to inform the House that on Friday the office of Colonial Treasurer was offered to my hon. colleague, Mr. Bruce Smith, and accepted by him. I also have to inform the House that on the same morning the office of Secretary for Public Works was offered to Mr. James Henry Young, a member of this House, and accepted by him, and that at an executive council held on the afternoon of the same day, both these hon. gentlemen were sworn in on taking possession of their respective offices.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH: I wish to make an explanation to the House. Now that the Premier has announced to the House that I have accepted the very important

post of Colonial Treasurer, I think it may not be out of place for me to say one or two words with regard to my acceptance of that office. It would appear from the newspapers that I had rather hastily accepted the position, because the word immediately was used, I noticed, in both the morning newspapers. I have always considered that if a man wishes to go through life, especially political life, with dignity and self-respect, he should never appear to be too hasty to occupy any particular position, and lest it should be thought that I had snapped at the office immediately it was offered to me, I desire to say that as far as the opinion of my colleagues was concerned, it seemed from quite a fortnight before to be taken as a matter of course that when the new position was offered to me I should take it, otherwise I should certainly at least have assumed a little hesitation, and waited until Monday, before I accepted it. I should be sorry it should be thought that I had undertaken so great a responsibility, and accepted so great an office without due consideration, and to confirm the fact that I had plenty of time to consider the offer when it was made to me—and I presume the Premier will not object to my saying it—I observed to him it seemed to me inevitable that I should accept it, and therefore I said, to remove any further doubt I accept the position at once. I can only say that I regard very seriously the great responsibility which the acceptance of the office involves. I take it with no undue sense of the great amount of work, and the great responsibility which its acceptance involves, and I trust that in my endeavour to follow in the footsteps of so able a man as my hon. friend, Mr. McMillan, the House will extend to me that consideration which in all positions is extended to a new man, that is, to make allowance for the novelty of the position, and for the trying circumstances under which so important an office is wielded by a new hand.

Mr. McMILLAN: Perhaps, sir, under the circumstances, I may crave the indulgence of the House to make one or two personal remarks as supplementary to those which I made on Thursday evening.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member is going to make an address there is no question before the House; he can only make a personal explanation.

[*Mr. Allen.*]

Mr. McMILLAN: I do not wish to make an address. I wish to make a personal explanation with regard to one or two things said the other night. I do not mean to refer to the imputations for one moment with regard to my resignation other than the reasons which I placed before the House. I gave my word of honor with regard to those reasons, and any one who cares to dispute that word will certainly not be one for whose consideration I should care very much. One remark was made to which I think it is only fair to myself that I should refer. It was said by one hon. member that I did not make sufficient provision for the public service to extend over a reasonable period after my resignation. Now, the vote which brought about the dissolution of the late Parliament was taken on the 28th May, and on the 1st June I arranged for every possible provision, not merely to meet the public service during the elections, but to extend over a considerable period after my resignation, which I knew would take place whether the Government was defeated or not. I therefore say that this imputation has no right to rest upon me. For, at the present time, arrangements are made arising out of my negotiations which are sufficient to carry on every public work at present existing in this country beyond any reasonable period for negotiations in London. I may be allowed also to say that a great deal of the responsibility arising out of my action has been relieved by the knowledge that I am succeeded by one of the ablest men in this country. As criticism has been exercised with regard to my statements previously, although I sat side by side with my hon. friend as a member of the present Government, although I now sit behind the Government, and am as loyal to them as if I were sitting on the Treasury benches, I ask my hon. friend if, in the review of the past or in the necessary criticisms in his future statements, he finds anything not consonant with his own views, to give me no quarter.

Mr. DIBBS: I do not know whether I shall be in order in saying a word or two with regard to the peculiar statements made by the last two speakers, because the course taken by the Colonial Treasurer is to a certain extent a novelty in our practice. I think the House deserved some explanation, and I presume it has

been offered by the Colonial Treasurer as a sort of atonement to the House for the neglect of the Government in keeping the office vacant when it ought to have been filled. The hon. member has asked the House to bear with him as a new member.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH: I did not say as a new member!

Mr. DIBBS: I only wished to compliment the hon. member on his modesty, and to say there is no doubt that both sides of the House will give him every possible consideration. All we ask on this side is that every consideration shall be paid to us with regard to any questions which we may put about Treasury matters, and that there shall be no attempt, when questions are asked from any side of the House, to throw dust in the eyes of hon. members. I would like to ask a question of the Colonial Secretary, who is no longer Acting Colonial Treasurer, and I am induced to ask the question because hon. members have heard two questions put by me to-day concerning some statements which came out in last Thursday's debate. What I wished to ascertain was, first, whether any securities of the colony have been deposited in any bank in London. The House will remember that when I put the question very categorically to the Colonial Treasurer I got the most extraordinary answer which ever came from a minister's lips. The Premier, in answer to a question calling his attention to a telegram which appeared in the daily newspapers, said:

As that telegram reads, there is no substantial foundation for the statement. But there is this foundation, that securities were lodged in London some considerable time ago—I think in the hands of the Bank of England—to be sold to private persons who might desire to invest in colonial stocks.

That statement was made by the head of the Government, acting as Colonial Treasurer. If hon. members read the cable news which comes to us every day they will find that many brokers in London object to this hole-and-corner and private manner of dealing with our securities. Following up that statement of the Premier, I placed a question on to-day's business-paper as follows:—

In what form, and what security was deposited with the London banks for the loans made to the colony, and referred to in the paper laid upon the table of this House on Thursday last, 13th August?

The House will be very much surprised at the answer which has been given by the Colonial Treasurer who directly and flatly contradicts the statement made by the Premier. Great importance attaches to this matter, as showing that the Premier either knows nothing about the financial business of the country, or chooses to come to the House and make statements which are greatly at variance with the truth. The answer given was :

There is no record in the Treasury of any security having been deposited with the London banks —

Mr. HAYNES : I rise to order. The leader of the Opposition is, in my opinion, taking a course which even a new member would scarcely take. The hon. member is dealing with certain answers made by the Premier. I do not object to the leader of the Opposition making a statement, and upon that statement asking a question of the Colonial Treasurer ; but the House will see, and I think you, Mr. Speaker, will rule, that the hon. member is going altogether outside what he proposed to do ; he is opening up what is practically a debate.

Mr. SPEAKER : The hon. member is not opening up a debate, because I will not allow any other hon. member to follow him. Great latitude is allowed the leader of the Opposition on all occasions when ministers make statements to the House. The hon. member is not exceeding that.

Mr. DIBBS : My only desire is to have the truth placed before the House. The hon. member for Mudjee ought to be thankful that inquiry is made from this side of the Chamber for the purpose of enlightening the darkness under which we rest in regard to our finances. The answer I obtained is as follows :—

There is no record in the Treasury of any security having been deposited with the London banks —

I ask how does this tally with the statement made by the Premier last week to the effect that securities had been lodged with the London banks ? I maintain that this matter is a most important one, because if the credit of the colony is being pledged by instalments, there will be great difficulty in the future in obtaining loans. It is this hole-and-corner manner of dealing with loans which induces me to ask a

[*Mr. Dibbs.*

still more searching question, which I shall put presently. The Colonial Treasurer went on to say :

There is no record in the Treasury of any security having been deposited with the London banks in connection with any of the advances made to the colony. I find, in one of the Agent-General's communications of June, mention of a probable deposit of inscribed stock, with one bank, in this month (August), as security for advance of £200,000 made in June ; but, even regarding that, there is no definite record that it has been actually deposited.

Is the House going to allow that state of things to exist ? According to the newspapers, the Colonial Treasurer was to have had an interview with the ex-Colonial Treasurer to-day, in order that he might put himself in possession of all the information there was to be obtained from him, and we have a right, upon whichever side of the House we may sit, to whatever information can be given. Does it come to this : that the Treasury records show no proof whatever as to whether our securities are or are not deposited with London banks ? Something is stated in the answer which I have read of a probable deposit of inscribed stock. Surely the Colonial Treasurer, the ex-Colonial Treasurer, or the Premier, will be able to tell us whether any authority has gone from the Government authorising the deposit of any of our stock for financial purposes. That is what I want to get at ; and I put this question to the Colonial Treasurer and to the ex-Colonial Treasurer : Where is the authority which has been forwarded from this colony to the Agent-General or any other person to deposit any of our stock with the London banks ? The answer I have obtained to-day from the real, live Colonial Treasurer is that there is no record in the Treasury of any deposit of our securities, and I naturally ask now, knowing the importance of the Inscribed Stock Act, in what form has the deposit been made ? Surely the Agent-General has no power to deposit our stock in London except on the authority of the Government. Any order which is forwarded must be an order from the Colonial Treasurer, backed by an executive warrant, and signed by the Governor. We have a right to know whether that has been done. That question I put to the Government as the first question. I now put another question.

I want the Premier to say whether any authority has ever left this colony authorising the Agent-General or any other person to deposit inscribed stock or any other form of security with the London banks? That is also a matter in regard to which the public have a right to receive information. Day after day we see statements in the paper bearing upon this matter, and we all know, of course, that there is no smoke without fire. I wish to know whether the head of the Government, directly or indirectly, has been communicated with by any person in London with regard to any private sale of any portion of our inscribed stock or Treasury bills? The sooner an answer is given by the Premier in the clearest possible terms, the sooner ought the information to be telegraphed to London, so that the people there may know whether it is true or not that there has been any tampering, private or otherwise, in the matter of borrowing by this colony in London. These are questions which the Opposition have a right to ask. My object in asking them is to get at the truth, and to save the necessity of moving the adjournment of the House. The Premier stated last week that there was no substantial ground for the telegram appearing in the public newspapers, and yet he gave us a ground by stating that securities had been lodged in a London bank some time ago to be sold. What I desire is that the Premier will be emphatic in his denial, if facts will so permit him, in order that a cablegram may be sent to England, stating that he had officially denied that any person had a right to deal with our stock, excepting in the most open and public manner. In answer to an interruption, in answering the question put to him last week, the Premier said :

There was simply a number of securities lodged, I believe, in the hands of the Bank of England, to be sold to any one wishing to invest in colonial securities.

This is pretty good evidence that there has been some attempt to lodge our securities, and yet we have the denial from the Colonial Treasurer that there has been any deposit made—only some memorandum from the Agent-General of a probable deposit. I wish to know in what form that probable deposit has been made, especially as the Colonial Treasurer himself cannot float

a loan, nor give authority for the issue of inscribed stock, excepting with executive sanction?

Sir HENRY PARKES : I am very glad that the hon. member has asked these questions of me. Before I answer them I may state that I do not think he has represented very ingenuously what I stated the other evening. I never said that securities had been lodged or pledged. I said that securities had been placed to be sold as opportunity offered, that is, if persons desired to invest in our securities.

Mr. DIBBS : I wish the hon. member would read *Hansard*!

Sir HENRY PARKES : I know what I said.

Mr. DIBBS : The hon. member does not know what he said!

Sir HENRY PARKES : However, the questions are more important. I had called the attention of the Under-Secretary for the Treasury to a telegram I saw in the papers, and the fact that I was seeking information led me to state what I did. What I stated, and what I desired to convey, was not that any securities of ours had been pledged or lodged as securities; but that there were securities which might be sold at the price fixed upon them by persons offering advances.

Mr. McMILLAN : It was in connection with the conversion of stock!

Sir HENRY PARKES : I make these observations to explain what I myself understood, and what I desired to convey to the House on this point. I now come to these important questions. I am asked to answer them emphatically, and emphatically I answer them. I presume the questions refer to the period during which I attended to the business of the Treasury.

Mr. DIBBS : I asked the questions with regard to what took place both before and during the time the Premier was Acting Colonial Treasurer!

Sir HENRY PARKES : Well, I must answer them in the first place as to my own personal knowledge, and leave the Colonial Treasurer who is now in office to answer with respect to other periods. From first to last, during about twenty or eighteen days that I attended to the business of the Treasury, no communication was made by me, except to inquire of the proper officer, the Agent-General, who was instructed to seek advice, as to the

probabilities of a loan. In one case where a large sum of money was offered to the Government of this country, on the deposit of securities, as I thought such a condition ought not to be made, I declined to accept the offer; so that, instead of seeking in an improper way to borrow money, I actually declined to accept an offer that was made by a large bank, as they stipulated for the deposit of securities.

Mr. DIBBS: A bank in London?

Sir HENRY PARKES: Yes; the London Joint Stock Bank. Beyond that another large sum was offered, through the Sydney manager, by the Union Bank of Australia, on the simple undertaking of the Government to repay the loan at a given date, and that I accepted. That is the extent of my communication with London during that period. I hope I am clearly understood.

Mr. DIBBS: Will the hon. member say what was the large sum?

Sir HENRY PARKES: £100,000.

Mr. DIBBS: That is a very small sum!

Sir HENRY PARKES: I do not know that that has much to do with it. I wish, and I think I ought to be permitted, to state very distinctly the full extent of any transactions with which I had anything whatever to do. In the first place, it was the inquiry, as I had a right to inquire, seeking to obtain certain information as to the expediency of floating a loan on the London market. In the second place, it was to decline an offer of money from an English bank, because I thought the conditions were not in accord with what this colony, considering its wealth and influential position, had a right to expect. In the third place, it was to accept a sum when it was offered to us through a bank in Sydney on the undertaking of the Government to repay at a given date. That is the extent of my transactions. Now, I come to the other question. No communication whatever has been made to this Government by any person whatever in England, or any other part of the world, with regard to a loan being negotiated either in England or anywhere else. I do not know that I can more completely answer the question.

Mr. DIBBS: I should like the hon. member to cause that denial to be sent to England at the earliest possible moment by wire. Will he promise to do that?

[*Sir Henry Parkes.*]

Sir HENRY PARKES: Certainly; I have not the least objection in the world.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH: I think I can account for the apparent contradiction which the hon. member for The Murrumbidgee thought to exist between the answer given by the Premier a few nights ago and the answer I gave to-night. The answer of the Premier was given after the hon. member for The Murrumbidgee had elicited from him a certain statement as to advances made in London, and he followed up his perusal of that statement by asking what securities had been given in London, apparently with the desire to know what securities had been given for those advances. The Premier gave an answer to that question, and the hon. member for The Murrumbidgee has asked me to-day a somewhat similar question, to which I have replied that up to the present no securities for advances have been given at all.

Mr. DIBBS: That does not tally with the Premier's statement!

Mr. BRUCE SMITH: What the Premier was alluding to was this: The hon. member knows that in January something like £1,500,000 of the 5 per cent. stock of this colony has to be converted, and debentures for 3½ per cent. stock exchanged for it. Those debentures have been lodged with the bank, to be taken up by the 5 per cent. debenture holders.

Mr. DIBBS: Have debentures been sent from the colony, or is it not inscribed stock?

Mr. BRUCE SMITH: Inscribed stock is really debentures.

Mr. DIBBS: No!

Mr. BRUCE SMITH: That inscribed stock at 3½ per cent. was lodged in anticipation of its being taken up by the 5 per cent. debenture holders, and it is that to which the Premier alluded the other night. It is quite distinct from the hon. member's question as to whether security had been lodged by this Government on account of advances lately made by English banks.

Mr. GARVAN: The ex-Colonial Treasurer has made a statement reflecting upon a speech which I made the other evening. He complained that a statement was made that he left the Treasury without making any provision for carrying on public-works. That complaint was made directly

with reference to a speech made by me, and I have no doubt the hon. gentleman will not deny that. I did make that statement, and I made it with the fullest authority and justification for making it, and I will quote to the House —

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. gentleman is in order in addressing the House at all. The hon. member for East Sydney, Mr. McMillan, made a personal explanation. He asked the indulgence of the House to be allowed to do so, and I did not like to stop the hon. member from making a personal explanation, but I cannot allow the hon. member to debate the matter.

Mr. GARVAN: I do not intend to debate it. I think I am entitled when a statement has been made by an ex-Colonial Treasurer reflecting upon a statement made by me, to set myself right. If the House does not wish to listen to me I am willing to resume my seat. The hon. member for East Sydney made a speech complaining of a statement made by me —

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to point out to the hon. member for Eden that the hon. member for East Sydney did not mention his name.

Mr. GARVAN: You might have noticed, Mr. Speaker, that when I commenced my remarks I appealed to the hon. member if he had referred to me, and he said that he had.

Mr. McMILLAN: On the point of order I rose to make a simple statement to the House which had no right to create debate, and which I would not have made had I thought that it would.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order. There is no point of order before the Chair. I ask the hon. member for Eden to make his explanation as brief as possible.

Mr. GARVAN: The hon. member for East Sydney complained of a statement made by me the other evening in addressing the House. He said that it was inaccurate, because he left the Treasury with ample means to carry on the public works of the colony. I made my statement, however, on full and true authority, summed up in the latest official document emanating from the Treasury under the hon. member's signature, and which I now hold in my hand. This document is my justification for the statement which I made,

and I find by it that, instead of the hon. gentleman leaving ample funds for carrying on the public works —

Sir HENRY PARKES: Surely this is not an explanation!

Mr. GARVAN: I claim that nothing could be more pertinent. This document shows that the hon. gentleman left the Treasury with the consolidated revenue account overdrawn to the extent of £160,000, with the loan account overdrawn by £1,105,000, and indebted to the Bank of New South Wales for £72,192, to the Commercial Banking Company of Sydney for £70,813, to the Australian Joint Stock Bank for £73,486, and to the Commercial Bank of Australia for £97,329.

Mr. McMILLAN: What has that got to do with it?

Mr. GARVAN: I stated that in view of these facts, having borrowed to the extent mentioned from the institutions which I have named, the hon. gentleman left the Treasury without making proper arrangements for carrying on public works, and I had a right to make that statement.

Mr. McMILLAN: The hon. member tried to mislead the House!

Mr. GARVAN: I claim your protection, Mr. Speaker, from such an insult.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear the remark.

Mr. GARVAN: The hon. member for East Sydney stated that I tried to mislead the House. If I did, it was in quoting from an official document published by him, and the insult therefore recoils upon himself.

Mr. SPEAKER: The remark was out of order. The hon. member ought not to make such a charge against any hon. member.

Mr. McMILLAN: In withdrawing the remark, I think the House will allow me to say that although I had made these arrangements, I have also arranged for an advance of £700,000 more to carry on the public business of the country.

AUSTRALIAN BANKING COMPANY  
OF SYDNEY BILL.

Report of select committee presented.

SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS.

*Resolved* (motion by Sir HENRY PARKES):  
That the seat of James Henry Young, Esquire, hath become and is now vacant by reason of his

acceptance of the office of Secretary for Public Works since his election and return to serve in this House as a member for the electoral district of The Hastings and Manning.

#### MEMBERS INAUDIBLE.

Mr. J. D. FITZGERALD: I wish to make a complaint against both the leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Government for not speaking up, in order that members at the back of the House could hear what they had to say. To-night the leader of the Opposition made an indictment against the Government which might perhaps, if any one could hear it, have put them out of office in five minutes; but not one hon. gentleman in this part of the House heard a word that he said.

An HON. MEMBER: Those hon. members do not keep quiet!

Mr. J. D. FITZGERALD: When an hon. gentleman is mumbling something to himself, or speaking confidentially to an hon. member on the other side of the table, what inducement is there for us to keep quiet? This is a serious matter, as important business might be transacted by the House and hon. members in this part of the Chamber might know nothing about it. I trust that these remarks will be sufficient to cause this confidential chatting across the table between hon. gentlemen to be discontinued, and that hon. gentlemen occupying seats at the back of the Chamber will be taken into the confidence of the leaders of the House.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

##### WATER RATES ON MINERAL LAND.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received an intimation from the hon. member for Mudgee, Mr. Wall, that he desires to move the adjournment of the House, "to direct attention to the power conferred by the present Municipalities Act in regard to levying water rates on mineral lands."

*Five hon. members having risen in their places,*

Question proposed.

Mr. WALL: I am very reluctantly compelled to take this course; but it is the only means of bringing the matter under the notice of the Government. I find that in consequence of a decision given some time ago in regard to the Stockton Colliery, where the municipality were deemed to be justified in levying rates on the output from the mine, the justification

has been extended to every municipality in the colony to do the same thing. Only last week a decision was given at Hill End in connection with the claim of Emmet and Hughes, whereby £160 was demanded by the municipality as a rate levied upon the gold taken from the mine, because it happened to be within the municipality. I do not think it was the intention of the framers of the Municipalities Act that rates should be collected from any property that did not, to some extent, benefit by them, and though in a case such as Stockton, where the mine is held by a large company, and the property is considerably improved by the expenditure of rates in the locality, it may be right to levy them, I do not think it was intended that the practice should apply to individual miners who have taken up land which they hold under a very short tenure. Gold is approximately worth £4 an oz., and the levying of a rate of 1s. in the £1 means a charge of 4s. an oz., upon all the gold taken from a mine. Now, a number of mining townships have been incorporated with the consent of the miners, because they did not think themselves affected by the incorporation; but if the Municipalities Act allows rates to be levied upon their property the sooner it is repealed the better, because these miners will feel it their duty to petition to have these incorporations rescinded. I trust the Secretary for Mines and Agriculture will take this matter into consideration. I do not know whether it is legal or not, but the charge has been made and upheld by a decision of the court. The hon. gentleman knows that it is a very difficult thing for miners to appeal to a higher court to reverse the decision, and I think he should inquire into the question to see if it is just that this charge should be made. I am quite sure it is not the intention of the Municipalities Act. It has occurred through the loose wording of a clause referring to "Crown lands not in occupation." It appears that Crown lands once taken possession of become rateable, although they may only be temporarily held under miner's right. I do not think it was intended that Crown lands taken possession of, unless held for the municipal year, should be liable to be rated. The rate is levied in all cases for the municipal year, and though,

in many cases, gold-mining claims are only held for three months, yet if the decision, to which I have referred is sustained persons only in occupation for three months will be compelled to pay a year's rates. I am sure the Minister will see the injustice of levying a rate of 4s. an oz. on gold where the gold-field has been incorporated, and that he will take steps to set aside the decision of the court, or, if this is not possible, that he will, as soon as practicable, bring in a measure to prevent municipalities from levying rates in the way complained of. I am compelled to take the present course of moving the adjournment of the House in order to put the facts of the case before hon. members and the Government. I believe the whole question has arisen on account of the decision given at the court at Newcastle in regard to the Stockton Colliery. That colliery stands in an exceptional position. Some of the land is held under freehold and some under leasehold, and the expenditure of money in the municipality benefits the property because it is held permanently. This, however, does not apply to ordinary gold-mining claims.

Question proposed.

Mr. S. SMITH: I will bring this matter under the notice of my colleagues, and every attention will be given to the statement just made. This is the first time the question has been brought under my notice; in fact, I think the decision was only given last week. I can promise the hon. member that the matter will be brought under the notice of the Cabinet, and an early decision will be arrived at in order to see what can be done.

Question resolved in the negative.

#### DAILY HANSARD.

Mr. A. HUTCHISON rose to move:

That, inasmuch as none of the daily papers publish anything like a correct and truthful report of the debates and proceedings of Parliament, this House is of opinion it is desirable, to enable the people to fully comprehend and understand the great questions affecting their own rights, liberties, and wellbeing, and the future destiny of the colony, that a daily issue of *Hansard* should be published.

He said: I do not wish in any way to come into collision with the press on this important question. I believe we have reason, not only in this colony, but in all the civilised nations of the world, to be

proud of the press. At the same time, it does not meet the requirements and wants of the people of this colony in regard to political questions to the extent that I think is desirable in the interests of the people themselves. In this nineteenth century of forward movement, we have not only primary schools and colleges—technical and otherwise—as well as a system of university education, but we have also every conceivable machinery brought into operation whereby the public mind can be educated and society advanced in the forward march of civilisation. In regard to the political education of the people, I hold that this House is the place where political questions are fully and completely ventilated; and, in order that the people may fully understand and comprehend the vital questions at issue, embracing not only their own individual interests, but also the collective interests of the entire community, it is desirable that some means should be adopted to place a full report of the proceedings of Parliament before the public. The press, no doubt, has done an immense amount of good in this country and all over the world. There was a time when it was a great reformer, and, like all other reformers, its conductors suffered persecution at the pillory and on the rack. Still, while that is the case, everything has not been gained by the position in which the press is placed in this colony at the present time, and particularly with reference to the reports which it gives of the proceedings, not only of this House, but also of the other Chamber—for when I refer to Parliament, I include both chambers. The press is, no doubt, a powerful organ, and ought to voice the wishes of the people from one end of the country to the other, and not only should it do this, but it should also voice the opinions of the people's representatives in this House. It is only by having a full and complete report of the proceedings in Parliament presented to them from day to day, that the people will be able to fully comprehend and take an interest in the vital public questions considered from time to time. Before I entered this House I was always at considerable difficulty to find out the truth as to what was actually said in Parliament. When I took up the *Sydney Morning Herald*, the *Evening News*, and the *Daily Telegraph*, I generally found that they all

followed out the same line of management, and had a certain idea which they wanted to put before the public mind; and, of course, in doing this, a correct report of the proceedings of Parliament was not given. When I turned, on the other hand, to the *Australian Star*, I would find a considerable difference in the reports. Each paper favoured the particular party whose views it supported. Now, I say in all sincerity and truth, that such a state of things is not in the interests of the people. Seeing that we go to such an enormous expense in maintaining schools for primary education as well as technical colleges, and a university for the complete training of our people, to enable them to take high positions in life, it becomes our duty to see that we have an organ established for the purpose of conveying to them a correct report of the proceedings of their representatives in Parliament. Of course, I am aware that newspapers generally are run upon commercial lines; but I do not say that that is a good thing in the interests of the people, particularly with reference to politics. While it is necessary that we should have our people educated in all the various branches necessary to equip them for the battle of life, I maintain that the publication of the debates which take place in Parliament upon the enactment of laws is of still greater importance. The people have a right to know who are those who speak to the point, and legislate in the interests of the people. If it were not for the press, as the great mouthpiece whereby the people are instructed in all the events that transpire, our people in this and in all other countries would be in a state of great ignorance. Therefore, we are in duty bound, notwithstanding that we think the newspapers incorrectly report the proceedings of Parliament, to give them due credit and honor for the great and good work which they perform for the people. When I say in the motion that the newspapers fail to give a truthful report, I do not say that they wilfully misrepresent the speeches made by hon. members; but where a fair and complete report is not given, so that the people can see both sides of the questions debated in this House, the newspapers fail to give a fair and truthful report of the proceedings. The questions which we are called upon to debate affect the liberties and the vital interests of the people of this country.

[*Mr. A. Hutchison.*

As this is a democratic proposal in the interests of the community, every hon. member should give his support to my motion. I would not say one word inside or outside of this Chamber that I would be ashamed to utter anywhere, and I hope that no hon. member is so conservative that he would wish to have our proceedings kept secret. An hon. member has stated in my hearing that he intends to move an amendment that there should be no report whatsoever. I believe in giving publicity to every discussion in the form that will best enable the people to understand it, and render them capable of coming to a just decision. I should like to read a few extracts from a very good address delivered by the late General Garfield, President of the United States, before the Ohio Editorial Association, in July, 1878. After pointing to the long and fierce struggle, and the immense army of martyrs who suffered imprisonment for the free expression and publication of their opinions, he went on to say:

Cromwell had a glimpse of the better view when he ordered the release of Harrington's "Oceana," which had been seized as libellous. He said, "Let him take his book. If my government is made to stand, it has nothing to fear from paper shot."

I believe that no hon. gentleman has anything to fear from the full and complete publication of his speeches in this House, and we should always be prepared to give the people a proper opportunity of expressing their opinions as to our proceedings. General Garfield went on to say:

Publicity is the strong bond which unites the people and their government. Authority should do no act that will not bear the light. But freedom brings with it increased responsibility, and I turn from this imperfect historical sketch to inquire what the community demands of the press. I may not express the opinion of the majority; but, certainly, it is my own, that the first and greatest demand which the public makes of its editors is that they shall obtain and publish the news—that they shall print a veritable and intelligible record of important current events. Rather than to weaken, neglect, or falsify this, it were better that every other feature of the newspaper should be abandoned.

And so say I. If newspapers give a garbled statement with respect to any question brought before the House, it would be better for them to leave out the information altogether. He says further:

No intelligent American of our day leads an isolated life. We are connected with society by a thousand ties of interest, opinion, and sym-

pathy. To know what others are thinking and doing; to know what events are occurring that affect the interests and character of the community, makes each citizen not only a vital part of society, but a living and intelligent force to guide and direct it. To supply this knowledge, to furnish fresh stimulant of thought, is the greatest work of the journalist.

I hold, that as the great question of federation and other very important questions will be considered by Parliament at no distant date, in the true interests of the people of this country, we are bound to enable the people to fully understand what takes place. That is equally true with regard to the question of free-trade and protection, and the question of local option. The people desire to be instructed and educated with regard to all those great subjects which affect their vital interests and well being. There is an enormous amount of money spent in the publication of useless documents. If that was discontinued, and the money so saved spent upon the publication of a daily *Hansard*, we should be bestowing a real boon upon the community. I move this motion in the true interests of democracy.

Mr. REID: By whom would it be published?

Mr. A. HUTCHISON: In Queensland a daily *Hansard* is published and circulated with the newspapers. Therefore, I think that example can be followed here, and *Hansard* can be sent broadcast throughout the land the same as the daily journals are now sent. It would lessen the duties of the journalists, and seeing that it would effect a twofold object, I hope every hon. member will give the question that due consideration which its importance demands, and vote for the motion in the true interests of this democratic community.

Question proposed.

Mr. J. D. FITZGERALD: If any member of the Ministry desires to speak I shall give way. Well, as no minister wishes to speak, I rise to second the motion, with the wording of which I do not quite agree, because the hon. member has introduced two very important and very debatable questions. The first portion reads:

That inasmuch as none of the daily papers publish anything like a correct and truthful report of the debates and proceedings of Parliament —

If the hon. member had brought forward a motion condemning the unfair reports

in the daily press I believe I should have been one of his strongest supporters. But I do not see why he should associate this censure of the press with the very important question of publishing a daily *Hansard*. I hope he will withdraw that part of the motion, and if he brings forward the question at a later period I shall give him my support. It seems to me that many arguments could be adduced in favour of a daily *Hansard*, and no greater argument could be adduced than the fact that a daily *Hansard* exists in Queensland, and has given the utmost satisfaction. I have worked on the Queensland daily *Hansard* as a compositor. I know something about the practical working of that publication. I afterwards worked in Queensland on country newspapers, and saw the delivery of the daily *Hansard* to the subscribers. In Queensland, before a session of Parliament begins, each country newspaper notifies its subscribers that it is prepared to supply the daily *Hansard* as an inset to the newspaper at a certain fixed rate—in Rockhampton, where I lived, the subscription was something like 3s. a month—and the subscribers express their wishes. The newspapers do not report, or make any attempt to report the speeches in Parliament, they depend entirely upon the *Hansard*. Well, the subscribers send in their subscriptions to the daily *Hansard*, and the proprietor applies to the central authorities in Brisbane for the requisite number, and the *Hansard* is distributed with the newspaper to each subscriber. The proprietor of the newspaper is directly responsible to the Government for the copies of daily *Hansard* which he receives. The morning newspaper of Brisbane, the *Courier*, may be compared to the *Sydney Morning Herald*. What could be easier than for the subscribers to the *Sydney Morning Herald* who desire to read the daily *Hansard* to send in their names to the proprietors, the same as is done to the proprietors of the *Brisbane Courier*, and for the proprietors to send it out, in broadsheet form, as an inset to the *Herald*?

Mr. STEVENSON: Would they do it?

Mr. J. D. FITZGERALD: I think it would pay them well to do it. If we established a daily *Hansard* it would do away at once with the necessity for a newspaper keeping a staff of reporters to report

the parliamentary debates. The speeches are sent out in a broadsheet form, and then, I presume, judging from the bound volumes which have been sent to me from Queensland, they are afterwards collected or made up in short sheets and published in book form. The reports of the daily press of Sydney are a source of complaint, I think, to almost every hon. member. In the first place, the protectionist members have just reason to complain of the unfair reports of their speeches in the free-trade press. But their complaints are nothing in comparison with the just complaints which could be made against the protectionist press from the free-trade side of the House.

Mr. WILLIS: There is no protectionist press!

Mr. J. D. FITZGERALD: I am glad to hear the hon. member say so. I did not put their organ under the head of the press at all. I am not going to advertise them yet, and let the world know that there is such a thing in existence. I did not particularise any paper. Hon. members on both sides have reasonable cause for complaint against the unfair reports in the press. The reports are coloured through being read with free-trade or protectionist spectacles. But what complaint can we, the third party, make in this respect? I think we can bring the strongest indictment against the whole press for the manner in which they have generally ignored us. When they were compelled to recognise us and report our speeches what did they do? They misrepresented what we said. They tortured our utterances into things which we never dreamt of. They omitted things which were necessary, and inserted things which we never uttered. I shall support the motion, though I hope my hon. friend will withdraw the first portion, and if he brings a motion of censure against the daily press of Sydney it shall have my strong support. I do not think the House will be justified in passing a motion containing these two important assertions.

Mr. A. HUTCHISON: The question is whether they are true or untrue!

Mr. J. D. FITZGERALD: The hon. member may bring forward the question in a separate motion, and if he does no doubt he will receive support from both

[Mr. J. D. Fitzgerald.]

sides, because both sides have been misrepresented. I hope he will not press the first portion of his motion.

Mr. TRAILL: The motion of the hon. member for Glen Innes, so far as it records the approbation of the idea of issuing a daily *Hansard*, has my fullest concurrence. I think there are great disadvantages in the present system of *Hansard*, which is published perhaps as many as four days after the speeches which it records are delivered. It would be very convenient for hon. members, when there are adjourned debates, to be able to review what has been said on the previous night, with the object of addressing their remarks to the points which have been put before them. The reports which appear in the daily press—without entering into the question of their fairness or unfairness—are certainly inadequate to supply hon. members who wish to address themselves to an adjourned debate with material for making their speeches; whereas, if we had verbatim reports published on the morning following a debate, they would be of very great assistance indeed. Apart from that, it frequently happens that a great deal depends upon public opinion being educated during the course of a debate. The public, however, have nothing to guide them except the scrappy reports which appear in the morning papers, which very insufficiently give the views of, at least, a large majority of hon. members, whilst adequately giving the views of ministers and some of the most prominent members on the opposition or cross-benches. It very frequently happens when members who do not hold an official or recognised position in the House, so to speak, give utterance to some very important and very significant truths, that in the condensation which takes place in the speeches delivered by these gentlemen, the parts which are reported are not what they themselves had intended to be their salient points, and what were really the salient points are omitted. It may be said that had we a daily *Hansard* distributed amongst the people, it would be an incitement to blathering in the House—that more useless talking would be the result. At first it might have that effect, but I think that is a malady which would cure itself, inasmuch as if a man kept perpetually pouring a lot of common-place nonsense into a

publication which was issued next morning, and which came before the eyes of his own constituents, he would soon get to hear of it. He would get to hear of it at every quarter; his measure would be taken, not only by the reporters in the gallery, but by the people who read the publication. They would soon come to be known by the constituencies generally as men who spoke a great deal too much on too many points, as men of many words but few ideas. Like the hon. member for West Sydney, Mr. J. D. Fitzgerald, I have had some practical experience of the process as it prevails, and has prevailed for many years past, in Queensland. I was connected with the *Brisbane Courier* at the time a daily *Hansard* was first instituted. An idea prevailed then of letting the printing of *Hansard* by contract to one of the morning daily papers of the metropolis. They were to print the whole of the matter, put it into their own formes, and issue additional sheets to be given to the Government to distribute and make what use of they liked. The process was slightly different to that which has been stated by the hon. member for West Sydney. Subsequently, I was the proprietor of a country newspaper in Queensland, and had occasion to distribute *Hansard*. The plan we adopted, or attempted to adopt, was one of gratuitous distribution to subscribers to the newspaper. The Government published the *Hansard* every morning in good time, sent it away in large batches to the country papers, who, I think, merely paid the actual cost price of the printing paper and machining. This brought the price down to a very insignificant sum, indeed. The publication was sold to the proprietors of the papers according to their requirements, and they placed it in their newspapers and distributed it broadcast throughout the country. Certain inconveniences were found to attend this course. Country newspapers, for the most part, do not appear daily—they are weekly, bi-weekly, or tri-weekly publications—and it sometimes happened, according to the delivery of the mails, that two or three days' *Hansards* would have to go out with one issue of the paper, forming, possibly, a very awkward and inconvenient mass which the subscribers of the paper could not practically undertake to read at one time. As far as my recollection and experience goes, the sys-

tem did not work very well, as regards distribution, to the country papers. *Hansard* is published in Brisbane as early as the morning papers are published. It is printed, published, and distributed as early as the morning papers, and without the necessity of employing a very extravagant staff in the gallery. Hon. members will be surprised to learn that in Queensland the legislature is able to publish *Hansard* every morning whilst employing a less expensive staff than we, who publish *Hansard* perhaps three or four days after the debates have been recorded. I have looked up the Queensland estimates for 1891, and I find that in that colony there are employed to bring out a daily *Hansard*, one Chief Shorthand-Writer, who receives £600 a year; one shorthand-writer in charge of the committees of both houses, who may or may not be employed on *Hansard*—probably not—nevertheless I charge him against *Hansard* in making this comparison—who receives £550 a year; eight shorthand-writers—that is one less than in the previous year, when there were nine—one at £450; one at £400, and six at £300 a year; two messengers for day and night five months in the year, £28; altogether £3,828 a year. Turning to our own expenses, I find that in order to bring out *Hansard* days after the speeches which it reports have been delivered, we have one Principal Shorthand-Writer at £900 a year; a second Shorthand-Writer at £700; four shorthand-writers—three at £550 and one at £350—making £2,000, one shorthand-writer, £470 a year; three shorthand-writers, £450 a year; one shorthand-writer, £350 a year; and one shorthand typewriter, £200 a year. In addition there are contingencies—sessional shorthand writing, £400, and incidental expenses, £10; making a total of £6,380 for a *Hansard* which does not come out for days after the necessity has arisen, as against £3,828 for a daily *Hansard* in Queensland. In fact, we pay here not very much short of double what is paid in Queensland, where they bring out a daily *Hansard*. I will undertake to say that if the matter were placed in the hands of any business-like men connected with journalism they would turn out a daily *Hansard* here at a not very much greater cost than is necessary to bring it out in Queensland. Hon. members must remember that in both

cases the gentlemen employed to bring out *Hansard* are not paid by the piece, or merely whilst the House is sitting. They are officers of Parliament with annual salaries, so that the question of the duration of Parliament does not bear upon their salaries. Consequently the expense need be no consideration in a case of this kind. Furthermore, mechanical difficulties do not exist. I have seen the machinery producing the daily *Hansard* in the Government Printing Office at Queensland, and it did not involve the speediest or most modern machinery to bring out the publication. Since I saw this machinery in Brisbane ten years ago, vast improvements have been made, and facilities are now available which did not at that time exist. There are no difficulties in the way of bringing out a daily *Hansard* here, should it be considered desirable to do it. I have shown that the distribution through the country press would not be convenient, and as to the Sydney daily papers, they would not take the *Hansard* report. Experience has shown that the morning press prefers its own report. I am aware that the *Brisbane Courier* at one time distributed the official report; but I am under the impression that they have ceased to do so. I was in the inner counsels of that paper, both editorial and proprietorial, for a number of years, and I remember that this matter was considered, and the impression on my mind after the lapse of so many years, is that there was a preference for the paper publishing its own reports. But that is not the question this House has to deal with. Our desire is that the people should be able to form an opinion for themselves as to what is said and done here, instead of having opinions formed for them in the reporters' gallery or in the editor's room. Hon. members who have looked through the files of country papers kept in the library, must have noticed that the account of the proceedings of Parliament is usually condensed into five or six lines, or at most a few inches, so that the people in the interior, a large proportion of whom see only their local newspapers, have no conception of what transpires here, beyond the statement of a few bare facts. They can form no conception as to the relative value of the men who sit here. There are a few choice men who are made pets of by the daily press, and to whose

[*Mr. Traill.*

speeches prominence is given; but other hon. members are entirely passed over. There have been sitting on the crossbenches gentlemen whose remarks occasionally, if not always, have been worthy of most serious attention; but because they are not always worthy of that attention they never receive publicity through the press. But there are other means of distributing *Hansard* than by the aid of the press. We have the whole of the postal resources at our disposal. At present the Government carry daily tons of newspapers for private proprietors free; why, then, should not the Post Office be charged with the conveyance of the Government's own publication; so that wherever the Post Office reached it would be possible for a daily *Hansard* to reach also? There is no reason why there should not be a gratuitous publication in every sense of the word. It would not do perhaps to send a copy of *Hansard* to every individual whose name was on the electoral roll, because there might be thousands, and tens of thousands, of persons to whom it would be simply a bore; but it would be reasonable and practicable to send it to every elector in the colony who chose to ask for it, and who kept on asking for it. I would not, because a man's name happened to be once on the list, send him a copy to all eternity; but if a person were to ask for it every three or six months, there would be a certainty that the publication would only go to those who wanted it.

MR. STEVENSON: Say every session!

MR. TRAILL: I am thinking of something beyond the session. By this means not only would the *Hansard* go to every individual who wished for it; but it could go without cost to the state. The hon. member for West Sydney, Mr. J. D. Fitzgerald, said that it was not contemplated to have anything to do with advertisements. Now, I do contemplate having to do with advertisements. I do not see why the state, which displays advertisements on its railway-stations, in its tramway cars, and even in connection with the Post Office in an indirect way, as well as in the *Government Gazette*, should not seek to get advertisements to publish in a daily *Hansard*. If they did so, I am positive that *Hansard* would be not only self-sustaining, but might even become, as the post office is in some countries, a source of revenue

to the state. A daily *Hansard*, distributed as I suggested, would have the largest circulation of any publication in the colonies. Circulation is the main point which every newspaper endeavours, by posters and other means, to impress upon advertisers. You see posters displayed on the walls of the city stating that the circulation of such and such a newspaper is so and so. The *Evening News*, I believe, claims to have a circulation double that of all the other papers in creation—I am not sure whether it is creation or the colony; but it is somewhere. Each newspaper endeavours to prove that its circulation is great, in order to show advertisers that it is worth their while to advertise in it, and to give a high price for their advertisements, inasmuch as their advertisements will meet many eyes. Well, this daily *Hansard* would undoubtedly have the largest circulation of any daily publication issued in New South Wales, and, on that account, it would command an immense number of advertisements, and very good prices for them. As regards interference with vested interests, the highest vested interest in this country is the interest of the whole community; not that of a few individuals who happen to have a monopoly, and that one of the most difficult monopolies to assail—an advertising monopoly. Take the case of a daily newspaper in this city, which has a great advertising connection. We will suppose that a person who has something to sell has a particular dislike to the principles of that newspaper. He would on no account support it if he could possibly avoid doing so; but he wants to sell something, and because everybody else is advertising the particular class of commodity which he has for sale in the columns of that newspaper, he is absolutely constrained to put his advertisement in it, because every one who wants to buy looks at its advertisements. Even though the community dislike a paper so much that they would rather see it perish than advertise in it, they must advertise in it, because those advertising do not form a class; they cannot come together and strike. A man never knows when he is going to be an advertiser in this way or another, and as soon as a newspaper has its advertisements recognised everybody is compelled to advertise in it, whether they approve of its prin-

ciples or not, so long as its circulation is considerable. I myself think that a monopoly of this kind is not one which should be regarded particularly tenderly by the people who have the interest of the state at heart, and therefore I think it would be a very good thing if, in publishing the debates in Parliament, advertisements were sought and obtained to take the burden off the shoulders of the community. A great difficulty, however, suggests itself. This House and the other Chamber sit but occasionally. Under ordinary circumstances we sit but three days in the week, and there are times when Parliament is not in session, so that the publication would be an intermittent affair; and if, you have advertisements, what are you going to do then? Well, the other day, by two mails, there were delivered at my residence over 1,000 printed pages of parliamentary and other intelligence, which I, as a representative of the people, am expected to read; but which no one could ever get through in the sense of exhaustive reading. But there are documents laid upon the table of the House, reports of royal commissions, which the public are sometimes most anxious to see, of select committees, and of boards of inquiry, and other papers of great interest to the community, all of which the people are entitled to see. Everything of this kind is put into type as it is, so that it need not cost a penny more to pass it into the columns of a daily paper of the description I have mentioned.

Mr. TOOMBS: The motion does not provide for that!

Mr. TRAILL: The only additional cost would be the paper which would be consumed. The matter would be in type already, and all that would be required by a sensible man in managing the affair would be to see that the kind of type was altered so that the matter could be set up in the first instance so as to be suitable to be laid upon the table of the House in the ordinary form, and afterwards to be put into the columns of *Hansard*. There is always information of great public interest which could very well be passed into the columns of a newspaper of this kind, and thus keep up the advertising connection, which would become a most valuable public property. If a publication such as this were judiciously worked, not only would

it be of no additional expense to the country, and not only would there be a daily report of our debates placed in the hands of the people far and wide on the morning after they took place, enabling them to form an opinion on a subject very often before it was settled; but I say deliberately that there would be a profit to the country of £50,000 a year. I know that there is a newspaper in this community which has made £50,000, £60,000, and £70,000 by advertising alone. The subscriptions, generally speaking, do not pay more than the expenses, and the profit lies in the advertising. I think, therefore, that there is a great deal more in this matter than at first meets the eye. For my own part, when the public mind is properly matured for it, I shall be quite prepared to go a great deal further. I would have a great state newspaper, not like the French *Moniteur*, which has simply perverted opinion—a paper which would not contain any expressions of opinion, or editorial expression at all; but would publish cablegrams on a grander scale than is ever known by any newspaper now, having actual news of shipping intelligence, and of matters of fact of that description. And what organisation in this colony or in Australia could be more complete for this purpose than that which the Government already possess? All throughout the colony its tendrils are put forth. There are the police, the Post Office and the telegraph office officials, and others, all of whom would make first-class news agents—that is, purveyors of news. If an occurrence of real interest happens in the furthest part of the colony, there is always a Government official there who could report it to the central agency in the city, and there would thus be possessed by the Government, not only a daily *Hansard*, but a grand state newspaper—a medium of intelligence, not a medium of opinion. I would have opinion most rigidly eschewed from its columns, except such as was uttered by hon. members in the House. Then there are certain advertisements which the law requires to be published in the *Government Gazette*, which at present is a mass of sheets put together in such a way that no person can ever read it. But the law could be so altered that instead of compelling these advertisements to be put in the *Government Gazette*, where they are

[Mr. Traill.

not seen, it would compel them to be put in the daily newspaper, where they would be seen. So that there is before us an opportunity for creating a very great machine, not only for the dissemination of the knowledge of what is being transacted in the legislature of the country, but for adding to the revenue of the country, and for getting rid of monopolies of opinion, which weigh very heavily upon the public life of the community. What I have been saying may not be advocated by many hon. members; but I think that it is absolutely certain that, as time rolls on, I shall have on the part of the people a very keen appreciation of my proposal. I have often heard it said in this connection that the Government Printing Office ought to be abolished because it interferes with private enterprise. But whose enterprise does it interfere with? Does it interfere with the enterprise of the compositor, of the man who actually works at the case? It interferes only with the enterprise of the profit-monger, of the man who employs others in order to derive a profit from their work for himself. Supposing the Government Printing Office did all the printing work in the community, would there be any fewer compositors employed? And they would be employed on better wages and under better conditions, so that I am not at all afraid of the argument that it would be giving a monopoly to the state. The state is the whole community, and, therefore, for the reasons I have already advanced, I propose to support the motion. But in order to put the views which I have just expressed on record, so that they can be again referred to, and at all hazard of being thought a faddist, I move as an amendment:

That all the words after the word "daily," be omitted with a view to substitute the following:—"publication should be made by the Government, to contain full reports of all proceedings and speeches in both houses of Parliament when in session, the text or substance of such reports by royal commissions, select committees, and public officers and departments as may be suited for publication; reports of deputations to ministers, and such other matters not being in the style of the opinions of the conductors of the publication, as may be deemed advisable; the reports of proceedings in Parliament to be published on the morning following in all cases where it is practicable so to do. Such publication to give space for advertisements, and to be sent free by post, or, if reasonably feasible, to be delivered to the address of every elector of New South Wales who may make application for same."

Mr. WILLIS: What will be the policy of the paper?

Mr. TRAILL: It will have no policy. The only policy will be just what hon. members may express.

Mr. CRICK: Let the Government make a contract with *Truth*!

Amendment proposed.

Sir HENRY PARKES: I rise to take part in this discussion more as a member of Parliament than as a minister. Indeed, as far as the original motion is concerned, I should say I rise exclusively to deal with it as a member of this House. Now, it strikes me in the first place that this resolution affords a very telling illustration of the waste of time in this Parliament. We have been in session more than a month, and if any one were to try to sum up what has been done either on Government nights or private nights they could not but acknowledge that it is next door to nothing; and how the public business is to be proceeded with if we indulge in discussions of this kind I am at a loss to conjecture. Taking the business on the paper for this day there are fifty-nine notices of motion, and instead of getting to this real business of Parliament—and I take it for granted that every hon. gentleman, who has placed one of those notices of motion on the paper, has done so because he believes it is in the interests of the public—before we can get to any of this real business of Parliament, we are consuming the whole night in considering by what means we shall make our proceedings known to the public. Well, I say that is a striking illustration of how the time that might be devoted to the real business of the country is wasted in considering some chimerical notion of how our proceedings are to be made public. Coming to the motion, on which I shall say very little, because it appears to me almost transparent, I assume, and it must be obvious to the mind of every hon. member, that there is only one medium through which it is worth while to publish speeches or anything else—a medium of real publicity. Unless the medium is one which spreads widely, which diffuses whatever is published in it amongst all classes, it cannot answer the purpose aimed at. It would be no use printing the speeches delivered in this House, either in a daily or a weekly *Hansard*, if there were no means of dif-

fusing them so that they would reach the whole people of the country, or the greater number of the people of the country. Well, you cannot give the means of spreading any dead-weight publication. Call it what you may, you cannot give it the means of circulation, and without circulation your reports would be of little consequence.

Mr. TOOHEY: What is the value of publishing *Hansard* at all, then?

Sir HENRY PARKES: I would vote for abolishing the publication of *Hansard*, as it is called, to-morrow.

Mr. DIBBS: It was not always so!

Mr. TOOHEY: The hon. gentleman has been badly quoted this afternoon!

Sir HENRY PARKES: I have never been in favour of the *Hansard* publication.

Mr. DIBBS: The hon. gentleman supported me in moving for it in 1873!

Sir HENRY PARKES: I suppose that was the reason it was carried.

Mr. CRICK: But it was lost on that occasion!

Mr. TOOHEY: The hon. member was very much brighter then!

Sir HENRY PARKES: It is a singular thing that I cannot get on my feet even as a member of this House without subjecting myself to insult, when I have listened patiently to every one else. What does the hon. member mean?

Mr. TOOHEY: That the hon. member's intelligence then was brighter than now. I did not mean any offence!

Sir HENRY PARKES: The hon. member is continually saying offensive things and not meaning them. Suppose I applied that observation to the hon. gentleman, would he feel flattered? Concerning this resolution, what I was trying to impress upon the House was that it is utterly impossible to give circulation to any publication of this kind; and the only possibility of circulating the reports of our proceedings is through the newspaper press. Suppose you adopted the whimsical notion of going to the cost of addressing one of those dead-weight publications to every elector in the colony, how many electors would wade through the report? Would one in a hundred, or one in five hundred? It simply comes to this: that if you wish for the sound life of Parliament, you must trust to the ordinary vehicles of public opinion and public comment, which owing to a variety of causes beyond the

possibility of summing up, have a circulation among the public. What makes the circulation of a newspaper? It is not even the talent in its leading columns, supposing it is of the highest possible kind; but it is a thousand things in giving information, so that it meets the wants and wishes and tastes of the greatest number of persons, and there is no other possible way of getting a circulation in civilised society but that. Whether the reports in the newspapers are satisfactory or not, you cannot reach the general public by any other means. I need scarcely say that in the interests of this House, in the interests of sound parliamentary government, I shall feel it my duty to vote both against the resolution and the amendment.

Mr. TOOHEY: The Colonial Secretary seems to be of opinion that the only means of disseminating the proceedings of this House is by the press of the community. My experience is that whatever side the press particularly desires to lean to, that side has the use and value of its columns, while the other side has those columns closed entirely to it. Strange to say, the new party in this House particularly agree with me, and the new members find that they have not among them one who, in the opinion of the daily press, is of sufficient position to entitle him to a fair representation of the words which he may use in this Chamber. My experience is quite in keeping with the experience of those hon. gentlemen. I have had seven years' experience of Parliament. I cannot claim that I am entitled to a report of my expressions of thought in this House, but I do claim that if the press desires to fairly represent Parliament, those who sent me here are entitled to a fair report of my proceedings in this House. The Premier says that the only circulating medium is the press of the community. Very well. What is to prevent the press of the community from contracting for the right to report the proceedings of this House? What is to prevent the press from offering a bonus to the Government for the right of publishing a report of the proceedings of the House? What fairer or more judicious means could be adopted by the House to give an opportunity to those unknown to fame, who have not won their spurs, or who do not happen to

[*Sir Henry Parkes.*

be on the side to which the press leans, of obtaining a fair and legitimate report of their utterances? I do not care whether you take the protectionist or the free-trade press, it cannot be said that they fairly, legitimately, and honestly represent hon. members. The reply would come at once that it would be impossible for any paper to fairly report the proceedings of this Chamber. Very well; who then becomes the arbiter in the public mind of the utterances made in this House? The press of the community. They have a higher power and authority than we have. They claim the right to report us, and as the hon. member for West Sydney has said very properly, the right to misreport, if they like, our proceedings. What do we ask from Parliament, and from the Premier, who so bitterly opposes this notion? That, as we represent the country our expressions in this House ought to be fairly reported to the country. At any rate we say publish a daily *Hansard*. I shall be met by the financiers with the statement that it will be an excessive cost. The hon. member for South Sydney, Mr. Traill, has met that argument completely. He has shown that it will be no cost whatever, that on the contrary it will be a financial advantage to the country. It will also have this advantage: that any newspaper which undertakes the responsibility will realise the fact that every member of this House has a right to complain of any wrong which may be done to him by misrepresentation in that newspaper, and that the contract will not be accepted by the Government next year from a newspaper which has unfairly and wrongfully treated an hon. member, whereas at the present time the press of the day will just tell you that they are commercial institutions built up on financial principles, and that they are run exactly on the lines which will suit those who desire to get the best financial benefits from the institution, and not with regard to the honesty of the publication of speeches. I have felt, and no doubt most hon. members feel, a sense of injustice. Possibly it may be that I imagine I am a much more capable man than I really am, and the very same statement might apply to most hon. members—nay to all. But I have felt a sense of injustice when I have dealt with large matters here, and when I

thought that I was entitled to fair representation, when I have sought that next day in the morning and evening papers I have felt sore and indignant. But what could I possibly do? Could I make the press a medium of expressing my grievance? The resolution of the hon. member for Glen Innes, however, furnishes a medium which can be controlled and governed by Parliament; whereby the expression of opinion of every hon. member shall be properly, fairly, and justly conveyed to the community, so that every man shall have a right to complain if he is misrepresented or misreported. His utterances and ideas will be made manifest to those who sent him here. I do not think any hon. member who desires the well-being of the country, and wishes above all things that a true representation of what takes place here shall be submitted to the people—not the suppression of a wild utterance but the true expression of a member's utterances here—will refuse to support this motion which will give the people an opportunity of knowing exactly what transpires here under all circumstances.

Dr. CULLEN: If I had any hope of persuading hon. members, I should urge most strongly upon them that so far from wasting any more of the country's money in unnecessary printing, they should cut down the present extravagance in publishing *Hansard*. The wording of this motion is an insult to the press of this country:

That inasmuch as none of the daily papers publish anything like a correct and truthful report of the debates and proceeding of Parliament —

I say it is an insult to the press of this country to say that not one of the newspapers publishes what is true or correct. I hold, as I am certain everybody does who knows anything of our country, that the press is what the people make it. The press is as good as the people deserve. What the people want the press will give them, and if the press will not, the people will soon have newspapers that will. I say it is not only an insult to the press, but an insult to the people of this country to say

this House is of opinion it is desirable, to enable the people to fully comprehend and understand the great questions affecting their own rights, liberties, and well-being, and the future destiny of the colony, that a daily issue of *Hansard* should be published.

If the people of this colony have no notion of their rights, liberties, and wellbeing, but what they can gather by wading through *Hansard*, then they are in a bad way. I was never so much surprised in my life as when the hon. member for Glen Innes brought in the name of Oliver Cromwell, because I always understood that if ever there was a character in English history who was death on blather-skite it was Oliver Cromwell. If he did not apply Pride's Purge to Macquarie-street within a week he would not be the man that history represented him. There can be no possible justification for spending the public money by trying to compel the people to read what they do not want to read. What they want to know about the proceedings of Parliament they can get from the newspapers already. But what will be served by this publication at the expenditure of a large sum will be simply this: Hon. members who love to make long speeches on every possible pretext will get a chance to read them as they claim to have delivered them; and hon. members who want to trip up others by saying, "Six years ago the hon. member for Somewhere said tweedledum instead of tweedledee," will have a chance of producing the evidence in black and white. I appeal to hon. members whether three-fourths of the waste of time here does not occur through the existence of *Hansard*? It is because hon. members wish to drag up these things that the country has passed over and done with that all this expense is incurred, and a man if he ever changes his opinion will have *Hansard* produced, and hour after hour wasted in showing what he said some years ago, and that he is not saying exactly the same thing now. I oppose the motion most strongly.

Mr. FEGAN: I do not think it will take the House very long to settle this question. The short time I have had the honor of being a member has gone to prove to my mind that, with a daily *Hansard*, we should not have transacted half the business we have done.

Mr. DIBBS: That would not be much!

Mr. FEGAN: Quite so; but I have seen hon. members look up to the press-gallery and, finding the reporters had gone, would not speak. Before we sanction a daily *Hansard* we ought to know what lines we are going upon. So far as the

press are concerned, they give very fair reports. So far as the party I have had the honor of being connected with has been reported, I think it has been of the worst description, in some cases; but not in all. At the same time, I know that the labour party would get very little show in this House if we had a daily *Hansard* to publish our speeches, because leading members, most likely, would try to catch Mr. Speaker's eye, and the consequence would be that we should have a daily *Hansard* with very little in it. As regards the cost, I think that would be a very large item. We should be wasting the valuable time of this country in discussing questions of no importance whatever. We should have motions of adjournment moved one after the other, so that an hon. member might have his speech read next morning in the daily *Hansard*. I think, if we desire to give hon. members' speeches due consideration, the present *Hansard* is sufficient. It is issued to every hon. member; and is sent to every school of arts and mechanics' institute. That is quite sufficient, I think. I believe not one person out of every hundred reads the speeches of every member of this Parliament. I will admit that there is not much in some of the speeches. I know, too, that if the newspaper reporters cannot take a speech down correctly, as has been alleged here this evening, the *Hansard* reporters are no better than the newspaper reporters, if both desire to do their work. One reporter is as good as the other.

HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DAWSON: And better!

MR. O'SULLIVAN: One is only a summary writer!

MR. FEGAN: One reporter is as good as the other if they desire to do their work properly. But then come in the side issues, that one party and the other party have their respective papers in which to read their respective speeches. What has that to do with this House? A man is sent here to do the business of the country. An hon. member, whether he be a protectionist or a free-trader, or belongs to the labour party, owes a duty to his constituents and to his country before his party; and if he desires to promote the welfare of the country, he will legislate independently of what the press or any other power chooses to say about him.

[Mr. Fegan.]

What shall we gain by printing a daily *Hansard*? It would, as the hon. member for South Sydney said, entail a big cost; but that that cost would be nothing in comparison with the good it would do. I think the greatest of all cost is that hon. members, for the sake of being heard, and for the sake of their speeches being read, would take up the time of the House instead of getting to work as we ought to do. I have sat here for the last fortnight; I have listened to speech after speech, and when I came to sum them all up, the question was just in the same position as where the first or second speaker had left it. I shall vote against the amendment and the motion. I believe the present *Hansard* is sufficient for our purposes.

MR. TORPY: I feel so certain that the motion will not be carried that I need not say much on the question. It conveys, in my opinion, a very needless and foolish imputation upon the public press. I think the reports of the press generally are correct. I think the reports are generally true. The speeches may be summarised or condensed; but I say, in the main, the reports give a correct idea of the proceedings of this House. Some hon. members appear to feel keenly the fact that their speeches are not very fully reported. I think hon. members are under considerable obligation to the press for not too fully reporting their speeches. I am of opinion that many of our speeches are greatly improved by condensation. They are put into better English, and they convey more pointed meaning than those we ourselves express. My chief objection to a daily *Hansard* is that it would not be read. I am perfectly certain that it would only be read by a few persons desirous of seeing their own speeches in print. If there is any publication in this country which is not read it is *Hansard*. I undertake to say that if *Hansard* is, to-morrow, placed in a club-room, or school of arts, or any other public place, it will not be read by three people. Of course, *Hansard* is a very valuable record of the proceedings of the House; it is an excellent publication for reference, to enable one hon. member to show what another hon. member said six months ago, or three years ago. Personally, I think we ought to be very grateful to the press for the accurate way in which they report the proceedings of the House.

The hon. member for South Sydney has proposed that *Hansard* should compete with the daily newspapers for public advertisements. I object to that most strenuously. The Government are already doing too much in this direction; public enterprise should have more fair play. I do not see what advantage can be gained by the Government competing with the Sydney or country papers for advertisements, and I think such a proceeding would be highly improper. No doubt there is a tendency on the part of the press to give a little colouring to speeches made by those of political creeds opposed to the creeds represented by the papers. On the other hand, as the newspapers represent different political creeds, if hon. members do not get credit in one paper for what they say, they possibly get more credit than they deserve in another.

Mr. LEES: Putting aside the question of coming into competition with vested interests, I think the Premier has stated a solid objection to the proposal. I do not care how important the speeches delivered by hon. members may be, or how important may be the reports which are brought up by royal commissions or select committees, or how much interest may attach to those persons for whom they are got up, they will never make *Hansard* become a readable journal in this country. If *Hansard* is to become a readable paper, it must become a newspaper; and if it becomes a newspaper, it must come into competition with interests which are firmly and well established. If Parliament sets up a newspaper to come into competition with metropolitan or country newspapers, it will not, I think, do a wise thing. I have my opinions regarding a state printing office or a state newspaper; and I am inclined to think that there is more in what has been stated by the hon. member for South Sydney on this question than the House is inclined to give him credit for. At the same time, I am satisfied that the proceedings of the House, as reported by *Hansard*, are reported sufficiently well for the purposes of the House and the country. The hon. member for Orange has told us how *Hansard* is distributed gratuitously to municipal institutions, libraries, and schools of arts. What more is required in the direction of the dissemination of our proceedings? Let *Hansard* be

ever so well edited—let its reports be ever so well condensed—the newspapers of the day, with all their vested interests, can never be wiped out. They will do their work, and by the aid of the editors and their literary staffs, they will present the debates in a readable form—in a form in which this House cannot propose to put them. I think the resolution is untimely and unnecessary, and I shall vote against it.

Mr. CRICK: I do not intend to support the amendment of the hon. member for South Sydney. I do not think that amendment will reflect much credit on the intelligence of this side of the House if it consents to pass it. I cannot regard the matter in any other sense than did the hon. member for South Sydney himself when he stated that he would, no doubt, be designated as a faddist for moving the amendment. The question of the issue of a daily *Hansard* was, in 1887, referred by the House to a select committee. That committee carefully went into the whole of the matter, took evidence from practical men, and brought up a report. I propose to ask the House to adopt the report brought up in 1887. To show that the committee was an able one, I have only to remind hon. members of the names of those of whom it consisted. It consisted of the Minister of Public Instruction; Mr. Burns, an ex-colonial treasurer; the hon. member for The Hume, Mr. Lyne; the hon. member for Eden, Mr. Garvan; the hon. member for East Macquarie, Mr. Tonkin; Mr. Garland, the late hon. member for Carcoar; the leader of the Opposition; the hon. member for The Richmond, Mr. Ewing; Mr. D. O'Connor, Postmaster-General, and Mr. Henson. The report brought up by that committee was as follows:—

1. That it is expedient to print, publish, and circulate a daily issue of *Hansard*.
2. That the probable cost of so doing by the means hereinafter mentioned will be £6,500 per annum, from which must, however, be deducted the amount now expended in printing the weekly and sessional volumes at the Government Printing Office.
3. That the best means of effecting the above will be by calling for tenders from proprietors of daily newspapers published in Sydney, and making a contract with some tenderer for printing, publishing, and circulating such daily issue of *Hansard*.

The report of the committee is placed under three heads. The committee found

that it was advisable to print a daily *Hansard*. The cost was estimated at about £6,500 per annum, with certain deductions; and the committee suggested that tenders should be called from the daily papers of the metropolis for the purpose of circulating the reports. Summarised, the suggestion of the committee was to issue in the form of a supplement to a newspaper the proceedings of the House. That seems to me to be a very advisable course to pursue, if it can be carried out without extra expenditure or burden upon the people of the country. I am satisfied that that course could be carried out, and a large circulation given to *Hansard*, at no greater cost than that which is incurred by printing *Hansard* in its present form. The witnesses on that occasion were Samuel Cook, Esquire, I suppose a gentleman connected with the *Herald*; Mark John Hammond, once a member of the Legislative Assembly, a very able thinking man; Charles Potter, Government Printer; Charles Robinson, chief of the *Hansard* staff; and Watkin Wynne, of the *Daily Telegraph*. All these are men thoroughly capable of giving an intelligent opinion on this question, and the committee, having heard their evidence, decided that it would be advisable, in their opinion, to issue a daily *Hansard*. The proposal did not obtain the concurrence of this House. I will read the last few words of the report, written by the chief of the *Hansard* staff, Mr. Robinson. He says:

It seems to me, however, that the key of the position is held by the conductors of the daily press, who, as the result of large expenditure and great enterprise continued through many years, have enlisted the interest of all classes of the community in their undertakings.

I might here interpose a few words in regard to what has been referred to as vested interests, which seems to have roused the ire of the hon. member for Orange, Mr. Torpy. The hon. member jumped up in a way which might have made any one unacquainted with his circumstances think that he had some interest in a newspaper somewhere or other.

AN HON. MEMBER: At Orange!

Mr. CRICK: The hon. member might have an interest in a newspaper at Orange. Then another hon. member, who seldom disturbs the serenity of the House, the hon. member for The Nepean, Mr. Lees,

[*Mr. Crick.*

thought it incumbent on him to speak—he is a member who, I believe, does know a little about printing.

Mr. LEES: I wish I had an interest in some of the newspapers!

Mr. CRICK: I will give the hon. member an interest in a newspaper if he cares to accept it. I have a share in a newspaper, and if I had an enemy I should like to give it to him. In regard to this question of vested interests, I say that the proposal here is, to my mind, to take advantage of all that has been realised by the vesting of this capital for many years, as I propose to show in a few words. Mr. Robinson then goes on to say:

The services which they render to Parliament and civil government by the publication of intelligence is one of the grounds for the privilege or subsidy which they enjoy in the use of the railways and Post Office for the carriage of their newspapers free of charge.

There is a strong ground for the reason that this House should have a daily *Hansard*, that is a true record of its proceedings. The House, whether it actually does or does not, is supposed to represent the people of the country, and as we represent, or should represent, the people, we carry for the benefit of the people at large these newspapers, free of cost, to those large vested interests, one of which, we are told, makes as much as £50,000 a year out of them. If that is so, the people of the country are entitled to receive from this large institution, subsidised to such a great extent by the people, a fair and impartial report of the proceedings of those sent here to represent the country. I do not care what side the press is on, or whether a man is a free-trader or a protectionist, I cannot see how any newspaper could give what might be regarded as an impartial report of a speech that is in deadly hostility to the policy of that paper. It is hardly human nature to expect that it would.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh!

Mr. CRICK: The hon. member may say "Oh," but they are not all political philanthropists and social purists like him. Mr. Robinson goes on to say:

The disposition which they have shown to disseminate intelligence relating to the business of Parliament and of government may, perhaps, warrant the expectation that it would suit their business interests to distribute as a supplement to their own journals, the official publication contemplated; but, inasmuch as the newspapers

command practically all the avenues of appeal to the public, I would suggest that it becomes a necessary and an antecedent part of the inquiry to ascertain if one or more of the newspapers published in Sydney would accept and circulate the report.

There is the key-note of the whole thing. Is there a newspaper in the city that would for a fair remuneration undertake to report the proceedings of this House? I say that there is, and that our proceedings would better be reported than they are at present by the daily press, although I have little reason to complain of the reports of my utterances in the House by the daily press. The only complaint I have to make is that sometimes they report more than I say. On one occasion they reported me as having said some things which did not appear in *Hansard*, and it was no use denying it. They would not accept my denial. Whilst *Hansard* reported me as saying one thing, the daily press reported me as saying something entirely different. On the other hand, I contend that the publication would be largely read.

Mr. TORPY: Who would read it?

Mr. CRICK: I should say that the thinking portion of the community would read it.

Mr. TORPY: Those are just the people who would not read it!

Mr. CRICK: The hon. member says that the thinking portion of the community would be those who would not read it. I do not know how the hon. member arrives at that conclusion. I should say that a man will read according to his inclinations. A man who is politically inclined will read political works, and if you look into his library you will find there works of a political character. A man with a taste for a different kind of literature will gratify that taste.

Mr. LEVIEN: He will have John Bunyan in his library, as I have!

Mr. CRICK: You may find John Bunyan and the Bible in mine; but coming down to a weaker class of intellect, we find that some indulge in the ordinary yellow-backed novels—works which we shall not find in the hon. member's library. In his library we shall find the *Hansards* of the various parliaments throughout the world. I maintain that *Hansard* will be read by the political element in the colony, and that is proved by the fact that the working men in this colony, since they have

been in a position to get *Hansard*, have been undoubtedly the largest subscribers to it. But the publication of *Hansard* daily could be done, as I contend, at very little more cost than we incur at present. Whatever the result of the motion may be it might be well for the Government to institute some inquiries as to the terms on which some newspaper would undertake to issue a supplement containing a report of parliamentary debates from our own officers, say a circulation of 35,000 or 40,000 copies a day. And if this circulation could be obtained at a reasonable cost, then it would, in my opinion, be a good thing for Parliament to sanction the undertaking. Of course, in estimating the cost the Government would bear in mind that the newspapers at the present time enjoy the benefit of free transit through the Post Office. Half the money which we spend in postal communication, I will not say on trains, but in the matter of coaches, is a direct subsidy to the newspapers.

Mr. WRIGHT: More than half!

Mr. CRICK: I estimated it as at least one-half, because if you take the mail to any particular place, you will find that for 1 lb. of letters there will be 1 cwt. of newspapers.

An HON. MEMBER: £75,000 a year!

Mr. CRICK: That large sum is given to subsidise the newspapers. We might impose a rate on all newspapers except those circulating *Hansard*. Those circulating *Hansard* might have the advantage of being carried free through the Post Office. The matter is one well worthy of a report; and I would suggest to the hon. member for Glen Innes to take a practical course, and that would be to ask the concurrence of the hon. member for South Sydney in the withdrawal of the motion, so that both the amendment and the motion might be withdrawn, and the matter be again referred to a select committee competent to inquire into this phase of the question, as to whether we cannot establish a daily *Hansard* without a farthing of additional cost to the tax-payer. I am certain that it would be read. It is useless to say that *Hansard* is not read. If you go to the schools of arts—and in the country I have taken the opportunity of going to those institutions—you will find that the best thumbed volume in the place is the copy of *Hansard*. More than that, the

people would be in a position to form a correct estimate of their representatives. No doubt there are good men in this House who are absolutely killed or prejudiced by a partisan press. An hon. member may have made speeches as well thought out and carefully prepared as any ever delivered in this Chamber, and yet I have seen in the newspapers on the following day the bare statement that "Mr. So-and-so spoke." On the other hand, I have seen in the *Evening News* half a column of such stuff as the hon. member for Mudjee, Mr. Haynes, gives to the House every now and then.

Mr. HAYNES: That explains its large circulation!

Mr. CRICK: That may explain its large circulation, because there is a large number of people in the world who, after the turmoil of life, want a little relaxation in reading what the hon. member says. Perhaps on the same page we shall see half an inch given to the Premier, and the statement that "Mr. Reid supported the motion." That paper is very careful, not only in its reports, but also in its brevities, to give publicity to the opinions of the hon. member for Mudjee.

Mr. HAYNES: The *Wesleyan Chronicle* reports me in full!

Mr. CRICK: If the Orange Lodge had an organ, the hon. member would be cut out altogether. The *Freeman's Journal* does give him some space now and again. Other papers are the same, and, as I have said, there are many hon. members who can complain, not because they are not reported, for they may not care about that, but because they are misrepresented, and a misconception is created in the minds of their constituents of what has occurred. It may be said that they have *Hansard* to correct misrepresentation, but what hon. member can afford to purchase a thousand copies of *Hansard* to distribute amongst his constituents in order to correct every misrepresentation? If *Hansard* were issued as a supplement to a newspaper, any misrepresentation could easily be corrected. An hon. member could himself, at a small cost, buy a number of supplements and distribute them amongst his constituents if the newspaper did not circulate in his constituency. I am satisfied that without any additional cost to the taxpayer we can obtain the circulation

[*Mr. Crick.*

of a daily issue of *Hansard*. I hope that the hon. member for Glen Innes will withdraw the motion in its present crude form, and adopt the course followed before of moving that the question be referred to a select committee.

Mr. MELVILLE: If hon. members will look at this subject in its broader aspect, they will not be led away by the remarks of the hon. and learned member for Camden, Dr. Cullen. Perhaps it would have been well if the hon. and learned member had waited until he had gained a little more experience before venturing to give lessons to those who have passed through the mill. The hon. and learned member has been fortunate in that the press of the city have thought it their duty to report his speeches since he entered this Chamber, and those whom he represents have thus had an opportunity of learning how he discharges the duty which he was sent here to discharge. But other hon. members who have been here many years, myself included, have learned to their cost what it is to depend upon the reports of the newspapers. I am not going to complain or say that the newspapers have not a right to do as they like; but I claim that every hon. member, having a sacred duty to discharge, the manner in which he discharges it should be known to those he represents. My experience for nearly five years after I entered the House was that the daily press had a standing block for me, because whenever I addressed the House—and I appeal to those who have known me ever since I entered Parliament, whether I have not always endeavoured to express my views fairly and impartially—whether I spoke nonsense or common-sense there appeared in the press next morning the words, "Mr. Melville spoke," while those who replied to my arguments were reported at length. It is all very well for hon. members to smile; but I sat here as the representative of nearly 3,000 electors, who had an absolute right to know how I was discharging my duty. "But," hon. members may say, "what claim had you upon the columns of the newspaper?" If a newspaper refuses to publish any report of the proceedings of this House, then I have no claim; but if they are carried by the Government of the country free of charge I have a claim. It is only recently that a protectionist has been reported at all by

the daily press. When the hon. member for Northumberland, Mr. Fegan, makes his appearance again before his constituents, the miners, who always seek for *Hansard* to endeavour to find out what their representatives are doing —

Mr. FEGAN (*speaking from behind the bar*): He will be able to answer for himself!

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to remind hon. members that they must not speak from behind the Chair under any circumstances.

Mr. MELVILLE: Hon. member's constituents will be in a better position to judge their representatives by the issue of a daily *Hansard* than they are by the means now at their disposal. An hon. member spoke of saving the time of the House. If he will go back to the days when there was no *Hansard*, he will find that the time of the House was taken up then as much as it is now by hon. members. This talk about *Hansard* being an incentive to hon. members to make long speeches is proved by experience not to be correct, because hon. members who feel disposed to speak at length upon any subject will speak whether they are reported or not. I think I can put myself forward as a good example of that. The fact that I would not be reported by the press never deterred me from expressing my opinions. Hon. members seem to forget that those they represent expect them to express their opinions if they are capable of expressing them; and if they are not capable they should not have been sent here. Now, I am not going to find fault with the daily press. If they have been so foolish as to publish the speeches of those members whom they fancy, and to omit the speeches of those to whom they are adverse, *Hansard* affords us the means of remedying that to some extent. But to what extent are hon. members prepared to supply their constituents with a copy of *Hansard*? Are hon. members prepared to supply not only schools of arts, but every one who requires it, with *Hansard*, not that they may read only what their own representatives have said, but that they may also read what other hon. members have said, and may thus arrive at a correct conclusion as to what is going on here? It is all very well to tell us that if there were

a daily *Hansard* we should have more speeches, and the hon. member for Newcastle said that leading members of the House would rise so often that other hon. members would have no opportunity of speaking. But as the hon. member will learn if he remains here long, Mr. Speaker has given and will give a fair opportunity to every hon. member to express his opinions. But what is the position now? Let a member of the Government rise at any hour of the night or morning, no matter if it is getting towards daylight, in reply to speeches made against the Government, and every word of his speech will be reported, while the speeches to which he is replying will be suppressed. Is that fair to the electors of the country? Even if those who have spoken against the Government have made statements which are not correct, should the electors not be able to know what those statements were? In the last Parliament the leader of the Opposition made a speech against the Government, and some of its most vital points were suppressed by the press, although the Minister of the Crown who replied to it was reported verbatim. Those who read the daily press, and the hon. member for Orange, Mr. Torpy, said that the general public do not read the parliamentary speeches there — though it is a singular thing if the general public are not educated by the press, because for what other reason are the newspapers carried free?

Mr. TORPY: They do not read *Hansard*!

Mr. MELVILLE: For the simple reason that they never get it. They get certain reports, and where those reports are simply condensed, the motion, which sets forth that the press have not given a truthful report of our proceedings, is not fair to the newspapers. As to the cost of the proposal we have had a select committee to inquire into the matter, and they found that the cost would not be so great, after all was said and done. As to the abolition of *Hansard* altogether, while I have a seat in the House I shall vote against such a proposal, because I hold that there should be a correct record of the utterances of hon. members. In my political experience I have heard one thing said here and another thing said on the platform outside, and *Hansard* has proved to the public that the representative who stood on the platform and stated that he

had been faithful to his allegiance was in error. We value too lightly the giving of information to the public. If debates on matters of importance take time, and speeches are delivered upon such matters, those we represent have a right to read them, and an arrangement could be entered into with one of the leading journals of the city that if they did not publish *Hansard* themselves they would circulate it, and it would be read with just the same avidity as the reports in the press are now read. The hon. member for Orange said just now that he could place a copy of *Hansard* on the table of his club and no one would read it; but will he tell us that the members of his club will not read the reports in the newspapers every morning? It is possible to give these reports to the public, and if they are given in connection with the newspapers, where one person reads them now, a thousand will read them in the future. What will be the consequence? If speeches are recorded in *Hansard*, which have been made for the purpose of wasting time, upon whom will come the penalty? Those whom we represent outside, whose time has been wasted and whose interests have been neglected, would take care that the seats of those who have wasted the time are occupied by others in the next Parliament. If some hon. members prevent public business by talking on every conceivable subject, is it not better that we should scatter the fact broadcast to the colony? But I should like the mover of the motion to accept the amendment of the hon. member for West Macquarie.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, keep it on!

MR. MELVILLE: If he does it is very probable that the motion will be lost. If, however, he accepts the amendment he will at a future date be able to give reliable information upon which we can act. I am not going to take the course which some hon. members have taken to-night of making a special appeal to any section of the House. I have gone through the mill, and I have known what it is to struggle in the interest of those whom I represent. I shall give an instance. I had not been many months a member of the Assembly when the government of the day, near the conclusion of the session, when members had gone to their homes, suddenly became aware of the fact that they required

[*Mr. Melville.*

increased taxation, and upon a Thursday came down with additional estimates of expenditure, and a proposal to impose an export duty on wool and coal. The hon. member who thinks it his duty on all occasions to give advice to those who have not been here as long as he has would, I believe, if he had been here, have been as great a sinner as I was on that occasion. Were we to allow these proposals to go through while hon. members were at their homes, and knew nothing about them, or were we to resist the business of the Government until these hon. members could assemble? But how much of the speeches which we delivered were reported, while those who opposed us, who advocated the imposition of these duties, and who fought for them, were reported at length in the daily press? Myself and others who were struggling against the proposals, and who eventually defeated the Government, were not reported at all. The press have a right to do what they like in this matter, because the reports are made at their own expense; but while they have that right, we, as representatives of the people, have a right to establish means whereby the people can be educated in these subjects, and we can do that without hurting any one by publishing a daily *Hansard*, and giving the public the information which is their due, and which we have no right to keep from them, allowing the utterances of every hon. member, whether he be a member of the Government or the humblest member of the House, to be reported so that those whom he represents may read what he says.

MR. HAYNES: I cannot understand how any hon. member, claiming to be an able representative of the people, can, for a moment, defend this proposition. Not a single solid reason has been advanced in its favour, and I regret that the time of the House has again been wasted in the discussion of a question which has been dealt with before and rejected. The position of the hon. member in asking for the publication of a daily *Hansard* is proved to be unsound by considering for one moment what is the object of debate in this Chamber. Hon. members come into this House to debate—what for? To educate the people outside? Every speech made here must be delivered for the sole purpose of influencing the vote one way or

the other on the question before the House. Debate in this Chamber has no other reason and can have no other object. A member standing here debating a question tries to urge reasons for or against a certain question to be dealt with by the House, and debate has no concern whatever with any persons outside. The hon. member says that a daily *Hansard* should be issued for the education of the public. I say that the place to educate the public is the public platform. Parliament does not educate the public. It is merely the executive of the public. Instead of originating great reforms, it, in reality, but puts into acts of Parliament opinions which are proclaimed from one end of the country to the other. If Parliament is for the purpose of educating the public, as the hon. member alleges, then enlarge the arena of Parliament until it can hold 10,000 or 20,000 people, and let them hear the hon. member speak, and then the public will be educated.

Mr. A. HUTCHISON: Is not the press a means of educating the public?

Mr. HAYNES: Yes.

Mr. A. HUTCHISON: Then would not *Hansard* do so?

Mr. HAYNES: *Hansard* educate the public—why, it would fill the lunatic asylums! *Hansard* is maintained for the purpose of conveying to those outside the Chamber the opinions expressed within its walls, but only as a record of the proceedings. If any hon. member wishes to educate the public mind, let him go to the public platform, where, if his speeches are of any value, the press will report him. Hon. gentlemen to-night have displayed lamentable ignorance with regard to the operations of the press. The press is an institution maintained by the public, so long as it is of value. If the public demanded lengthy reports of parliamentary debates, then the paper would succeed which gave long reports. But newspaper men are able to gauge the public mind to a letter, and they see that the public require that parliamentary speeches, which are wretched torrents of bosh, should be condensed into four or five, or ten lines. If a newspaper in this city found to-morrow that the public demanded a page of parliamentary speeches, does it not stand to common-sense that it would issue that

page? But I say, as a newspaper man, that the paper would fall flat that would attempt to drench the public with a reproduction of the wretched harangues we so often hear in Parliament.

Mr. A. HUTCHISON: Such as the hon. gentleman delivers!

Mr. HAYNES: From the first day I entered Parliament until now I have delivered shorter speeches than any man who has ever stood on the floor. The hon. member for West Macquarie says that a certain newspaper reports me at length. I have often complained to myself that the newspapers have not given me full reports; but if a certain newspaper—I believe the hon. gentleman said the *Evening News*; I am not acquainted with that paper—if the *Evening News* reports me at length, and reports other gentlemen briefly, that explains the fact that the *Evening News* has a larger circulation than any other paper in Australasia; and the people who run that paper are people who know their way about. I trust that the remark made by the hon. member for West Macquarie will be availed of by all the morning papers, and that they will take action accordingly. I maintain that there is absolutely no escape from the proposition I have laid down, that debate in this Chamber is for the sole purpose of influencing the votes of hon. members.

Mr. HOUGHTON: And for advertising the *Evening News*!

Mr. HAYNES: It requires no advertisement—it is known from pole to pole.

Mr. A. HUTCHISON: On account of the hon. gentleman's contributions!

Mr. HAYNES: I only write the poetry in that paper. The hon. member for Northumberland complained of the injustice of the press in not reporting him some time ago. The answer to the hon. gentleman on that point is this: at the time to which he makes reference he was so obnoxious as a loquacious member that not the press, but the Parliament itself, put him down by the introduction of the *clôture*. I remember that at the time I entered the House three men ruled Parliament by their torrents of speech. Not the press, but Parliament itself, valuing the worthlessness of the debate, introduced the *clôture*, and put the gag on to save

itself. There is one thing that illustrates the ridiculousness of the proposal to arrange for the publication of *Hansard* by means of a newspaper. Suppose one newspaper makes an arrangement to publish *Hansard*, what about all the other papers? If the paper publishing *Hansard* has a circulation of 40,000, does that get at the public? If you attempt to do a thing of that kind you must make it general, and provide that every paper in the colony shall be furnished with *Hansard*. What is the use of a metropolitan paper getting *Hansard* if all the provincial papers are not supplied? The thing is ridiculous, and cannot stand a moment's examination; and I am surprised to hear non. gentlemen stand up and defend a proposition of the kind.

Mr. ROSE: I desire to approach this question in a rather more serious manner than it has been dealt with by the hon. member for Mudgee. I think I can detect a great principle in the motion. The hon. member for Glen Innes appeals to us tonight to say whether we shall extend the conscience of the state beyond a newspaper, or, on the other hand, whether we shall draw the line at a newspaper. Before entering upon anything of a controversial nature, I should like to refer to a few remarks made by the Premier. I am at a loss to know why he should have referred to the hon. member for Glen Innes as wasting the time of the House in introducing this motion. It is quite within my memory that if any hon. member has wasted the time of the House, it is the Premier himself—with all due respect to him—in introducing the womanhood suffrage —

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order.

Mr. ROSE: I was only referring to wasting the time of the House. As it would be out of order, I must pass to other matters. Speaking in a general sense, it all depends upon the construction you may place upon wasting time. While the Premier may consider that it is waste of time, the hon. member for Glen Innes will probably consider that it is no such thing. Considering the press to be the tribunal of public opinion, and also taking into consideration that for want of space the press is bound to condense our views, it is quite reasonable for the hon. member

for Glen Innes to bring forward this motion. In reply to the hon. member for Orange, about the outside public not reading the speeches, there is this to be considered: If the outside public have no taste for reading political speeches, it says very little indeed for their political opinions. I hold quite a contrary view. If you take the public at the various meetings, they exhibit a solid grasp of the current events of the day, and if they have not taken to *Hansard* it is simply because they have not had an opportunity of doing so. But the great principle which we have to look at is this: Why should the state carry the newspapers of private individuals through the post free, and object to send a state newspaper free? Why should the state spend so many hundreds of thousands every year in educating the masses, giving them certain elementary education, and not go one step further and send a state newspaper free? I shall have very much pleasure in voting for the motion. It is one more step in the march of progress. If we take upon ourselves the right of educating the people free, if we take upon ourselves the right of supporting commercial institutions in the shape of newspapers, then in the interests of the masses we have a right to run a newspaper; and instead of doing it on a small scale, I trust we shall see it extended. I trust to see a state newspaper which shall reach every elector. We should take the electoral roll of New South Wales and send every elector a copy of *Hansard*, to be published daily.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I shall vote for this motion if the offensive words with regard to the press are eliminated. I do not think they are called for, because the press give as much space possibly as they can afford for parliamentary reports. But the very fact that they only do that is a reason why we should issue a daily *Hansard*. The press has not room to give a fair report of the debates amongst their ordinary news. But if a daily *Hansard* were issued, and the sheets were circulated in the press, that full report would go to the people, who would then certainly get a more accurate account of what their members are doing than they obtain at present, while, at the same time, the space now devoted to parliamentary reporting in the daily newspapers would be available for current news. I am not at all im-

pressed by the somewhat cavalier fashion in which the Premier addressed himself to the motion. I think the hon. member is somewhat behind the times. I am not at all swayed by the somewhat grotesque address of the hon. member for Mudgee, Mr. Haynes. I look at it in this way: We publish a *Hansard* now. What do we do it for? Is it merely for the purpose of tripping up each other by quoting speeches made months or years ago? Or is it for the purpose of having a true and accurate record for the benefit of the public? I certainly think it is more intended for the public interest than for the interest of members of this or of the other Chamber. If we undertake the work at all, why not do so in a more systematic and comprehensive manner than we do at present? For probably the present cost we could issue a daily *Hansard* with exactly the same staff and machinery, and we could compel the daily papers to issue *Hansard* inside their own publications. At the present time we are spending tens of thousands of pounds per annum for the purpose of benefiting the private owners of newspapers.

Mr. WILLIS: That is for spreading literature!

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I venture to say that if the hon. member took in one hand the *Daily Telegraph* and the Bible in the other hand to the Post Office, he would have to pay postage on the Bible, but he would not have to pay postage on the *Daily Telegraph*. We have a somewhat inconsistent practice of allowing the daily newspapers to go post free, but the very publication which records the speeches of hon. members has to be paid for if sent through the Post Office. I would say to these newspapers, "We will carry your papers post free as at present, but only on condition that you will circulate inside of your papers the sheets of *Hansard* which will be supplied to you gratuitously."

Mr. J. F. CULLEN: They would not do it!

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: They would very soon be compelled to do it by their subscribers. If the public demanded these parliamentary reports the newspapers dare not withhold them, because if they did some one else would soon start a newspaper which would outbid them. The

port of the select committee shows that the daily *Hansard* would not involve more than the present cost. There would be the same reporters, the same machinery at the Government Printing Office, and we could print a daily *Hansard*, as they do in Queensland. If the newspapers will not circulate the *Hansard* I would treat them like any other ordinary business persons. I would say, "If you will not accommodate the state, the state will not accommodate you, and we shall only carry your papers post free on condition that you circulate this state publication." It is about time we got out of the old track. I think there is no harm in making an innovation of this character. At any rate, I see no harm in making an experiment. I, for one, shall be quite ready to support it if these objectionable words are struck out. I do not believe the newspapers designedly misreport hon. members. I believe, as far as the space at their command will allow them, they do make an effort to give a reflex of what an hon. member says: the misrepresentation is in the comments on the speeches, and that is just where the trouble comes in. If a man's speech were given in full, he could defy the misrepresentation and unfair comments made by the newspapers on his speeches. But how often when we go back for re-election are we confronted with some statement cut out twelve months before, which is itself a gross misrepresentation, and have to waste half an hour, or an hour, in explaining the misrepresentation. If one's speech were given in full, it could stand any attack of that kind. I certainly think the public would prefer to have the speeches in that way. I am not at all in touch with those who desire that the people shall not read *Hansard*. That may be the case in some electorates where the people are more dense than in other places; but I can tell the hon. member that if he ever has to travel my electorate he will very often be confronted with *Hansard*. It is a good thing for the public interest that it is so. I think if we could more often put this publication in the way of the people, it would be better appreciated. I am not going to say that everything will be read, but everything they desire to read will be read. And in addition to making use of the daily newspapers of Sydney, why should not this *Hansard* go to the

country newspapers? To the country newspapers it would be absolutely valuable. I venture to say that every proprietor of a country newspaper would be glad to avail himself of the sheets. At all events, from my knowledge of the business, I venture to say that we could produce this publication more cheaply than we can now, without inflicting loss upon any one. It may be said, "Oh, you would take away the business of the parliamentary reporters for the press." Nothing of the sort would happen, for the newspapers have to employ these reporters when Parliament is not sitting, and they would have to employ them if no parliamentary reports were given. Therefore, as I do not see how we can inflict a hardship upon anybody, as I can see that it may be carried out as cheaply as at the present time, and as I am under the impression that public good will arise from it, and a good deal of misconception and misrepresentation will be avoided, I certainly shall give my vote for the proposal.

Mr. MURPHY: If any change is to be made in the issuing of *Hansard*, I hope the change will rather be in the direction pointed out by the hon. member for South Sydney, than in the direction suggested in this motion. I think the state could not do better than have its own daily newspaper. I was very pleased to see some hon. members whom up to to-night I had looked upon as rank conservatives, advocating this change, which to me appears rather of a socialistic tendency. Not only could the columns of that newspaper be used to give governmental news, but also to give a true reflex of the proceedings of this House, and also as a medium for publishing all local, home, and foreign news. As far as it lies in the power of the Government, I think it is their absolute duty to further that course. If a departure is to be made at this time, the departure should be in that direction. If a daily *Hansard* would have the tendency of curtailing long speeches; if it would have the tendency of keeping out of future parliaments those gentlemen who indulge in lengthy and weary speeches, it might have a good effect. But a peculiar feature of the last general election was, that the gentleman who has the record of having made the longest speech in Parliament was returned at the head of the poll;

[*Mr. O'Sullivan.*

so that I do not see that the making of long speeches, even if reported in a daily *Hansard*, would tend in any way to prevent an hon. member from re-entering the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. member for Paddington, Mr. Neild, has made the shortest speech, too!

Mr. MURPHY: I have been aspiring to have that honor; but on this occasion, although probably not able to use as forcible arguments as other hon. members, I feel too deeply to express myself. I hope that, if any departure is made, it will tend more in the direction of the state acquiring one other means—which should and will yet have to be in its hands—of diffusing, not only a general knowledge of what takes place in this Chamber, but also a general and useful knowledge of what takes place in politics all over the world. For that reason, I am more inclined to support the amendment than the motion. But the loss of the amendment will not prevent me supporting the motion. It is a step, I believe, in the right direction, and, if we cannot carry the amendment, I shall think it my duty to take what I can and support the motion.

Mr. DIBBS: I think that the suggestion made by the hon. member for West Macquarie is the fairest one in this matter. I would suggest to the hon. member for Glen Innes and the hon. member for South Sydney that both the motion and the amendment be withdrawn in order to allow this question to go again before a select committee. I do not approve of the motion as it is worded; for it is no part of the business of this House to pass a resolution condemning the press. I do not think the proposal of the hon. member for South Sydney to practically publish another daily newspaper is at all suited to the object we have in view. I think sufficient time has been devoted to the discussion of this question, and that the suggestion of the hon. member for West Macquarie might well now be adopted.

Mr. WALL: I trust the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition will be adopted. If the motion goes to a division, I shall certainly vote against it in its present shape; but I do not feel justified in occupying time to explain my reasons for taking that course.

Mr. RAE: I should like to mention one thing in regard to which we can make a beneficial change as far as *Hansard* is concerned. For my part, I am not very particular whether the motion is or is not carried, although I intend to vote for it. I certainly think the House will be doing right if it reduces the charge for *Hansard*. I found upon writing for information that we have to pay £2 2s. per session for a copy of *Hansard*, independent of the copy which is issued free to hon. members. Although it may not be desirable to force *Hansard* upon the bulk of the electors of this colony, yet I certainly think that every facility should be given to those persons who want to read *Hansard*. I may say that several electors in my constituency have written to me and asked me if I could furnish them with *Hansard* regularly; but, upon making inquiry, I found that I could not do so, owing to the charge of £2 2s. per session for a copy. In New Zealand, *Hansard* is issued at the rate of 2d. per copy; and, if taken for the session, for 5s. Whether this motion is carried or not, we certainly ought to pass some resolution which would popularise *Hansard*, and lead to its distribution amongst those electors who really desire to read the debates. I shall vote for the motion, because I think it is in the interest of the truth.

AN HON. MEMBER: Which *Truth*?

Mr. RAE: I said the truth, not something which only calls itself truth. I believe it would be in the interest of truth and fair play to have *Hansard* distributed as widely as possible. It is not that I and other hon. members object to having our speeches either condensed or entirely omitted; but that we wish, when our speeches are reported, they should be reported correctly, instead of their general sense and meaning being distorted in various ways. For my part, I do not blame the reporters; I believe they do their work fairly and honestly. It is when their reports get to the newspaper offices that they are cut up, mutilated, and distorted. It is those who conduct newspapers on certain lines, and who misrepresent those who differ with them, who are to blame. I consider it is absolutely necessary, in the interests of truth and justice, that we should have some reliable daily record to which we can refer, and to which we can

also refer our constituents, in case of disputes. I intend to vote for the amendment and the motion, in the hope that if one is not carried the other may be.

Mr. A. HUTCHISON, in reply: I have listened very attentively to the speeches which have been delivered, particularly to those delivered by hon. members opposed to the motion, and I have failed to discover one tangible argument against my proposal. The best that can be said against the motion is that the publication of a daily *Hansard* would lead hon. members to parade themselves under the eyes of their constituents. I think it is scarcely honorable to attribute such motives to hon. members. I can honestly state that I had no such idea in moving the resolution. My only object was to give the people of the country greater facility for understanding the vital and important questions upon which they are called to express opinions at the general elections. The hon. member for West Sydney has stated that the motion contains a censure upon the press. I have stated, however, that I had no such intention. I admit that I have stated that it is impossible for any daily newspaper to publish a full and complete report of our proceedings, and to sell the papers at the price for which they are sold now. There are now two, even three, parties in this House representing the people, and their constituents have a perfect right to know all that transpires in the Chamber, in order that they may be able to judge whether their representatives do their duty or not. I repeat that the words I uttered in regard to the press were not intended to bear the construction which has been placed upon them. At the same time, not one hon. member who has spoken against the resolution has dared to say that the press gives correct reports of our proceedings. The hon. member for South Sydney has pointed out that the expense of publishing a daily *Hansard* will not be 1s. more than the expense of publishing *Hansard* as it is at present issued. The hon. member has also pointed out that the desired object is attained in Queensland by the expenditure of £3,828 per annum. Seeing that over £6,000 is spent on the production of *Hansard* in New South Wales, I see no reason why we should not publish a daily issue, and even if a little more money is

expended than now the people would not grudge to pay it. I have been told by some hon. members that the people do not read *Hansard*. For a very good reason. Because they do not and cannot get it. I am also told by the Premier that the resolution is a mere waste of time, but I should like to know who made the hon. gentleman a judge of what is waste of time? I have a right to give expression to my judgment on this matter, and I hold my judgment to be on a par with that of the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government. My opinions are fortified by the report of the select committee appointed some years ago to investigate this question in detail. "We have no means," said the Premier, "to sell *Hansard* if we make it a daily publication." I ask what means are at the command of the daily press for the circulation of their publications? The same means which are at the command of the daily press for the circulation of their publications at the expense of the public are at the command of the Government. All that I desire is this: that the subsidy which is given to the daily press—the means given for the circulation of newspapers—be given for the circulation of *Hansard*. I am satisfied that by that means the reports of our debates will reach the most remote parts of the colony. It has been stated by the hon. member for Newcastle, Mr. Fegan, that if a daily *Hansard* were published hon. members would speak for the sake of having their speeches reported and read by the public. I think that that is a very low object to attribute to hon. members when they rise to speak on important occasions. I believe that there is not a member of the House who rises to speak on an important question for the mere purpose of occupying time and getting a good report. If they do rise with that object they are very much deceived, because they are not reported in the daily press.

Mr. HAYNES: What is the object of debate in this Chamber?

Mr. A. HUTCHISON: The object of debate in a deliberative assembly is to elicit the truth. Owing to their isolated condition, living so far apart, the population of the interior require every possible means to be placed within their reach of enabling them to understand political questions. We have been told by the

[Mr. A. Hutchison.

hon. member for Orange that the press improves the speeches of hon. members. I have heard splendid speeches delivered in the House which were certainly not improved by the press. On looking for them in the daily papers, I have found that instead of half a column or a column of space being given to them, they received about half an inch. Does the hon. member call that fair reporting? I call it crucifying the speeches of hon. members. My object, as I said before, is not to pass a motion of censure. I do not care whether they take it as such or not; but that is not my intention. For the reasons which I have stated, it is practically impossible for the press of this country, run upon commercial lines at the expense of the people, to give a fair representation of the views of hon. members on political questions. I say emphatically that full and correct reports of the speeches are not given. I want to point out that there are thousands of pounds expended every year in the interests of the press, spent in carrying their literature from house to house and from town to town, and not a cent is paid for the benefits obtained. But if I desire to send a copy of *Hansard* to a friend I have to put on it a 2d. or 1d. stamp.

Mr. HAYNES: It is charged by weight!

Mr. A. HUTCHISON: Why not charge the newspapers by weight? I have no objection to that; but I do not see why the press should be subsidised whilst other literature is charged for by weight. From time immemorial in this country the spirit of party has been carried to such an extent that it exercises an evil influence over the country. Had we full and honest reports of our debates on free-trade and protection, free-trade would be damned and protection would be triumphant. It is such a common-sense question that people only want a ray of light to fully understand it. I appeal to the young members of the House, who constitute the third party, to vote for the motion. It is brought forward in the interests of democracy, in the true interests of the people, and I call upon every member of the third party to give it his undivided support.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the question—put. The House divided:

Ayes, 55; noes, 17; majority, 38.

## AYES.

Barbour, R.  
Bavister, T.  
Bowes, J. W.  
Brown, H. H.  
Brunker, J. N.  
Collins, C.  
Cook, J.  
Cotton, F.  
Cruickshank, G. A.  
Cullen, J. F.  
Cullen, Dr.  
Dangar, O. O.  
Davis, T. M.  
Dawson, H.  
Dibbs, G. R.  
Dickens, E. B. L.  
Donald, G.  
Ewing, T. T.  
Fegan, J. L.  
Gormly, J.  
Gould, A. J.  
Hart, J. S.  
Haynes, J.  
Holborow, W. H.  
Hoyle, H. C.  
Hutchinson, G. F.  
Jones, R.  
Kelly, A. J.

Langwell, H.  
Lee, C. A.  
Levien, R. H.  
Lonsdale, E.  
Lysaght, A.  
Marks, J.  
Melville, N.  
Morgan, J.  
Newman, H. W.  
Nicoll, B. B.  
Parkes, Sir Henry  
Perry, J.  
Ross, Dr. A.  
Schey, W. F.  
Scobie, R.  
Sharp, W. H.  
Sheldon, J.  
Smith, Bruce  
Smith, S.  
Stevenson, R.  
Suttor, F. B.  
Tonkin, J. E.  
Torpy, J.  
Williams, T. H.  
Wright, F. A.  
*Tellers,*  
Crick, W. P.  
Fuller, G. W.

## NOES.

Black, G.  
Cann, J. H.  
Clark, G. D.  
Edden, A.  
Gardiner, A.  
Grahame, W.  
Houghton, T. J.  
Hutchinson, A.  
Johnston, J.

McGowen, J. S. T.  
Murphy, W. A.  
Nicholson, J. B.  
Rae, A.  
Rose, T.  
Traill, W. H.  
*Tellers,*  
Howe, J. P.  
Willis, W. N.

## AYES.

Barbour, R.  
Bowes, J. W.  
Cann, J. H.  
Clark, G. D.  
Cook, J.  
Crick, W. P.  
Edden, A.  
Gardiner, A.  
Grahame, W.  
Houghton, T. J.  
Howe, J. P.  
Hoyle, H. C.  
Hutchinson, A.  
Johnston, J.  
Kelly, A. J.  
Langwell, H.  
Levien, R. H.

McGowen, J. S. T.  
Melville, N.  
Murphy, W. A.  
Nicholson, J. B.  
Rae, A.  
Ross, Dr.  
Schey, W. F.  
Scott, D.  
Sharp, W. H.  
Stevenson, R.  
Suttor, F. B.  
Traill, W. H.  
Williams, T. H.  
Willis, W. N.  
*Tellers,*  
Black, G.  
Rose, T.

## NOES.

Allen, A.  
Bavister, T.  
Brown, H. H.  
Brunker, J. N.  
Collins, C.  
Cotton, F.  
Cruickshank, G. A.  
Cullen, J. F.  
Cullen, Dr.  
Dangar, O. O.  
Davis, T. M.  
Dawson, H.  
Dibbs, G. R.  
Dickens, E. B. L.  
Donald, G.  
Fegan, J. L.  
Fuller, G. W.  
Gormly, J.  
Gould, A. J.  
Hart, J. S.  
Haynes, J.  
Holborow, W. H.

Hutchinson, G. F.  
Jones, R.  
Lees, S. E.  
Lonsdale, E.  
Lysaght, A.  
Marks, J.  
Morgan, J.  
Newman, H. W.  
Nicoll, B. B.  
Parkes, Sir Henry  
Perry, J.  
Scobie, R.  
Sheldon, J.  
Smith, Bruce  
Smith, S.  
Tonkin, J. E.  
Torpy, J.  
Wright, F. A.  
*Tellers,*  
Ewing, T. T.  
Lee, C. A.

Question so resolved in the negative.

## WENTWORTH ELECTORATE SUBDIVISION ACT AMENDING BILL.

Mr. CANN rose to move :

That leave be given to bring in a bill to amend the Wentworth Electorate Subdivision Act.

He said : I have no desire, in moving this motion, to interfere with the measure already before the House, and which will, perhaps, become law, but I am desirous to make an effort to give the electors whom I represent a chance of getting justice eventually, if the Government measure happens not to pass. We, in the Sturt electorate, have, I consider, been suffering a very great injustice. At the present time it is my unfortunate lot to represent something like 8,306 electors, and that number does not include many who would be entitled to vote were it not for the six months residential provision of the existing act, and who are disfranchised because they have

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. STEVENSON : I wish to move a further amendment on the motion. I think I shall be quite in order in moving that the question be referred to a select committee for consideration and report.

Mr. SPEAKER : The hon. member cannot do that now.

Question—That, inasmuch as none of the daily papers publish anything like a correct and truthful report of the debates and proceedings of Parliament, this House is of opinion it is desirable, to enable the people to fully comprehend and understand the great questions affecting their own rights, liberties and wellbeing and the future destiny of the colony, that a daily issue of *Hansard* should be published—put. The House divided :

Ayes, 33 ; noes, 41 ; majority, 8.

to move from one part of the colony to another. I wish to have an opportunity to give the electors what they desire, supposing the Government measure comes to grief, so that they shall not be situated in the future as they have been situated in the past. At the last general election there were sufficient electors in the district to entitle them to return more than one representative under the expansive sections of the present act, and the number has considerably increased since. Although those electors have been repeatedly promised an increased representation, they find themselves to-day in precisely the same position as they were something like three years ago. View it from what aspect you like—whether as representing a large amount of capital or as representing a very large industry—the Sturt electorate commends itself for more consideration than it has had hitherto. It has very great climatic disadvantages also, occasioning a scarcity of water there, and the Government should, I think, take some means to increase its representation.

Mr. CRICK : There is no one opposing the motion !

Mr. CANN : I am very sorry to inform the hon. member that, although it was known that I intended to move the motion merely to enable me to bring in the bill, it was objected to this evening. Perhaps the hon. member was not in the House at the time.

An HON. MEMBER : That was only a formal motion !

Mr. CANN : I do not wish to take up the time of the House in repeating what is not necessary. I believe that we have had too much repetition of fine phrases already, and too little real business. If the Government give the Sturt electorate fair representation, my object will be satisfied ; but if their measure does not pass I hope hon. members will give me an opportunity to pass my bill before the House goes to the country again.

Question proposed.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH : The Government do not intend to offer any opposition to the hon. member in the step he proposes to take regarding this bill. But in not objecting the Government do not wish to be understood as encouraging the hon. member in what must be characterised as piecemeal legislation ; because hon. members will see

[Mr. Cann.

at once from the title of this bill that it proposes to do something which will be more comprehensively dealt with in the Electoral Bill now before the House, and which it is to be hoped a few weeks will see made the law of the country. The hon. member must know that even after this preliminary step is taken a number of other stages have to be gone through, and many months will perhaps elapse before he can hope to see this product of his upon the statute-book, and it is for him to consider if it is worth while proceeding with the bill, and taking a large amount of trouble in carrying it through its many stages, when it seems almost inevitable that the Electoral Bill now before the House will become law long before the hon. gentleman can hope to pass his measure. But if the hon. gentleman desires to go on with it the Government will certainly offer no opposition at this stage, and the future will depend on the provisions which the bill contains.

Mr. DICKENS : Being well acquainted with the circumstances of this case, and with the district concerned, I sympathise very much with the hon. member for Sturt in the position he occupies in the House, representing as he does an electorate with a population of something like 25,000 people, and I recognise that Broken Hill requires increased representation. But I agree with the remarks of the Colonial Treasurer in reference to the bill introduced by the Government dealing with the whole question of representation, and I would advise my hon. friend to withdraw his motion at the present time, assuring him that I am perfectly in sympathy with his object, and if the measure of the Government does not meet with the views of his constituents he can rely on my support in seeing that his electorate has justice done to it.

Mr. GORMLY : The hon. member for Sturt has my sympathy in the introduction of this bill, and I have no doubt that when it comes before the House it will have my support. The hon. member, however, must be aware of the danger of introducing bills of this nature. When a former bill, dealing with the electorate of Wentworth, was introduced by a private member, it was very defective in its provisions, or otherwise, when the general election took place, the Sturt electorate

would have been entitled to larger representation under the expansive provisions of the Electoral Act. Although the Government have promised to introduce a bill to divide the colony into single electorates—and I think that system a very desirable one—we have no assurance that the measure will become law; and I trust that the hon. member for Sturt, in introducing his bill, will avoid the defects of the former measure.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

#### MARBLE REQUIRED FOR PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. HOYLE rose to move:

(1.) That, in the opinion of this House, all marble required for the public works shall be the product of the colony.

(2.) That the foregoing resolution be communicated by address to his Excellency the Governor.

He said: In moving this motion I desire to endeavour in some way to develop the natural resources of the colony. We hear a great deal from time to time about the natural wealth of Australia; but it has often struck me that it is of little use having great national wealth unless we make that wealth a marketable commodity. I have looked upon our mineral wealth much in the same way as one looks at a nice toy in a glass case. It is a very good thing to talk about, but what earthly use is the mineral wealth of this country unless we make it a marketable commodity? In reference to marble I find on inquiry that an industry has been started in the colony for the production not only of tiling, which is about the only use to which our marble has been put up to the present time; but, with the encouragement of the state, an industry has been started capable of turning out any description of ornamental marble required for our great state buildings. With the imperfect machinery and plant now available, and under the disadvantages which the industry suffers in its present stage, I can guarantee that if the state will give the encouragement I ask to-night, we can produce marble for our public buildings at a very slight increase upon the cost of the foreign article. A short time ago a contract was let for tiling the Lands Office with colonial marble, and I may say that it was distinctly specified that colonial

marble should be used in the construction of that building. But what did we find? As soon as a man had spent £2,000 in developing marble quarries at Caloola, the persons interested in the importation of marble saw that the colonial industry was likely to interfere with their trade, and finding that the man who started the industry was getting into difficulties, they closed on him, and compelled him to assign his estate. If he had been allowed to carry on his contract at the Lands Office he would have been able to produce a tiling suitable for the public buildings if not at a cheaper price, at any rate as cheap as the imported article, because he was at the point of perfecting his machinery for the production of the tiling. But in the case of ornamental marble, of an architectural design, they are able in this colony, with their imperfect plant, to produce anything equal to what can be brought from a foreign country. I claim the votes of hon. gentlemen who directly represent labour in this House, as I do, because this is one of the planks of the labour platform: that the requirements of the state shall be manufactured in the colony. I do not move the resolution with any desire to raise the free-trade or protection cry. I raise it as a question of state socialism only. I claim the votes of the friends of labour who desire to relieve at least some countries from the sweating system. Nearly the whole of the marble of the tiling description produced in foreign countries is produced under the most abject system of sweating. In Italy this marble is got by whole families—fathers, mothers, daughters, and sons are all engaged in this industry; and the whole family can only earn, and very often not earn, enough to keep body and soul together. Yet we, in this colony, are asked to establish industries and develop our natural resources in competition with the sweating system in other lands. Therefore, I ask the House not to deal with this question on the basis of free-trade or protection, but upon the broad basis of doing something to establish an industry in the colony which will develop its natural wealth, and so aid to put a stop to the importation of an article obtained in foreign countries by a system of sweating children and women. I do not see that there is any necessity to spin out my arguments much further, because

there are many other hon. members who have business on the paper. I will merely say, in conclusion, that the marble, in the working of which skill and art are required, can be produced as cheaply in the colony as it can be imported from foreign countries. In the first place, the item of insurance alone is very large in connection with the imported article, because there is an extraordinary amount of breakage. I now leave the question in the hands of the House, claiming the votes of my hon. friends who represent labour.

Question proposed.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH : I have no doubt that a number of hon. members will think fit to speak upon this motion, and I should not have intervened at this early stage, were it not that I am in a position to put facts before hon. members which will take the logical ground from under the feet of the hon. member who has moved the motion. He concluded his remarks by telling the House that marble can be produced as cheaply in this country as in any part of the world. The best test of what can be done is obtained by asking people to do it. It is a fact that in the case of the Lands Department building, over which this question arose, tenders were actually called for in the colonies, giving the contractor the option of supplying either the colonial article or the imported article. In that case the hon. member for Redfern has stated that there was a sort of conspiracy among the importers. He did not use those words, but he said that the importers combined together to shut up the works of the colonial maker. I take upon myself the responsibility of having altered the specification of that particular building from colonial marble to imported marble. It happened that in drawing up the specifications, an officer of the Colonial Architect's Department had introduced the stipulation that colonial marble should be provided for this particular work. But in the contract it was optional for the Public Works Department to take either the colonial or the imported article. My attention was drawn to it, not by any designing body of importers, but by the hon. member for Mudgee, Mr. Haynes, who asked me whether I was aware that the specifications stipulated for the colonial article, and whether I was aware what the difference in cost would

[Mr. Hoyle.

be. I looked at the specifications, and I found that this had been stipulated for. I at once asked upon what authority that stipulation had been made, and the only satisfactory answer I could get was that an officer in the Colonial Architect's Department was of opinion that it would foster native industry, and therefore he put it into the specification. I instructed that officer in future to be good enough to confine himself to his duties as architect, and not to deal with politics when preparing specifications for public buildings. I took the precaution to ask the Government Architect to ascertain what difference there would be in the cost of the marble, if the contractor supplied the imported article, and I was very much surprised by the figures placed before me. In order to put the colonial made article into this building we should have had to pay the sum of £5,850. By taking the Pyrenees marble, it was done for £2,850, so that there was a difference of £3,000 on a job of £5,850. I have met a great many protectionists in my life, but I have never found a protectionist yet who carried his doctrines to the extent of imposing a duty of about 125 per cent. I am quite sure that no protectionist in this House, even of the most rabid type, would contend that we should pay a bonus of £3,000 to any particular industry to help it on to its feet in carrying out an object which was to cost £2,850. That would have been the effect in this particular case.

Mr. CRICK : Where was the marble to come from ?

Mr. BRUCE SMITH : I cannot tell the hon. member.

AN HON. MEMBER : From Caloola !

Mr. BRUCE SMITH : At all events, the contractors had undertaken to put colonial marble in, and we may depend upon it that they would have got it where it could be got cheapest. The hon. member has used an argument which we have heard very frequently used by protectionists. I do not want, and I am sure the House does not want, to find itself plunged into a fiscal argument ; this is not the time for a fiscal argument, and it is such a big subject that I always hesitate to approach it, because once you enter upon it everybody wants to have the last word, and it means not a night's, but a week's debate. I think it will be admitted that I have

sufficiently proved to the House the great difference which this country would have to pay if it adopted the course which the hon. member has suggested. The hon. member has availed himself of that very old and, I think, hackneyed argument, that it would give employment to the people. But he forgets that by saving the £3,000 we were able to spend £3,000 more upon public works, and of a character to which our country is better adapted, because in spending that money on free-trade principles we shall put the country into competition with others, and we shall by that means get £3,000 worth of work in which we can compete with the whole world.

Mr. A. HUTCHISON: But the money will go out of the country!

Mr. BRUCE SMITH: In one case we should have sent £2,800 out of the country; in the other case, we should have spent £5,800 in the country.

Mr. A. HUTCHISON: We should have kept it all here!

Mr. BRUCE SMITH: Perhaps the hon. member will keep his elementary economics for another occasion. Everybody knows that when we send money out of the country we get something for it. We know very well that if we did not send it out of the country and get something for it, we should have to employ people in producing that locally which we get in exchange, and if we employ people in producing that article, we are just doing the same thing as if we sent out of the country the money which it costs.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: The hon. member is inviting a very long debate!

Mr. BRUCE SMITH: I have already said that I do not wish to be plunged into a fiscal debate, for that is a thing I am sick of. The principal arguments of the hon. member for Redfern were—first, that the marble could be produced as cheaply in this country as in Europe, and secondly, that it would have the effect of giving more employment to people. I think I have shown, as far as the cost is concerned, that it would have amounted to a subsidy of £3,000 to an individual at the expense of the whole community; that it would not have given more labour to the people, because where you have not an unlimited sum, if you can save £3,000, you have that money to spend on public works, so that the labour will be given in other

ways without giving £3,000 away, where probably no good results can come from it. Now, the hon. member talked of national wealth and natural resources. I think it would be very inopportune and undesirable that I should deal with abstract subjects of that kind, because it would be plunging into the fiscal question. He also spoke of the conspiracy amongst the importers. I think I have disposed of that by telling the House that I never had an importer approach me in any way. I cannot, of course, look through the specifications of every public building.

Mr. HOYLE: I did not say they approached the hon. member; I said they approached the man who had the marble quarry!

Mr. BRUCE SMITH: I want the House to know that no importer's influence was brought to bear upon the department. My attention was drawn to the matter by accident, and I was very glad that it was so drawn, because, quite apart from my faith as a free-trader, even as a protectionist I should not have felt myself justified in practically imposing a duty of about 125 per cent. on the imported article in order to give encouragement to the local article. Well, that part of the case is also disposed of. Then the hon. member said that he claimed the labour vote. I hope the gentlemen to whom he thus appealed will admit that the case I put to the House is a very reasonable one. I am quite aware that some of the gentlemen to whom he appealed have protectionist sympathies. But I ask them whether they would assent to a doctrine of this kind, in which we are asked, even as protectionists, to give an unlimited subsidy so long as you get the thing produced in the country?—because we shall be driven to this logical result: that if we should be justified, even as protectionists, in giving £5,850 for an article which we can obtain for £2,850, it means that for the money which we are in the habit of expending under our free-trade policy, we should just get half of what we now get. I think it is generally admitted that we have not as much money to spend—and I am not speaking of the present year alone—as we should like to have. And if we are going to practically adopt a policy such as the hon. member recommends, of giving twice as much for the article produced locally as

we can get it imported for, it means that we shall have to cut down our supply of imported articles to one-half of what we have at present. Therefore, notwithstanding the hon. member's appeal to the labour party, I put it to them, that no greater amount of labour would be given by adopting the course he suggests than by the course which I had determined upon so long as I was in that department, because £3,000 would have been spent on additional work giving just the same amount of labour. Well, to those hon. gentlemen who are strong on the subject of protection, I put it to them, that it would mean a *reductio ad absurdum* of protectionist views to take an article at a price which would be equal to a bounty of 125 per cent. to the manufacturer. I shall not deal at any greater length with the question, except to quote one or two statements which the Colonial Architect has made in a report which I asked him for in anticipation of this debate. He says:

A similar change has also been made at the Central Police-station now in course of erection, and a considerable sum has also been saved, and at no expense to the finish of the building; a curious fact was mentioned in connection with this matter, namely, that the contractors were prepared to send colonial marble to Belgium to be manufactured into the tiles at a reduction of 38 per cent. upon contract price, thus showing clearly that the present appliances for handling this material in the colony are insufficient and inadequate for commercial purposes.

Mr. F. B. SUTTON: Give them the appliances!

Mr. BRUCE SMITH: The hon. member knows that if we are going to attempt to start every industry by supplying appliances, buildings, educated labour, and so forth, we might be starting every man in the community. Under free-trade we look to every man to start that industry which will stand upon its own feet—to start it on its own merits without coming to the Government for assistance. I take it that, if you once begin a system of helping a man to get appliances, there is no limit to the point at which you may stop. The student of law might come to the Government and say, "I regard legal education as the appliance by which I can earn my living, and I require the Government to give me that appliance."

AN HON. MEMBER: And he gets it!

[Mr. Bruce Smith.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH: He does not get it at the expense of the state. I can only say that I had a legal education, and I did not get a penny from the state to aid me. I do not know of any man who has been fortunate enough to get the state to pay for his education, be it in law, medicine, or even in divinity. The Government Architect continues:

The tiling of corridors of the Medical School, Sydney University, is unfortunately a telling instance of the difficulties attached to the use of colonial marble. Here the original contractor filed his petition of insolvency, and his sureties, who are carrying out the work, assure me—and I have no reason to doubt their word—that the tiling for which they are receiving about £3 per yard is costing them £6, and that they have the utmost difficulty in obtaining it. I find that the time penalties on the contract amount to £2,600 to date, though I am of opinion the sureties have done all that reasonable men can do to keep their engagement.

Colonial tiling costing 60s. per yard, if procurable, is equal to imported marble at from 25s. to 30s., and which can be laid at a day's notice.

I leave the House to determine the matter; but I am quite sure, without referring to those gentlemen who have free-trade proclivities, that even those gentlemen who have protectionist proclivities will not carry their doctrine to the extent of advocating that we should practically pay a subsidy of 100 per cent. for the manufacture of any article which we use in our Government buildings, whilst we require so much to be done in this country, and have really so little money to spare upon doing it.

Mr. TORPY: I do not wish to treat this question as one of free-trade or protection. In the district I represent we have, at a place called Caloola, so I am informed by an expert, the finest marble in the whole of Australia. I have paid a visit to the quarry, and I have found an outcrop a quarter of a mile long, and 300 or 400 yards wide, of as fine a marble as can be obtained in any part of the world. This marble is grained, and is of a beautiful pink tint. It is also of a red and cream colour, and it possesses the best qualities of the finest marble. It is capable of the highest polish, and it can be found in enormous quantities. Pillars of any size can be quarried from it. I am satisfied that the marble could not be polished or dressed at the same rate as the imported article. I think, however,

that a bonus might be given by the Government to stimulate the industry. It is all very well to say, "You must not stimulate any industry"; but how has the beet industry of France been stimulated? By bonuses. How has the growth of sugar in this country been maintained? By protection; and the effect has been to reduce the price of sugar, instead of increasing it. Ten years ago sugar was worth £35 a ton on the market, and under protection the price has been reduced to £25 or £26. I think the Government might well do something towards stimulating the production, and the dressing and shaping of marble. The marble of the quarry I have mentioned would make magnificent tiling; it is fit for table-tops, and for sculpture of every kind. The quarry is situated about 3 miles from a railway-station. If a tram-line were laid down, and freight were reduced, the marble could, I believe, be landed in Sydney at a very small advance on the price of the imported article. The expert to whom I have referred told me that this quarry, in France, or Italy, would be worth £1,000,000, and here it is lying utterly useless. I contend that we should stimulate our young men in the arts of architecture and sculpture; that we should teach them to convert marble into articles of beauty. I trust the motion will be carried, and that the Government will be induced to give a bonus to any man who will produce a certain value of marble in the shape of tiles, pillars, or statuary.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I do not see why, with all due respect to the Colonial Treasurer, if we are now diverting the trade of the country districts to Sydney at the expense of the state, we should not give a little encouragement in the same way to an industry of this character. If we have reduced the freight upon wire netting, in order to accommodate the squatters in the back portions of the country, I do not see why the same encouragement should not be given to the marble industry? I do not desire to raise the old question of free-trade and protection. If I did, I do not think I should have much trouble in controverting the arguments of the Colonial Treasurer. It appears to me, however, that the time has come in New South Wales when, under one name or the other, we ought to do something to develop the

resources of the country. Are they to lie here for centuries undeveloped, whilst there are men able and willing to work them if they only receive fair encouragement? Are we to neglect them, and at the same time import shipments of the very articles we ourselves can supply? I think the Colonial Treasurer revealed a little too much when he read the extract from the letter of the Colonial Architect. He told us—or implied by the extract which he read—that we could produce the marble cheaply enough, but it was simply the manipulation which made it so costly. He told us that if we sent the marble to Belgium and had it dressed and worked there, we might receive it here at very little above the cost of the imported article. If that can be done, I do not see why we should not, at all events, open the door now to some enterprising person to develop the marble, and, if necessary, import Belgian workmen to dress it. I hope that those who have been elected on a platform containing this plank, amongst others, will stand true to their platform notwithstanding the sophistical speech of the Colonial Treasurer.

Mr. DONALD: I may state one or two facts in regard to the encouragement of the marble industry with which most members are not acquainted. Colonial marble is very much harder than the Italian marble, and the Italian marble is worked by masons whose pay is 10d. per day; but the wages of masons in this colony is 10s. a day.

Mr. TOOMEY: Does the hon. member want to bring our masons down to that level?

Mr. DONALD: I do not want to bring them down to that level. At 10s. a day here it would cost £5 to work a piece of marble which could be worked in Italy at 10d. a day for £2, the colonial stone being so much harder than the Italian. I do not know whether or not it is owing to exposure, but all our colonial marbles have been found to have that defect. Mr. John Young, while building the Post Office, established a saw-mill at Woolloomooloo, and tried all the marble procurable in the country, but after working it for a year or two he found that it was a failure. Of course our friends will tell us that he had to compete with the imported article. If we could not

import the foreign article the result would be that private persons, and even the Government, would not be able to afford to use the colonial marble in public works, because it would be so expensive. The cost would be almost prohibitory, and the colonial marble is not so good as the Italian. If the marble from the quarry referred to by the hon. member for Orange is equal to any in the world, I think it could be cut even at the rates at present ruling in New South Wales for export, because the finest Carrara marble brings such a high price in England that it would pay to take marble from here if the alleged quantities and qualities exist.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the expense?

MR. DONALD: The expense of getting the marble roughly would amount to very little, because marble can be sawn out in blocks of any length by machinery at a very small expense. The machinery required to do it would not be very expensive. The expensiveness of marble when finished is caused by the great cost of labour.

MR. CRICK: The hon. member would not have the price of labour brought down!

MR. DONALD: It has been stated that women and children work in the marble industry in Italy. Well, they are no worse off than the women and children who work in the woollen factories of Victoria.

MR. BARBOUR: Two blacks do not make one white!

MR. DONALD: I consider that the marble industry is about the worst that could have been brought forward for Government encouragement. I shall vote against the motion.

MR. GORMLY: I am of opinion that we should give all the encouragement that we can to the development of our natural resources. We have a network of railways, extending over a great portion of the interior of the colony, and if we expect those railways to pay we must not have everything that we require brought in large vessels from abroad, whilst our railways are carrying nothing. If we are to accept the arguments of the Colonial Treasurer, we should be discouraged if, on sinking a shaft we get an ounce of gold, which has cost more to obtain than its intrinsic value. But should we not rather

continue until we have had a fair chance to develop the industry? I contend that the argument of the Colonial Treasurer should not sway us altogether in this matter. We have given subsidies to mail steamship companies; but do we not know that they bring a variety of things into the country, and what is that but giving protection to the vessels, while we are letting our railways go into comparative disuse? The trucks are carrying imported articles into the interior, but returning empty. I am not in favour of that sort of thing. I think we should persevere in our efforts to develop the marble industry. Although we may up to the present have failed to bring our marble down to the price of the imported article, we ought to see what can be done by bringing marble to Sydney for use in our public works. We have been told by the hon. member for Hartley that one reason why our marble cannot be used is that it is very hard; but if it is harder than any other marble it is likely to be more durable, and if it is to be made into tiles there will be a greater amount of wear in them. It will probably be found that the hardness of the marble will be one of its chief recommendations. We have been told that our marble cannot be manufactured here because marble is shaped in other parts of the world by cheap labour. I am not one of those who think that we should carry the question of cheap labour to its ultimate conclusion, because if we did we might say and expect that by subsidising mail steamships we shall bring our workmen down to the level of Chinamen. That is not what I wish to see. I wish to see industries encouraged, and the people receiving good wages. I think that the hon. member for Redfern was justified in bringing the motion forward. We ought to encourage local production as far as we are able. We must remember that we are encouraging a great deal of production at the present time. Have not large sums of money been voted to encourage the mining industry? Is not a very large bonus given to subsidise mining for gold? Are we not giving subsidies now to encourage our agricultural industry? As I am one of those who have always supported subsidies to agricultural societies, I think that that industry should not be the only one which we should encourage? We should endeavor

[Mr. Donald.]

favour to mete out fair play to all the industries that are likely to be developed in the country, and, therefore, when we give bonuses to steamship companies to carry an imported article to our shores, we are justified in making some sacrifice to develop our marble quarries. Although at first the attempt may be a failure, if we persist we may in time find that we are able to produce a good article as cheaply as we can import it. I would certainly give preference and encouragement to our own industries and productions, and I shall therefore support the motion.

Mr. WALL : I did not feel inclined to vote for the motion, but the speech of the Colonial Treasurer has certainly changed the course of action which I intended to take. He set out by stating that in the particular case to which he referred the country effected a saving of £3,000, and continuing his remarks he proved incontrovertibly that by an expenditure of 30 per cent. the colonial product could be sent to Italy, manufactured, and returned here again. Well, if an industry can be established by a 30 per cent. expenditure, I do not think it is too great a stretch of imagination for the hon. gentleman to suppose that the protectionists are inclined to vote for a proposal of the kind. The hon. gentleman showed us that the reason why marble could not be manufactured here was the lack of machinery; but if the persons who own marble quarries received any encouragement I have not the slightest doubt that they would introduce machinery which would enable them to manufacture the marble at a less rate than 30 per cent. But taking the figures quoted by the hon. gentleman, if all the marble required for Government buildings could be manufactured at an advance of 30 per cent., it would give employment to the people and create a purchasing power for them such as has been referred to by the hon. gentleman. This would be laying the foundation of the system of state socialism, of which a great many hon. members are in favour. The hon. member for Hartley referred to the quality of colonial marble, and stated that he intended to give the House some information of which they were not possessed; but I profess to know a little about the quality of marble, and I venture to say that the statement given utterance to by the hon. member will not be supported by

any one who has a knowledge of colonial marble. Our marble is neither so hard nor is its quality so inferior to the quality of the Italian marble as was stated by the hon. gentleman. There is virtually no difference whatever in their quality. So much is this the case that the Colonial Architect preferred the colonial marble, if it could be manufactured at the same price; and I venture to say that he has as great a knowledge of its quality as has any hon. gentleman present. But the case is this: We can give employment to a vast number of people, and lay the foundation of the system of state socialism by an imposition of 30 per cent., and this in the initiatory stage of the industry. When the cheap machinery which is requisite for the development of the industry is obtained, the marble will be manufactured for much less than 30 per cent. One thing is evident—that we shall never have that machinery here unless we make a start. This marble is not confined to one particular locality, but exists throughout the length and breadth of the colony, and it only requires the genius of legislation applied in this direction as an encouragement in the initiatory stage, to lay the foundation of an industry which will give employment to a vast number of people. In the particular instance referred to by the Secretary for Public Works, a saving might have been effected; but what were the circumstances of the case? It was utterly impossible at the time to obtain colonial marble. The owner of the only marble quarry that was working at the time was in difficulties; his affairs were wound up, and marble could not be produced at any price. The contractors found themselves in this position: that it would cost them £2,000 or £3,000 to take over the machinery and get the marble manufactured. Had the contract been let when the quarry was open, I venture to say there would have been a saving of £1,000. I shall certainly vote for the resolution. An hon. gentleman has stated that the stone can be sent to Italy and brought back for 30 per cent. in advance of the cost of the imported article, and if the machinery were in the colony I venture to say that the article could be produced for less than an advance of 30 per cent. If this encouragement were offered, sufficient marble would be used in connection with

our state buildings to induce persons to import machinery for the purpose of developing the many quarries that exist in various parts of the country.

Mr. MELVILLE: I trust hon. members will be possessed of sufficient patriotism, apart from any predilections they may have in regard to free-trade, to carry this resolution. Surely if nature has provided us with a product there must be something radically wrong when Parliament refuses to allow that product to be used in our public works. No one will deny the durability and good quality of the marble. As to the remarks about the cheap price for which the marble can be worked in Italy, and the employment of females in Victoria, they show the extent to which people will allow their prejudices to carry them. The hon. member for Newton, Mr. Cotton, should be aware that women and children are better paid in Victoria than they are in New South Wales. The hon. gentleman says that Italians are working for 10d. a day, while, as a matter of fact, they are getting 2s. 6d. a day. We have been severely rebuked in a peculiar way for our action in regard to this colonial industry. When we refused to develop the marble quarries on the ground that we could get a cheaper article in Italy, there actually arose out of one of the quarries a "marble man" to rebuke us. He came forth to demonstrate that marble could be produced here quite as good in quality as that from any other part of the world. Free-trade has produced in this country the occupants of our domains, with their starving wives and children. Free-trade has given us a number of people whose souls do not take them above the price of their boots, and who would crush every industry they could and scatter it broadcast. What about colonial tweed? At the present moment there are fewer tweed factories in New South Wales than there were twenty-five years ago. The hon. member who introduced this resolution ought to be ashamed to ask Parliament to assist production in New South Wales. It is a shame even to make such a suggestion. It is said we cannot even make bricks; that we ought to import bricks and everything else—that nothing ought to be made in the colony. I can show the hon. member tweed made in Sydney equal to any he can produce, and yet it is said that

[*Mr. Wall.*

tweed cannot be manufactured here. Then, again, we must not produce marbles for our little boys to play with, and there are a number of gentlemen who tell us that the Italians work for 10d. a day, and until we can get our people to work for 9d. we cannot utilise our marble quarries. These are the individuals who would pose before the country as philanthropists and statesmen. They would ignore what even nature has given us—ignore everything, and only keep a free port. Let the hon. member withdraw the resolution. Why should our own marble be used in our great public buildings? Why should our people be employed? Send to Italy, and let the Italians do the work. Let our money go to pay the taxes of that country, and let our people sleep in the domains and on the racecourses. Why should they have employment? Such a thing is an outrage upon free-trade. It is a disgrace that such a proposition should be made. Why not pursue the course which has been pursued for years past? Our public buildings are not to be adorned with our own marble, and the boast of Great Britain, that our people are capable of following the artistic professions, is to be ignored. I shall be told that this resolution would bring about monopoly. What about the monopoly of the merchants, and what about those who raise the cry about a land-tax to deceive the workmen of New South Wales by telling them that there is to be taxation on nothing except land, while they are starving? I enter my protest against what has degraded one of the finest nations on God's earth. The hon. member for Redfern has committed a crime by asking that our own marble should be used in our public buildings. Before that is done, the hon. member for Hartley will be able to pride himself upon Australian workmen who can work as well as Italians for 10d. per day.

Mr. RAE: I am prepared to move an amendment, because I believe in protection when it protects. I have listened to the hon. member for Northumberland, who has been pleading the cause of those who have neither money nor marbles, and who are not likely to get any if this motion be carried. I, for one, do not take much notice of the advocacy of this motion by the hon. member for Orange. Probably he has a little quarry of his own. I would fully concur with this motion if there was

any likelihood of its benefiting the great mass of the people; but from what I have seen and heard, and from the conditions under which I have lived in protected colonies, I have not found the workers any more prosperous in those colonies than they are in the free-trade colony, or the so-called free trade colony, of New South Wales. In either one or the other you will find monopoly. I move as an amendment:

That the following words be inserted after the word "colony":—"obtained from quarries owned and worked by the state."

That, of course, would be a measure of state socialism. If we are going to have protection, let us have protection that will protect all round, and not protect a small minority to the detriment of the greatest number. I believe it is quite practicable to produce marble in this colony cheaper even than it is in those underpaid countries we hear so much about; but not while you pay heavy royalties to some one who does nothing towards developing the quarry, and who supplies neither work nor money. My amendment will go in the direction of the state owning the quarries, and then, if you think fit to prohibit the importation of marble for private or public purposes, I should advocate that course. But I do not believe in building up a monopoly for a particular section of the community at the expense of the great majority. Believing in equal rights for all, I think this would be a good move. The only argument with which I have been met is that the state does not own these quarries.

Mr. TORPY: The quarry belongs to the state!

Mr. RAE: Then that exactly meets my motion. I hope the state will continue to hold the quarry. No matter how exorbitant the price may be, the money will go back to the community through the Government. We have a plank in the labour platform for extending the functions of the state as an employer, so that, taking the labour platform as a whole, it goes in the direction of socialism. Notwithstanding the bad language used towards socialism, I have been for many years a socialist. In the name of all that is good, and that will help to really assist the struggling industries of this country, let the state continue to hold these quarries,

and not allow the private monopolist to gain a fortune by sweating the people of this or any other country.

Mr. GARVAN: If the question of free-trade and protection were removed from the consideration of this question, I think the good sense of the House would almost unanimously support the principle of the motion. Marble produced in the colony labours under no natural difficulty or disability. It is absolutely and entirely the product of labour, and almost every shilling which would be expended in producing and using it in any public building would be paid in wages to Australians. The objection is that if you pay the wage to Australians—and only a fair wage—the cost of the marble under those conditions would be greater than the cost of the imported article, because the latter article would be produced by labour so much cheaper that Australian labour could not afford to compete with it. Remove at once, for one moment, the consideration of the fiscal issue, and I hold that the motion will commend itself to the patriotism of every hon. member. If the fact that we can import marble cheaper is to be an argument for using imported marble as against colonial marble, so it might be argued that we could run the railways at much cheaper wages than we now pay. If the principle of using that which we can use cheapest were to prevail universally in the country, then I say almost in every grade of the management of our great railway system we could import from Europe every man we required under a year's or three years', or five years' engagement, for, at least, 30 per cent. less than we now pay for labour. But would any hon. member contend that it would be a safe or wise thing to import that labour, and throw Australians out of employment? No hon. member would put forward such a proposal as that. Where the natural conditions are favourable to the production of an article, as in the production of marble; where no cost has to be paid to the owner of the land, the state, which owns thousands of acres of marble land; where every shilling paid for the production of the marble must find its way back in wages to Australians; where a number of Australians are out of employment, I say that no proposition would be sounder than that Australian labour should be em-

ployed in the production of that which is so commonly used, and could be more advantageously used. I should like to see the question dealt with distinct from the fiscal issue, and I think the amendment can be fairly accepted, for the motion only speaks of the use of marble in the public buildings. What is more reasonable than that the state should quarry the marble for state buildings?

Mr. CRICK: And work it!

Mr. GARVAN: Unquestionably, work it. Let the state own the quarry, and let it pay the wages for the production of the marble. Not one shilling would go to the middleman or the capitalist; every shilling would go into the most legitimate channels in which wages can go—into the pockets of Australian labour. I can fairly commend the amendment to the House, even more so than the original motion. If there were any doubt in my mind at all the amendment would remove it. I would suggest that the hon. member for Redfern should accept the amendment. I am quite sure that if hon. members will divest their minds for one moment of the great dividing line between the two parties, the good sense and real patriotism embodied in the motion and the amendment must commend itself to the House.

Mr. LONSDALE: The hon. member for Eden has said that if the amendment is carried all the wages will go into the pockets of the quarrymen. But where will the money come from to pay those men?

An HON. MEMBER: From the wealth they produce!

Mr. GARVAN: Where do the wages come from which are paid to the producers of the marble now?

Mr. LONSDALE: The wealth must be taken from somebody else to pay the producers of the marble. It has been stated plainly that marble which cost £2,850, landed here from Italy and put in the building, would have cost £5,850 if it had been produced in the colony. It follows clearly that the £3,000 must have been taken from somebody. It is not found as we find sand; nor is it found growing on trees. It must have been taken from those who produced that wealth in other ways. It must have been taken out of the general taxation in order to keep a certain number of men employed. It is just another way of keeping

[Mr. Garvan.

the men employed at the expense of the state. We are told that if we send the marble to Belgium, and bring it back here manufactured, it will cost 30 per cent. more than the imported article. But then the wages are paid not to our workers, but to the Belgian workers, so that there is no advantage in that case, while in the other you have to pay 120 per cent. extra for your protected industry.

Mr. RAE: It will not cost that if the state owns it!

Mr. LONSDALE: It is no use making that interjection. I say it will cost more. We know that men do not exert themselves for the state as they do for private employers. We know about the Government stroke; and when these things are carried out by the Government the public have to pay far more than is paid by contractors.

Mr. EDDEN: Getsomebody to stand over them with a whip, and make them work!

Mr. LONSDALE: I have no such desire; I only desire to put the true aspect of the case before the House.

Mr. RAE: According to the hon. member's opinion!

Mr. LONSDALE: According to my opinion, and according to the common-sense view, I, and every other taxpayer, must contribute some portion of the £3,000 which it would cost to have that marble manufactured here. Supposing the resolution is carried, where will you get anybody who will start with the machinery to produce marble merely for the Government buildings? You will find no capitalist in the world foolish enough to do it. Will hon. members who speak in favour of the motion use the marble for mantelpieces for their own cottages? Will these gentlemen who are so anxious to produce marble in the colony provide their own houses with the colonial article? I say at once that they are absolute free-traders when it comes to a matter of that kind, and they will not give 3d. more for any article they require for themselves. Supposing the industry is started, have we the men to carry it out? Is it not a fact that if it is started, men will have to be imported from Italy to do the work? The probability is that the men will be imported, and you will have no further employment for the men already in the colony. If the difference between the two amounts were not so great, there

might not be so much to be said against the motion; but, as the amount is so large—125 per cent.—I do not think the country should be put to the expense of finding a very small amount of employment indeed. As to state socialism, I think that if we require it, we must seek for it in a different direction altogether.

Mr. ROSE: I can quite understand a free-trader being opposed to state socialism. Any man who wishes to buy labour in the cheapest market cannot believe in state socialism. I was very much amused with the remarks of the Colonial Treasurer, who tried to make a great deal of capital out of a comparison between the price of marble in New South Wales and the commodity which can be obtained from the Pyrenees. The hon. member, however, did not take into consideration that the marble of New South Wales is being produced under free-trade conditions—under the conditions of a young country which has not got the advantages of anything like labour-saving machinery. To have committed himself to a fair analogy, or to have made the comparison in any way reasonable, he ought to have allowed for the difference between machinery in this colony and the Pyrenees. I claim that it is only reasonable that if we are developing a young country, we must pay out a certain amount before we can get so much in return. I will take the case of a father with a family to educate. If the father only measures prosperity by the material sense of the word, he will say; "Instead of sending my boys to school and paying 2s. a week, I will keep them at work, and they will earn 4s. or 5s. a week." There is a material loss. What for? For an intellectual gain. On the same principle, I consider that the Colonial Treasurer was irrational in not taking into consideration that it is not altogether the material gain we want by producing the marble, but that intelligence which must be developed in creating another industry in New South Wales. If we follow out the hon. member's free-trade predilections, we come to this: How is it that we have not got any application of the principle in any other important industry in New South Wales? Take the case of differential railway rates. If this policy is such a sound one, why is it not applied to our railways which are

a national asset? Take the case of the gold-miners, and we find a subsidy on every side. In the matter of education, we find the colony loses something like £300,000 a year in imparting instruction to the rising generation. I now come to the hon. member for New England, Mr. Lonsdale. He is quite logical in stating that there is really no material difference between the amendment and the motion. The whole argument is this: if you have this marble you can only employ 1,000 people; there are over 1,000,000 outside the industry, and the million are taxed for the thousand. Now, with the state holding a marble mine, there will be no more people employed than with a private individual holding it; but if there is an unearned increment accruing by having the industry, I see how the state may gain. On the same principle I would support the state in establishing a newspaper; on the same principle I would support it in going in for a coal-mine, or for anything to develop the mineral wealth of New South Wales. We are called upon to affirm a very great principle as to whether we shall produce in open competition against the whole of the world, and so, in time to come, to reduce our wages to their level, or whether we shall keep our wages at the present standard, in the hope of increasing them still more. I can perfectly understand, from an economic view, that if all the labour in New South Wales were engaged in industries which would give them a fair remuneration, there would be no advantage in opening up any other fresh industries; because you would simply draw from the older industries to start new ones. I do not reason, however, upon assumption. I take things exactly as they are, and I am confident there are many unemployed who might be well employed at the marble industry. On that account, I consider that by opening up an industry we create a great benefit from the start, and by keeping it closed we do the reverse. There is another way of looking at the question. If it be a wise policy to produce marble for national works it must be just as wise a policy to produce it for private works. I want the labour party to take this matter into consideration. If it be a wise policy to produce all the marble required for the Post Office, the Public Works Office, the Treasury buildings, it must be

just as wise and politic to produce it for private mantelpieces. It is of no use state socialists fencing the question. Sooner or later they must face the fiscal issue. Hon. members will have to admit, with the hon. member for The Murrumbidgee, that at the very outside the production of marble for our public works will not, on the aggregate, amount to £50,000 a year. If it be a wise policy to produce £50,000 worth of marble for New South Wales, how much wiser policy will it be to get £100,000 in twelve months? We must be logical. I claim that the labour party must follow me upon this point: that if they vote to have marble produced for our public works they are bound, for the sake of logical consistency, to go a step further and to have the marble produced for private purposes. The motion and the amendment are stepping-stones to a tariff. I shall vote for the motion, because it is the thin end of the protective policy.

Mr. J. F. CULLEN: I shall not enter on so large a matter as the discussion of state socialism at this hour; but I think it right to point out the seriousness of the step taken by the hon. member for The Murrumbidgee, Mr. Rae. He would not be a party to sneaking in protection. He would say that the principle is so large that it is worthy of being brought in in open daylight. I would say the same with regard to state socialism, that is, that it is so important that it ought to be brought on formally and after due notice.

Mr. J. D. FITZGERALD: We have it in the railway system!

Mr. J. F. CULLEN: There is no doubt that we have it in the amendment. It is unfair that it should be brought in at the tail of a resolution which was regarded as a very harmless thing. The issue of state socialism is too large and too important in its bearing on the welfare of the community to be dealt with by a snatch vote in the early hours of the morning.

Mr. GARVAN: The hon. member is prepared to give his vote, is he not?

Mr. J. F. CULLEN: I am; but I should not like to give it without debating the matter. I wish to point out to the hon. member for Eden that the only department in which we have a mixture of state socialism with individualism is that of post and telegraphs. Our railways are not

a purely state department. Our post and telegraph service, in which there is the nearest approach to state socialism that we have, is the department in regard to which the hon. member for Eden the other day succeeded in passing a motion, expressing his doubt as to the purity of its administration. That emphasises the strength of my position, that we ought not to proceed to deal with such an important issue as that of state socialism at midnight.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is no new thing!

Mr. J. F. CULLEN: It is no new thing; but this is the first time that it has been brought before the House in the shape of a resolution. It is unfair with the few that are present to-night that a catch vote should be taken on such a question. Of course I do not disguise my view. I regard state socialism as the fastest way to general corruption in the body politic. I shall content myself with making my protest as an opponent of state socialism, and as one who looks upon it as one of those serious issues which should not be forced upon us in this way in connection with a comparatively harmless amendment.

Mr. J. D. FITZGERALD: The hon. member for St. Leonards' speech is an exemplification of the position of a gentleman who strains at a gnat and swallows a camel.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: It is more like an enormous whale!

Mr. J. D. FITZGERALD: The hon. member strains at this very harmless amendment whilst he swallows the socialistic camel of state railways, the state post-office, state workshops, state museums, state parks, and state art galleries. I do not see anything particularly dangerous about the motion, or about the amendment, which I consider an improvement on the motion. I shall vote for the amendment, but if it is not carried, I shall certainly vote for the motion. Reference has been made to the planks in the labour platform, and I admit that one of those planks is the extension of employment in the Government service, and another is the retention of Government contracts in the colony.

Mr. ROSE: Even at a higher cost!

Mr. J. D. FITZGERALD: There is not a word about higher cost. If exception can reasonably be taken to this small amendment, why does not the hon. mem-

[Mr. Rose.

ber for St. Leonards take exception to the raising of the fiscal question? We find that the motion is not regarded as one of censure by the Government. The hon. member for St. Leonards is not entitled to regard the motion and amendment as anything but a plain, common-sense motion and amendment. I hope that the arguments to be employed in support of state socialism will be plain, common-sense arguments. I really cannot understand why hon. members should exaggerate this matter. I am prepared to vote on the question now, and I trust that the amendment will be carried.

Mr. COTTON: I think it just as well, as we have to vote on this question, that we should look the thing in the face and see what we are voting for. I admit that if, after an experiment of twelve months, we find that we have got an increased expenditure of £3,000 a year, it would be simply a question of book-keeping. We should have as much marble as we had before in the public buildings, £3,000 less to expend in irrigation, and not one man more employed. I regard the amendment simply in the light of a direct subsidy, with a view of developing a certain industry. I regard it exactly in the same light as a vote for an agricultural show, or a prospecting vote; and I believe that if the contention put forward by the hon. member for Orange proves to be true, that we have this marble on Crown lands—which is an important matter—where no ingenious syndicate can go ahead and peg it out as soon as the motion is carried, and float the concern on the market with about £40,000 of stock in the shape of bogus shares to pay bogus dividends on imaginary capital—I think, if that is the case, the marble will not cost the colony anything extra, and we shall not be anything out by the experiment. Anyhow, I regard it simply as a direct subsidy. It is a very different thing to putting on a protective tariff, making the whole of the people pay for all the private mantelpieces on the off chance that somebody will develop a marble quarry. There is another point: By dealing with this matter directly as a state question, the quarries being owned by the state, we only pay one class of people—the people who will work at the marble. We do not pay the speculator who has foresight enough to go ahead, and peg out the site of the quarry,

and block production. We do not pay the brokers who run the concern on the market. We do not pay the individual who perhaps charges royalty on the product, and we do not pay the sweater who acts as middleman between the labour and the Government. If we get off without paying these other people, it is possible we may be able to pay the labour without any further cost. The hon. member for Eden, Mr. Garvan, made a striking economic discovery to-night. He said that the production of marble was only the application of labour to the raw material of nature. Now, I would very much like the hon. gentleman to prove that the production of anything under the sun, from a locomotive to a microscope, is anything more than the application of labour to the raw material of this universe. The only trouble is that we, by our legislation, and especially by our protective tariffs in other colonies, and our absurd tariff in this colony, allow certain people to stand between labour and production, and reap profits they never earned. I will vote distinctly for the amendment, because I regard it as a step in the right direction—that of passing a direct vote to encourage our own industries, instead of putting on our statute-book that absurd thing, a protective tariff, to discourage other people's industries without a care as to whether we develop our own or not.

Mr. HOYLE, in reply: I would like to tell the hon. member for New England, Mr. Lonsdale, that the railway rolling stock is now manufactured in the colony. A government of which the late Mr. John Sutherland was a member, first gave an impetus to the manufacture of rolling stock in the very same way that I am now asking the Hcuse to give the marble industry an impetus. Mr. Sutherland at that time gave the firm of P. N. Russell & Co. a five years' contract for the manufacture of rolling stock. We were then paying a very large sum indeed beyond what it could have been brought from England for; but, by giving the firm an opportunity to lay down a plant, the colony has benefited to such an extent that we can now manufacture rolling stock at prices that cannot be equalled by any other country in the world. We now manufacture our rolling stock cheaper than we could get it from anywhere else, simply

because the state, in the first place, gave encouragement to a private firm. I wish to resent very strongly the insult offered by the hon. member for New England to a large body of our public servants. I would like to tell the hon. gentleman that the public servants of this country work as hard as those of any private establishment in the colony. I worked harder for the state, and my experience as an officer of the Railway Department convinced me that our men in the railway service work harder than the men work in any of the private workshops of the country. As a matter of fact, when a short time ago, in consequence of a rush of work, I employed a number of men from Mort's Dock, those men complained that my shop was a slaughter-house. They thought before that the railway shops were the easiest places in the world to work in—that the hardest thing was to get a job in the Railway Department, but that if they got there they had nothing to do but draw their money. But when they got there they discovered we were making the men work at piece-work rates for day wages. I trust, therefore, that the hon. member for New England will not repeat the insult he offered to a body of well tried and hard worked public servants. Those hon. gentlemen who have spoken about the marble coming from Italy have argued that it is an unfair thing to pay 100 per cent. more for the goods produced in the colony; but they say nothing about the 1,000 per cent. less paid for wages in Italy. While 10d. a day is the price paid for labour in Italy, we in this country have to pay 10s., which is 1,000 per cent. more. If these are the terms on which we are to establish local industries—that the wages of our people should come down 1,000 per cent.—then I shall have nothing to do with such a system. The Colonial Treasurer in his remarks referred chiefly to tiling, and did not touch my main argument, which had reference to the architectural part of the work. I said in my opening remarks that we could not produce the tiles as cheaply as they could be produced in foreign countries, but that if encouragement had been given, and if the contractor for the Lands Office had been allowed to carry out his work, at the expiration of the contract he would have had his machinery in perfect order, and would have been able, in all

[*Mr. Hoyle.*

probability, to produce even tiles at as cheap a price as that for which they could be imported. My hon. friend never said a word about the architectural aspect of the question. My argument was that we could produce pillars and ornamental work. There was the "marble man" himself; that is supposed to have been manufactured by a colonial workman. But my contention is this: that although the cheaper labour in a foreign country may produce a cheaper article, the better-paid labour produces a superior article, and it is only the superior article that I ask should have a chance in the present instance—that we may be able to develop the marble industry in the true sense of the word, and not the paving-stone industry. With regard to the amendment, I believe in state socialism as well as many other hon. members, but I will leave that question to the House to decide. I have brought forward my motion with a strong desire to do something to establish an industry in the colony, and to develop our natural resources. I shall let my resolution go as it stands. If the amendment is carried I am perfectly satisfied; but I shall allow my resolution to go as it stands. I believe in state socialism. I believe the state to be the proper employer; but that question should be brought down in a comprehensive manner, and should not be raised on a motion of this kind. I shall call for a division on the motion, and I trust it will be carried.

Question—that the words proposed to be inserted be so inserted—put. The House divided:

Ayes, 36; noes, 23; majority, 13.

AYES.

Bavister, T.	Jones, R.
Cann, J. H.	Kelly, A. J.
Clark, G. D.	Langwell, H.
Cook, J.	McGowen, J. S. T.
Cotton, F.	Melville, N.
Davis, T. M.	Murphy, W. A.
Dawson, H.	Newman, H. W.
Donald, G.	Rac, A.
Edden, A.	Rose, T.
Fegan, J. L.	Ross, Dr.
Fitzgerald, J. D.	Schey, W. F.
Gardiner, A.	Sharp, W. H.
Garvan, J. P.	Sheldon, J.
Gormly, J.	Stevenson, R.
Haynes, J.	Wall, W. C.
Houghton, T. J.	
Howe, J. P.	<i>Tellers,</i>
Hutchinson, G. F.	Hoyle, H. C.
Johnston, J.	Willis, W. N.

## NOES.

Barbour, R.	Lees, S. E.
Brown, H. H.	Lonsdale, E.
Brunker, J. N.	Lysaght, A.
Crick, W. P.	Marks, J.
Cruikshank, G. A.	Morton, P. H.
Cullen, J. F.	Smith, Bruce
Dibbs, G. R.	Smith, S.
Dickens, E. B. L.	Suttor, F. B.
Fuller, G. W.	Torpy, J.
Gould, A. J.	<i>Tellers,</i>
Hart, J. S.	Cullen, Dr.
Hutchison, A.	Tonkin, J. E.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Question, as amended, put. The House divided:

Ayes, 44; noes, 13; majority, 31.

## AYES.

Barbour, R.	Johnston, J.
Bavister, T.	Jones, R.
Cann, J. H.	Kelly, J. A.
Clark, G. D.	Langwell, H.
Cook, J.	Lysaght, A.
Cotton, F.	McGowen, J. S. T.
Cruikshank, G. A.	Melville, N.
Davis, T. M.	Murphy, W. A.
Dawson, H.	Newman, H. W.
Dickens, E. B. L.	Rae, A.
Donald, G.	Ross, Dr. A.
Edden, A.	Schey, W. F.
Fegan, J. L.	Sharp, W. H.
Fitzgerald, J. D.	Stevenson, R.
Gardiner, A.	Suttor, F. B.
Garvan, J. P.	Tonkin, J. E.
Gormly, J.	Torpy, J.
Haynes, J.	Wall, W. C.
Houghton, T. J.	Willis, W. N.
Howe, J. P.	<i>Tellers,</i>
Hoyle, H. C.	Rose, T.
Hutchinson, G. F.	Sheldon, J.
Hutchison, A.	

## NOES.

Brown, H. H.	Lonsdale, E.
Brunker, J. N.	Marks, J.
Cullen, J. F.	Smith, Bruce
Cullen, Dr. W. P.	Smith, S.
Fuller, G. W.	<i>Tellers,</i>
Gould, A. J.	Lees, S. E.
Hart, J. S.	Morton, P. H.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

## ADJOURNMENT.

POST OFFICE STABLES—PRIVATE BUSINESS—COST AND CONVEYANCE OF "HANSARD"—NEWS-PAPER SUPPLEMENTS—FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS—DIRECTOR OF THE BOTANIC GARDENS.

Motion (by Mr. BRUCE SMITH) proposed: That this House do now adjourn.

Mr. GARVAN: The Colonial Secretary promised me on Thursday last that the papers with reference to the purchase of some stables in Castlereagh-street for the General Post Office would be laid upon

the table of the House not later than to-day. I would ask the Minister in charge of the Government business to-night to see that the papers are laid upon the table not later than to-morrow.

Mr. CRICK: Being a private night, I think the representative of the Government might have consulted private members, who are prepared to sit here, to know whether they desired to adjourn. It seems to me that if the Government are going to jump up and move the adjournment when hon. members are desirous of going on with business, we might as well have no private night at all. There are twenty hon. members here who are prepared to sit all through the night and try to get rid of some of the business on the paper. The paper for to-day contains fifty-nine notices of motion, and surely out of the hon. members in charge of those motions a quorum can be got to sit here and assist one another to dispose of the business. It is quite enough for the Government on a Government night to jump up without warning, and move the adjournment of the House. If this were a Government night, and the Government were desirous of getting some measure put through the House, I suppose they would keep us sitting here until 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning. But because this is a private night, I suppose they look on the motions passed to-night as of no value whatever, that we have had an innings, and that it is time now for us to go home to bed. I have a motion on the paper which cannot be treated in a cavalier manner:

That, in the opinion of this House, all future locomotives, cars, rolling stock, &c., required for the railways of this colony should be manufactured in the colony.

I think the Government might have consulted me as to whether I wished to go on with the motion to-night. And there are several motions for select committees which could be disposed of. For my part, although I shall not oppose the motion for adjournment to-night, if on another private night the Government move the adjournment of the House without first consulting some private members who have the following business on the paper, I shall deem it my duty to ask hon. members to negative the motion.

Mr. A. HUTCHISON: Do that to-night!

Mr. CRICK : I do not propose to take that course to-night, as it has been the practice for the Government to move the adjournment without consulting hon. members who have the next business on the paper. As the business-paper is assuming large proportions, and as many hon. members are prepared to make a quorum, and sit here through the night, I trust the Government will not in future move the adjournment of the House without consulting the wishes of private members.

Mr. WILLIS : In view of the remarks of hon. gentlemen as to the charges on the passage of *Hansard* through the post, I would ask the hon. member in charge of the Government if he would confer with the Postmaster-General to the intent that some arrangement may be made whereby hon. members and the public generally may possess the same privilege in regard to *Hansard* as they do in regard to newspapers? I may point out that the posting of two small *Hansards* to the interior costs from 3d. to 4d., and sometimes 5d. If this publication is sent to public institutions, there is no reason why it should not be carried on the same terms as the *Town and Country Journal*, the *Sydney Mail*, and other papers.

Mr. F. B. SUTTON : I was very much surprised to hear the motion for adjournment, especially as it was moved before hon. members had had time to get to their seats after the division. I have a motion on the notice-paper, No. 10, dealing with the practice of delivering bound copies of the *Votes and Proceedings* to hon. members, which is hardly debatable. The notice-paper contains about fifty motions which are not debatable, and I think we might, to-night, go a long way towards clearing them off.

Mr. G. D. CLARK : I wish to point out how unreasonable it is for hon. members to object night after night to many items on the notice-paper being taken as formal. There are a number of motions which are constantly objected to, and it almost seems as though there is no probability of their ever being reached. The same remark applies to bills. As far as I know, no principle is involved in allowing a bill to pass its first reading when it can be subsequently debated. There is one hon. member who makes it a practice to object to motions of a mere formal charac-

[*Mr. Crick.*

ter, and to bills at their preliminary stages. It seems to me that the business of the House is becoming burdened by motions which might be got rid of without any debate whatever.

Mr. J. D. FITZGERALD : Following upon the remarks of the hon. member for Bourke, I wish to draw attention to the fact that newspaper supplements, not printed in this country, are carried free through the post in many country newspapers.

Mr. WILLIS : It is against the regulations!

Mr. J. D. FITZGERALD : It ought to be stopped. English and other papers published outside the colony require to be stamped, and I contend that the supplements printed outside the colony should be charged in the same way.

Mr. GORMLY : I think the Colonial Treasurer was rather hasty in moving the adjournment of the House. I look upon the succeeding notice of motion as a very important one, and I fully expected the hon. member for The Macleay would have been present to object to the adjournment being moved. One would almost think that the Colonial Treasurer's haste is due to the fact of the Government having fared rather badly to-night. As the House seems in a humour to assist colonial productions, it is probable the hon. member would have carried his motion. If the hon. member expects other hon. members to assist him in carrying the motion, the least he could have done was to have been in his place to move it.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN : I desire to protest against this early adjournment. We have only one night a week for private business, and here we have the Government, at a quarter to 12 o'clock, stepping in to stop it from being proceeded with. See the inconsistency of the Colonial Treasurer. The other night, when discussing the proposal that no business be taken after 11 o'clock, he made a speech as to the necessity of carrying on business after that hour.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH : I said we ought to be free!

Mr. O'SULLIVAN : We have a fair chance of doing business to-night, and we are stopped by the Colonial Treasurer, who wants to get home. I protest against this proceeding. The other night we were

four hours discussing one line of the Electoral Bill, and that line is not passed yet ; and now that we have a chance of doing good work we are stopped. What are the motions on the business-paper? There is one by the hon. member for West Macquarie referring to the construction of locomotives and rolling stock ; one by the hon. member for Wollombi as to the necessity of paying civil servants fortnightly ; another by the hon. member for Mudgee, Mr. Wall, dealing with the prospecting vote ; and another by the hon. member for Northumberland, Mr. Melville, respecting the imposition of a royalty of  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per ton to compensate the widows of men killed in coal-mines. That surely is a matter touching human life. We ought to remember that there is on the paper a motion for the abolition of school fees. Why should we not go on with that? Let hon. members have no more humbug about getting on with business. We have had too much of that claptrap.

Mr. BRUNER : Did not the hon. member vote for the 11 o'clock rule?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN : I voted for it, because I saw the humbug of the Government last session. I am desirous of going on with the work of the country at any hour. If the House is true to itself, and desires to go on with labour legislation, hon. members have a chance to do so now. I will call for a division on the motion.

Mr. WALL : Some two years ago, Mr. Speaker, in your place in this House you called attention to the position of the financial institutions of the country. In the early part of the session I asked the Government if it was their intention to introduce a measure dealing with those institutions, and I should like to urge the Colonial Treasurer to lay it on the table without delay. A great many of our financial institutions are certainly in a very unsatisfactory condition? We have a number of building societies in the city and suburbs selling land and advancing money to enable the purchasers to build. The result will be that when the cottages are paid for, the purchasers will find that the deeds of the land are mortgaged.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH : I may save the hon. member some trouble by informing him that the bill has been drafted!

Mr. WALL : In dealing with a small property recently, I found that the deeds

were lodged in the bank, and that is what is being done by nearly all these institutions. They are receiving money week by week from people who are saving to provide themselves with homes, and in nine cases out of ten when the purchases are completed they will not have any home.

Mr. HOUGHTON : The hon. member for Bourke referred to the postage charged on *Hansard*, and I think it is only fair that attention should be drawn to a more important matter, namely, the cost of *Hansard*. Those who have the management of the department should reduce the charge, so that every one in the community may be able to buy it. At present we cannot obtain a single copy, no matter whether it consists of twenty pages or 500 pages, under 2s., and if one wants to subscribe for a whole session, whether it lasts a fortnight or a whole year, the price is 2 guineas in advance. I contend that the charge is altogether unreasonable. It debars the great bulk of the people, who in all probability would read *Hansard*, from obtaining it. I think we should popularise *Hansard*, and for that reason I strongly urge those in charge of the department to reduce the price.

Mr. WILLIS : Take the postage off it, too!

Mr. HOUGHTON : I certainly would.

Mr. JOHNSTON : I should like to draw the attention of the Colonial Treasurer to a statement that has just reached me, to the effect that the Curator of the Botanic Gardens has discharged some workmen for having formed a deputation to take steps to protect their wages. I hope the hon. member will see that those men are not made to suffer for standing up for their rights.

Mr. LEES : A complaint has been made about the hon. member for The Macleay, Mr. O. O. Dangar, not being here. I wish to say that the hon. member has been called away to the bedside of his father, who is in a dying state.

Mr. DIBBS : I would point out to the hon. member, who has assumed the purple of the treasuryship, and is, therefore, acting for the Colonial Secretary, that it is not usual for the Government, on a private night, to attempt to snatch an adjournment.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH : The hon. member knows that I did not attempt to snatch an adjournment at all!

Mr. DIBBS: The hon. and learned member moved the adjournment when hon. members were changing their positions after a division. It is not fair to ask the House to adjourn, on a private night, at the will of the Government. Recently we stayed here until 3 o'clock in the morning to pass a bill, at the instance of the Secretary for Lands. No adjournment was asked for by private members then, and if it had been the Government would have refused it. On a private night the adjournment ought not to be moved without hon. members being consulted. The Colonial Treasurer has been a little too fast to-night. I have no business on the paper; but if I had the third or fourth motion I should wish to go on with it.

Mr. MELVILLE: I wish to urge the Government to arrange for *Hansard* to go through the post just in the same way as a newspaper. I look upon *Hansard* as the newspaper of Parliament. If newspapers are carried through the post free *Hansard* ought to be carried free.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to point out that it is not reasonable to ask the Speaker to remain here seven or eight hours. I have been in the chair ever since half-past 4 o'clock without intermission, except one hour for tea. Hon. members can go in and out. If I am to be detained here every night on motions of adjournment, the House will have to get some one else to take the Chair. I do not want to prevent hon. members from addressing the Chair, but I ask them to be reasonable.

Mr. STEVENSON: The Colonial Treasurer has promised to take a note of the complaint of the hon. member for Mudgee, in reference to building societies, and I wish to draw attention to a matter affecting many thousands of people. I refer to the Friendly Societies Act, in reference to which a petition was laid on the table the other day, signed by 4,000 or 5,000 people.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH, in reply: The leader of the Opposition has, I think, not been very reasonable in lecturing me for moving the adjournment, because I took, and I take it now, that the majority of members desire to adjourn. I can only say for myself and my colleagues that we are as much prepared to go on with the

work as any body in the House. Hon. members must know that it is only the Government who can move the adjournment, and in doing so this evening I had no desire to stop hon. members from working. If at any time after moving the adjournment I saw that a large body of the House still desired to go on with the business I should have no hesitation in withdrawing my motion and assisting them in the work. But it must be remembered that since this Parliament met the adjournment speeches have generally occupied three-quarters of an hour or an hour, and adding that time on to the hour at which I moved the adjournment it would bring the time up to 1 o'clock, which means nine hours' work, and I think hon. gentlemen will admit that would be a fair night's work. The postage of *Hansard* has been referred to. I am bound to say I think that is a matter which could have been dealt with by a question on the business-paper. The Postmaster-General is not here; and it is a matter which will depend on his opinion. Personally, I think *Hansard* has as much claim to free postage as have the newspapers; and when we consider the edifying character of *Hansard*, and the instructive nature of its contents, I think it has even a greater claim. I can only say that I shall convey the wishes of hon. gentlemen to the Postmaster-General; and I have no doubt he will take the same view of the matter that I have taken. The hon. member for Mudgee, Mr. Wall, referred to the financial institutions. My predecessor in office framed a bill dealing in a very comprehensive manner with the financial institutions of the city. I have the bill in my possession; but I have not yet had time to study it to see whether it contains provisions with which I can wholly agree. But I can promise the hon. gentleman that I shall take an early opportunity of perusing the measure, and intimating to the House what time can be fixed for its introduction into the Assembly. The hon. member for Balmain has alluded to the objections to formal motions. It has been the policy of this Government, and will always be, to resist any needless objections to matters of a formal nature. I do not think the hon. member, or any other hon. member, can accuse the Government at any time of objecting to these motions,

[*Mr. Dibbs.*]

whether they come from this side of the House, or from the other, so long as they do not involve any matter of policy which the Government think should be submitted for discussion and consideration by the House. Another hon. member for Balmain has referred to some action by the Director of the Botanic Gardens. I certainly do not think that is a question which should occupy the time of the House. A simple question on the paper will obtain the particulars, and, of course, I cannot give any particulars as to what this officer has done. If the hon. gentleman had simply given notice of a question asking if it is a fact that these men were dismissed, and, if so, for what purpose, he would have the information in a nutshell from the best authority without occupying the time of the House. Then the hon. member for Bathurst, Mr. F. B. Suttor, has complained that he was not allowed to go on with his motion. As the hon. member for West Macquarie pointed out, there are fifty-nine motions on the paper, and, if one hon. member is entitled to complain, so are the other fifty-eight, and if we went down the list until 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning, we should still be asked to take one more motion, and so on. I can only say that if the bulk of the House are even now desirous of going on with the work I am prepared to do so; but if, on the other hand, the general opinion is that eight or nine hours are sufficient for a sitting, I am quite willing that we should adjourn.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

House adjourned at 12:42 a.m. (Wednesday).

---

## Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 19 August, 1891.

---

Member Sworn.—Forfeiture of Crown Lands—Crown Lands Bill (Suspension of Standing Orders)—Bankers Books Evidence Bill (second reading)—Crown Lands Act Amendment Bill (second reading)—Land Company of Australasia Railway Bill.

The PRESIDENT took the chair.

### MEMBER SWORN.

Mr. H. Mort took the oath and subscribed the roll.

### FORFEITURE OF CROWN LANDS.

Mr. JACOB asked the VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL,—(1.) In how many of the 32,488 cases of forfeiture of any contract with the Crown for the purchase or leasing of Crown lands, which the Secretary for Lands has publicly stated, have been reversed since the passing of the Land Act of 1861, have such purchases or leases been reselected? (2.) How many, if any, of the second selectors have been compensated for the loss of their selections? (3.) How many, if any, reselections have been made since 20th October, 1890, of selections which have been notified as having been forfeited? (4.) How many cases of forfeiture or reversal of forfeiture are at present pending in the Land Court?

Mr. W. H. SUTTOR answered,—(1.) The figures quoted by the Secretary for Lands referred only to the forfeiture of conditional purchases since the passing of the Crown Lands Alienation Act of 1861, and it would be a work of great magnitude to ascertain the number of instances in which forfeiture has been reversed during the same period, and equally difficult to supply the actual number of reselections of such purchases. (2.) Since the year 1871 it would appear that there has been one case in which compensation was granted. (3.) As all applications for conditional purchases are lodged with the Crown land agents and then forwarded to the land boards, it would necessitate an examination in each office of every application since that date before an accurate reply could be given; but two cases have already come under the notice of the Secretary for Lands in which it is clear that the reselections have been made with a view to profit, if possible, under the decision given in O'Brien's case. (4.) There are twenty-four cases of appeal against proposed forfeiture for non-fulfilment of the conditions of the law, but in no instance does it appear that conflicting interests have arisen.

### CROWN LANDS BILL.

#### SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS.

Mr. W. H. SUTTOR rose to move :

That so much of the standing orders be suspended as would preclude the passing of "a bill to validate certain forfeitures, and certain reversals of forfeitures, of land sold or leased by the Crown, and to declare the effect of such