

## Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 7 September, 1899.

Estate of the late S. M. Swift—Accommodation of Strangers  
—Motion of Censure—Adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER took the chair.

### ESTATE OF THE LATE S. M. SWIFT.

MR. W. M. HUGHES (Sydney—Lang) [4:31] (*with concurrence*) rose to move :

That the select committee upon the estate of the late S. M. Swift, of Petersham, have leave to sit during the adjournment of the House to-morrow.

He said : The reason I make this motion is that witnesses have been brought from a great distance, at considerable expense on the part of the Crown ; and this expense will be thrown away if the witnesses are compelled to return without being examined, as might be the case if the committee did not sit to-morrow.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

### ACCOMMODATION OF STRANGERS.

MR. SPEAKER : I should like to say to hon. members that the accommodation for strangers here is so limited, and there is generally such a demand for tickets on an occasion of this kind, that I feel I ought not to allow the precincts of the Chamber to be crowded as they have been during the past two or three nights ; and unless visitors can obtain sitting accommodation I have made up my mind that I will not issue tickets for them. I shall treat all hon. members alike in this respect. The passages behind my chair, and leading into the ante-rooms last night and on the preceding night were so blocked that it was almost impossible for me and other hon. members to pass in and out the House. I am told that 300 persons wished to obtain admission to the galleries last night. The accommodation for strangers is very limited, and I will not have the place made suffocating, as it has been during the past two or three nights. The ventilation under ordinary circumstances is bad enough, and it is rendered ten times worse when the passages and ante-rooms are crowded in the way in which they have been recently.

### MOTION OF CENSURE.

Debate resumed (from 6th September, *vide* page 1254) on motion by Mr. Lyne :

- (1.) That the present Government does not possess the confidence of this House.
- (2.) That the foregoing resolution be conveyed by address to his Excellency the Governor.

Upon which Mr. Fegan had moved :

That the question be amended by inserting after the word "House," the words "and deserves censure for having made payments of public money to Mr. J. C. Neild, member for Paddington, without asking Parliament, and contrary to the assurance given by the right hon. the Premier."

Upon which amendment Mr. Wilks had moved :

That the proposed amendment be amended by leaving out all the words after the first word "and" and inserting the words "this House proposes to deal with the advance made to the hon. member for Paddington, Mr. J. C. Neild, and the constitution acts relating there to, after the motion of censure is disposed of, whether in the affirmative or negative,"—instead thereof.

MR. STOREY (Randwick) [4:34] : I should like to preface the few remarks I intend to make in this debate by stating to hon. members that I do not cherish any feelings of animosity towards the right hon. the Premier, or to any member of the Government, for their action in connection with the federal movement. To do so at this stage, when a motion of censure is before the House, would, I think, be unfair and ungenerous on my part. So far as I am personally concerned, I still consider that they acted in a manner which did not tend to their credit in this country, I felt then, as I feel now, that the members of the Ministry, and the members of our party who acted with them in an endeavour to bring about federation, certainly acted in a manner contrary to the interests of this colony ; but I cannot allow that consideration to influence me to-night in this debate ; and if, indeed, I were so narrow-minded as to allow any feeling of the kind to exercise my mind, I should have been influenced against it by the action of the hon. and learned member for Ashfield and some other hon. members who sit on the left of Mr. Speaker early this morning, when I moved the adjournment of the debate. A hue and cry was then raised by hon. members on the Opposition side of the House. They were like a lot of hungry wolves barking for the scalp of the Premier,

*Fifth night.*

in order to get on the Treasury benches, and showing by their feverish anxiety to close the debate that their only consideration was to get located where they would receive the emoluments of office.

Mr. LYNE: —————

Mr. STOREY: As the hon. member has interrupted me, I will say this: I consider that he is entitled to the unanimous good opinion of 82,000 of the people of this country for the magnificent stand he took on the 20th June and prior to that date; and he is also entitled to the credit of the people of New South Wales for the loyal way in which he defended their interests during all the meetings of the convention. I consider that the Premier and the hon. member were the men, of all the representatives of New South Wales, who fought and battled for our interests then, which was the proper time to battle. It is no good talking now. It was perfectly sickening last night to listen to the hon. member for the Hastings-Macleay talking about federation. I say here, fearlessly, that if there is any gratitude to be given to any member of this House for bringing about federation, it is not due to the Hon. Edmund Barton, but to the right hon. the Premier. It is a generous thing for me to say. Five years ago the question of federation was dead, and the right hon. the Premier revived it—the party that were associated with him revived it. I care not what he did since. I care not what opinions hon. members may have as to his action, or the opinions I have had myself. Those days are gone by. But if credit be given to any man, it should be given to the right man. The question of federation—of whether federation is now safe or otherwise—is not to be considered. Whatever the Premier or the hon. member for Hastings-Macleay may say, we know it is beyond the power of this or the parliament of any other state that has acquiesced in the Commonwealth Bill to stop the consummation of the federal enterprise. Having said that much, before I come to the direct motion of censure moved by the leader of the Opposition, I should like to say that the hon. member for Phillip Division—I do not say that he did it intentionally, I would rather say that he did it unknowingly—misrepresented me here the other night when he said that I was not sincere when I proposed duties of a

[Mr. Storey.

tentative character, and some hon. member interrupted him with the remark that I was not present when the division took place. It is true I was not present in this Chamber at a quarter to 6 in the morning, when the division took place. My reason was that I was suffering from ill-health at the time, and it would have been dangerous for me to remain here all night. Several hon. members are quite aware of that, and I need not make further reference to it. I am still of the same opinion, and, to show the hon. member for Phillip Division and other hon. members who sit on this side of the House that I am genuine and sincere in this respect, I may say that on every platform prior to the last election, when I addressed the electors at Randwick, I told them that immediately the people of New South Wales ratified the Commonwealth Bill, which I hoped then they would not do, I would suggest and would support, and, indeed, if the proposal were not brought forward by the Government or by some other member of the House, I would myself bring forward a proposal for duties of a tentative character of more than 10 per cent. *ad valorem* upon commodities subject to duties in the other proposed contracting states. That is my answer to the accusation of insincerity made by the hon. member for Phillip Division and some other hon. members. Coming now to the motion of censure, that motion is a very fair one. It is one that you would expect to be moved by the leader of a great party. It is general in its character. It is in no way small. It takes in everything that can possibly be imagined against the Government for the past five years. Its wording is:

That the present Government does not possess the confidence of this House.

Had that resolution been left in the position in which it was moved it would have been much fairer and much better. We should then have had a clear-cut opinion as to the state of parties in the House, upon the actions of the Government in the past, upon their policy, and upon the proposed policy of the leader of the Opposition and his friends in the future, if they should be successful in the attempt in which they are now engaged. Before going into the charges made by the leader of the Opposition, I should like to say

with regard to my hon. friend, the member for Wickham, that whatever his intentions were, his action at any rate does not tend to raise his character in the estimation of members of this House or the people of this country. I do not mean in a personal sense. Personally I have a very high opinion of the hon. member for Wickham. No man has a higher opinion of the hon. member than I have. But at the present juncture, he has been the means of drawing a herring across the whole issue. He has been the means of making the hon. member for Paddington a regular buffer wherewith to defeat the Government. If the Government are to be defeated at the present time upon their general policy, upon corruption, upon fraud, or upon anything else, is it not a fact that the greater always includes the less, and the hon. gentleman's amendment is only one item among a great many. The whole interest in the debate has settled upon this one point. The finances are forgotten, the Premier's action in connection with federation is forgotten—and surely it should be when the hon. member for The Hume, who leads the Opposition, is surrounded by so many any-price federalists. If I had any doubt in my mind as to whether I should vote on one side or the other, I should have some doubt about supporting the hon. member for The Hume, much as I admired his action in the past, when he is joined by men who want to take every advantage of the opportunity to crucify the Government under any circumstances. I have said that the finances do not come into consideration, nor do they. The whole interest of the debate is centred upon what I may call the Neild unhappy episode. I would refer to the labour party with great respect. They hold a position in this House the same as I do, through the majority of the votes in their constituencies. We know that when that party met in caucus to discuss the question they decided by a majority of one, a small majority, but still the fact remains that they decided to support the Government on the greater general issue.

MR. EDDEN: How does the hon. member know?

MR. STOREY: From the daily press. So far it has not been contradicted. How do I know that later on they rescinded

their previously well thought out determination to support the Government on the greater issue? I know it, because it was placarded throughout the city of Sydney. I would ask the members of that party whether they are going to be logical? After coming to a determination to support the Government on the greater and broader question, are they going back on that determination, and to act upon a later one, owing to personal animosity towards the hon. member for Paddington? Are they going to crucify this man? Are they going to say that he is corrupt? That the right hon. the Premier is a fraud? That he is dishonored; that every member of his Cabinet is dishonored; that there has been a political conspiracy between the Premier and the members of his Cabinet and the hon. member for Paddington to purloin the funds of the taxpayers? I say that when a motion of censure in that shape is brought before the Chamber, when the graver issue is laid aside, and when a lesser one is proceeded with, when the Opposition are satisfied to use all their arguments to attack the hon. member for Paddington, and when they are supported in that by members of the labour party, I say that it is time that I should seriously consider and exercise my mind as to the wisdom of the course that is pursued, no matter what my feelings have been towards the Premier. I have not spoken to the Premier twice for twelve months. I have not received a single favour in five years from his hands. I have not received a single favour from any member of the Cabinet; but there is too much idea of fairness and generosity in me to allow me to join in taking away the character for ever of the Premier and the members of his Cabinet and of the hon. member for Paddington. Whilst I may differ from them on public grounds, I care not what government is in office, I decline to be a party to stab men under the belt. I decline to be associated with anything of that kind, and it is an action which cannot reflect honorably upon the labour party.

MR. EDDEN: Poor old labour party!

MR. STOREY: The labour party are all right when they act right, and they are all wrong when they vote wrong.

MR. O'SULLIVAN: The hon. member has been all round the compass lately!

*Fifth night.*

Mr. STOREY : Well, that should give me greater experience. Coming to the payment of the £350 to the hon. member for Paddington, the very fact of that money having been paid back by the hon. member is proof conclusive that a mistake was made. As far as I am concerned, I think that if a man makes a mistake it is well that he should make amends to some extent. The hon. member for Paddington has made the best amends that it is possible to make. The taxpayers of the country have received their money again. It has been said that the Premier paid this money in a corrupt way. I refuse to believe any such thing. I refuse to believe that the members of his Cabinet will subscribe to a corrupt action of that kind. What was this £350 paid for? It was paid for a report upon old-age pensions, charitable relief, and state insurance. It was for expenses in connection with the furnishing of a report upon the best systems existing in England and other parts of the world. I find from one paragraph that

This involved the perusal of many thousands of pages in the English language, and an examination of thousands more in foreign languages, of which latter about 2,000 pages were subsequently translated by Messrs. George Jarret, Government Interpreter, and F. F. Falconer, of the Postal Department, to both of whom I express my thanks for the able manner in which they have accomplished the work.

Another little item I wish to read which I think hon. members will not object to hear:

During the present year, a delay of three months occurred through exigencies in the Government Printing Office, and when these were overcome, an all but fatal illness, originating in physical and nervous prostration, due to overwork, in the preparation of this report, prevented its resumption for another three months.

Here is a work consisting of 515 pages, and we must take into consideration the amount of thought, the amount of work required in the first instance to collate all this matter, the exercise of mind necessary to marshal all the facts, to put them in readable form so that it would be a creditable production to the author, the amount of work necessary in preparing the manuscript, and the work involved in examining and correcting the printers' proofs. Considering the nature of the production, if, instead of £350 having been paid to the hon. member for Paddington without the authority of Parliament, that amount had been placed upon the estimates to be

[*Mr. Storey.*

voted in the ordinary way, would any hon. member have been mean and contemptible enough to vote against the grant? The work is one which, in the ordinary way, could not be produced for five times the sum, and then, perhaps, only by a less capable authority. I give the members of the labour party credit for the interest which I believe they take in the question of old-age pensions and general charitable relief. In days to come, when they wish to speak upon the public platforms of the country upon those subjects, if they want reliable authorities from which to quote, they must go to this concise work; and, if to-night they record their votes to take away the character of the man who has been associated with this production, I think that in the future, when they refer to this work, they will feel a throb of the heart and the accusation of conscience for what they have done. A great deal has been said about fraud and corruption, and I wish to bring before the House and the country the existence of wholesale corruption. The payment to the hon. member for Paddington can be defended upon every platform, before all whose verdict is worth having; but the wholesale corruption to which I refer cannot be defended. It consists in the action of the Government in giving to every hon. member of this House the equivalent of £15 worth of postage stamps.

Mr. NEILD : Per annum?

Mr. STOREY : Yes. That act is as much at variance with the spirit of the Constitution as was the payment to the hon. member for Paddington.

Mr. NEILD : The value of the free envelopes issued amounts to £4,000 a year!

Mr. STOREY : Then the amount is larger than I thought it was. It is time that somebody exposed this so-called purity school. How many members of the labour party have accepted this £15?

Mr. J. C. WATSON : I am one who has not!

Mr. CRICK : Well, I am a member who has!

Mr. STOREY : I am very glad to hear that the hon. member for Young has not accepted the envelopes. For hon. members to accept this favour is equivalent to the taking of money out of the Treasury. I am not going to debate the wisdom of the Parliamentary Allowances Act, but I say

that the allowance given to hon. members under that act was intended, not as salary or as wages, but to reimburse hon. gentlemen for postage and other incidental expenses in connection with the representation of their electorates. I have heard, though I do not know if it is true, that the Government were petitioned by a round-robin to increase the privileges of members of Parliament behind the backs of the people by giving them this free postage. I care not that the issue of the envelopes may have been sanctioned by a minute ratified by the Governor in Council; the first ratification should have been the vote of a majority of the House. Every hon. member who has illegally accepted this money—because the envelopes are the equivalent of money—should pay it back to the General Post Office, and admit that he made a mistake in accepting it.

Mr. NORTON: Who proffered this corrupt bribe?

Mr. STOREY: Would it not be possible for a list to be published, so that we could see how many of those who are accusing the Government of corruption have aided and abetted them in the perpetration of this wrong? I am credibly informed that every member of the labour party—they are the real Simon Pures of public life—and many members of the Opposition who are now charging the Government with corruption and theft and wrong-doing of every kind, should be looked upon as conspirators with the Government in this corruption. The payment to the hon. member for Paddington cannot be placed in the same category as the issue of these envelopes. The Government made a mistake in giving way in a weak moment to the request of certain hon. members, but it is degrading to Parliament and contrary to the spirit of the Constitution that the practice should continue. If £15 can be given, £500 can be given. In the interests of the purity of public life, every hon. member should return the envelopes which he has not used, and should pay for those which he has used, and the Government should rescind the *Gazette* notice which allows this corrupt practice to exist.

An HON. MEMBER: Does the hon. member use his telephone on public business?

Mr. STOREY: I pay for it.

Mr. J. C. WATSON: Who has informed the hon. member that members of the labour party above all other hon. members have taken these envelopes?

Mr. CRICK: Well, I have taken them, and I have signed for them!

Mr. STOREY: I hope that the hon. member will send them back, because I believe him to be an honorable and an honest man.

Mr. D. DAVIS: Does not the hon. member for Randwick use the parliamentary note paper?

Mr. CRICK: I rise to order. Is the hon. member for Randwick right in levelling charges against hon. members? A regulation has been issued by the Government, under which certain hon. members have been supplied with stamped envelopes. Why should hon. members be charged with corruption because they have taken them? I, for one, have taken them. Why should the hon. member be allowed to insult certain hon. members by singling them out, and asking why they have taken them? Why does the hon. member use his railway pass?

Mr. STOREY: Because it is granted to me under the statute-law of the country!

Mr. CRICK: I might as well charge the hon. member with doing something improper in using his railway pass.

Mr. SAVERS: ———

Mr. SPEAKER: I have asked the hon. member for Tamworth two or three times not to interrupt.

Mr. SAVERS: But the hon. member is charging me with corruption!

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Randwick is not charging the hon. gentleman any more than any other hon. member. I have no hesitation in saying that the hon. member for Randwick is out of order in making an imputation of corruption against hon. members for what has been done in regard to these stamped envelopes. It might as well be charged against hon. members that they are guilty of corruption because they use the parliamentary note paper and envelopes.

Mr. NORTON: I will take your ruling, sir, on another matter. Will it be out of order for an hon. member, in the course of this debate, whilst criticising the general conduct of the Government, to refer to the issue of these postage stamps to hon. members as an act of corruption?

*Fifth night.*

Mr. SPEAKER : I will not give a ruling at present upon it. The rule is, that the Speaker never gives a ruling on a hypothetical case. If the hon. member wants to raise that question by-and-by, he can do so, and then will be the time to settle the point of order. I will not anticipate it.

Mr. NORTON : But I want to speak on the point of order, and your ruling !

Mr. SPEAKER : That question has not arisen, and I will not give a ruling upon it now.

Mr. NORTON : I will raise it later on !

Mr. STOREY : I did not mean to charge hon. members with personal corruption, but only with political corruption. I make that amends to hon. members. I bow to your ruling, sir, but I think that that case is somewhat analogous to the case of the hon. member for Paddington.

Mr. NORTON : A great deal more corrupt !

Mr. STOREY : That is, of course, a matter of opinion.

Mr. MCGOWEN : The hon. member for Randwick never answered the question as to who gave him authority to say that the members of the labour party use these franked envelopes !

Mr. J. C. WATSON : And apparently they only !

Mr. STOREY : Do they ?

Mr. MCGOWEN : I do not know myself. I have not seen one !

Mr. STOREY : I, personally, was never informed that these envelopes could be had—no information in that respect was given to me. I think that a list should be published, and then we would know which hon. members have received the franked envelopes.

An HON. MEMBER : The hon. member is only damaging the Government !

Mr. STOREY : I do not care whether I am damaging the Government or not. I intend to discharge my duties in this House in a fearless manner. The Government have been charged with certain things in connection with the hon. member for Paddington, and I was referring to what I consider a more serious charge, and was going to say that the majority of hon. members who are censuring the Government for the payment to the hon. member for Paddington are in an illogical position. Look at the illogical position of hon. members who constitute the labour

party. They ought to have another caucus meeting if they wish to maintain their influence in this country. They have already had two caucus meetings. In the first instance they arranged by a majority to vote against the greater accusation ; in the next instance they arranged by a majority of two, I believe, to vote in favour of the less accusation.

Mr. W. M. HUGHES : And the greater !

Mr. STOREY : And the greater, of course, for, although it may seem paradoxical, in this case the less includes the greater, because I take it that the Government would not so demean themselves as to retain office if the amendment moved by the hon. member for Wickham were carried. In the first instance, when the Government were generally accused, the labour party decided to support them. Before sitting down I should like to say that until yesterday I was very much exercised in my mind as to how I should vote on this occasion. As I have already said, I have not been on the most friendly terms with the Government, because I considered they acted against the interests of the people of New South Wales in many respects. But as this debate proceeded I felt that it would be ungenerous on my part to be a party to taking away their character and branding them as corrupt for all time to come, and the hon. member for Paddington with them. If there is to be a fight, let it be a fight upon principles and policy. The leader of the Opposition knows perfectly well that I am in favour of 10 per cent. tentative duties.

Mr. THOMAS : What—a free-trader !

Mr. STOREY : The leader of the Opposition knows perfectly well also that if he had brought forward a resolution in favour of those duties I should have had no alternative, but would have been obliged to support it. The hon. gentleman, however, has further stated on the floor of the House that he will not interfere with the tariff during the life of this Parliament. That really means that there would be no need to put on the duties then, because the federal parliament would be very likely discussing what the federal tariff should be. This Parliament having been elected as a federal parliament has completed the work it was elected to do. That being so, in my opinion, the Government ought to strongly advise his

[*Mr. Storey.*]

Excellency the Governor to dissolve the House, because it does not represent the people of the country. If my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, be successful at the present juncture he ought to have a dissolution and go before the country with a state policy as against an Australian policy. I think that in the future, during the state elections and in the state parliament, the interests of the state will be paramount, and we shall have on the broader, wider range of politics an Australian policy. At the present juncture the people of this country, under the changed conditions, should have an opportunity of electing a parliament with a state policy, and in that state policy should be included those duties to which I have referred as being of a tentative character. That state policy should also include a redistribution of seats bill, reducing the numerical strength of this House to at least one-third. I do not think a reduction to one-half would be right. We might put three of these single electorates into one, and those three would form one electorate for a representative of the state in the federal parliament. The electorates so arranged would nearly tally with the number of members required. The population of three of the single electorates would approach the number necessary to elect a representative to the federal parliament. I would advocate seventy-five members for this House.

MR. ROSE: What about the £300 a year?

MR. STOREY: I will not go into that question at the present time. I have been considerably exercised in my mind as to what I should do in regard to this motion of censure. After giving the matter every consideration—not in my own interests, but in the interests of the country—and being inclined to extend fair play even to my greatest enemies, I have come to the conclusion that at the present juncture, whatever I may do in the future, I must vote against the amendment of the hon. member for Wickham, and also against the amendment of the hon. member for Balmain North. In doing so I consider I am acting rightly. I would ask hon. members to accept my assurance that I have as high an idea of rectitude as has any member of this Chamber, but I refuse to join with any number of men to crucify

and take away the character of another in this mean and contemptible way. Let hon. members fight the Government upon their public policy, and not upon a side issue of this kind. Before I sit down I cannot help expressing my surprise at the action of members of the labour party. They have discounted their influence in this country, if to-day they can determine to do one thing, and to-morrow rescind that action at the whim, influence, or intrigue of some member or members of this House. If they wish to retain their honor and their self-respect, let them hold another caucus, and decide whether it is fair play to take away the character of a man who, whatever his faults may be, at any rate is not corrupt. Whatever the faults of the Government may have been, no matter how many errors they may have committed in the past, I say, as a supporter of the Government for five years, careless and indifferent as to their approbation and disapproval, careless and indifferent as to the opinions of any hon. member who sits in Opposition or among the labour party, careless and indifferent as to the electors of this country, so long as I act in keeping with the dictates of my own heart—I say that I will never be a party to stabbing a man or a number of men in this mean, contemptible way, knowing as I do that they are innocent of corruption. Notwithstanding that, I highly disapprove of the payment of the money to the hon. member for Paddington behind the backs of Parliament and of the country. There have been precedents innumerable in the past for such payments. The hon. member for Paddington last night gave the details of payments, amounting in the aggregate to thousands of pounds, without the vote of this House. I do not think such a thing is likely to occur again. The second paragraph of the report of the select committee is in these terms:

Your committee are of opinion that the practice of the acceptance of payment from the Government by members of either House of Parliament holding commissions from the Crown, without the previous consent of Parliament, is constitutionally dangerous, and should be discontinued.

That clearly expresses disapproval of the payment of money without the sanction of Parliament, and I do not think the practice is likely to be revived in the future. It is a mean contemptible action to stab the

Government through the hon. member for Paddington, in order to get possession of the Treasury benches, when every hon. member must know in his own heart that no fraud or corruption has been perpetrated upon the taxpayers of the country. Under the circumstances, I shall vote against both amendments, and also against the general motion.

Mr. MOLESWORTH (Newtown—Erskine) [5.26]: In listening very carefully to the speech of the hon. member for The Hume, the mover of this resolution, I endeavoured to discover what indictments the hon. member lodged against the Government, and it appeared to me, analysing the contents of his speech, that they resolved themselves practically into two distinct charges against the present Administration. One of these is the old matter which is raked up every time a financial statement is made, or when a motion of censure is moved—the question of the presentation of the accounts by the Premier of the country. Nothing can be more damaging to the welfare of the country than this continual wrangle about the method of presenting accounts to Parliament—these continual statements that they are misrepresented to the people of this country. That charge has been answered again and again. It has been clearly demonstrated in this House that the accounts of the Premier are absolutely and positively correct. The hon. member referred also to the Auditor-General's report. If any hon. member will take the trouble to compare the Auditor-General's report with the system of accounts in the Treasury, he will find that the two statements are not irreconcilable. The difference arises from the two different methods of keeping the accounts. The Auditor-General keeps them upon a continuous system; the Treasury for the past three years have kept them upon a cash basis, keeping the cash of each year within the financial year. How is the apparent difference between these two different sets of accounts to be reconciled. It is to be done in this way. Let hon. members take the Auditor-General's accounts and take from them the deficiency account—it stands in the Treasury by itself—and take also the two suspense accounts, for which this Government can scarcely be held responsible, inasmuch as they were created before they came into power. It is

true that the Government have expended a small sum under one of these accounts, in conformity with an act of Parliament, I refer to the Centennial Park account. The other account is the Post Office street account. Now, it is well known to hon. members who have been here for some time, that these two accounts are governed by two distinct acts of the legislature and are kept entirely and distinctly apart from all the other accounts. As to the third account, the deficiency account, that is practically in suspense because it is set by separately in the Treasury, and this Parliament by its own act determined that certain sums from the consolidated revenue of each year should be utilised to pay off the deficiency. That account therefore stands as a distinct account as do the two suspense accounts to which I refer, and to mix these matters up with the ordinary cash account is unfair to the Colonial Treasurer, and unjust to the country. I have no hesitation in staking my business reputation upon the statement that the accounts of the Premier of this colony are absolutely and positively correct. Anyone can prove it if he takes the trouble to go into the matter. That is the first charge which the hon. member for The Hume made against the Government. If it were true that the Government, or the Premier acting on behalf of the Government, made any misrepresentation of the public accounts in this House which would go forth to the country, then I say that no more serious charge could be made against the Government, and if they were guilty of anything of the kind they would be deserving of the severest censure, and ought to be hurled out of office by every honest-minded man in the community. That matter has been absolutely disposed of in this debate. The Opposition, themselves, are quite ready to put that aside altogether, and are concentrating their energies upon the second count, so to speak. That count is that this Government made certain payments without the authority of Parliament. Members of this House know that the Treasurer's advance account is given to the Colonial Treasurer to enable him to pay certain accounts which require to be paid before Parliament has an opportunity to vote the money, the money so expended being afterwards accounted for to Parlia-

[*Mr. Storey.*



ment. The only question to be determined is whether these amounts are justifiably paid out of the account without the sanction of Parliament. As to the amount paid to Mr. Goldstein, £120 or £130 for services rendered in collecting certain information, I think this House would do well to dismiss that payment from their minds as too paltry and insignificant. If the Premier cannot be trusted to expend a small sum of money like this in the collection of information in the old country he certainly is not fit to retain the position he holds. Then another payment was made to Dr. Cullen, who went to Melbourne to assist in drafting the Federal Constitution Bill in its amended form. Now, I think it will be admitted that the fees paid for that work are reasonably proportioned to the work done. We fully acknowledge Dr. Cullen to be fully competent to do this work. His knowledge of the federal question probably assisted him to perform it very successfully. The whole indictment against the Government has resolved itself into the one charge of the payment of £350 to the hon. member for Paddington. I am not going to attempt to justify that act. Personally, I do not approve of it. I never could. I disapproved of the £1,000 being paid to Sir George Dibbs. I was the person, I think, who first brought that matter to light in this House, and I said I would never rest until the money was paid back to the Treasury. I never did rest until the money was paid to the Treasury, and when the money was paid back I rested perfectly satisfied, because the state suffered no wrong. I should be sorry to think I did it out of any personal antagonism to Sir George Dibbs. He was a personal friend of mine, though we differed in politics. But I looked upon it as an unconstitutional act, and I thought that the least thing that could have been done was to ask Parliament for the money, and probably Parliament would have granted it readily. I come now to this question of the payment of £350 to the hon. member for Paddington, to reimburse him for expenses out of pocket. I should have no objection to the hon. member being paid for expenses out of pocket in the ordinary way. If the item came before Parliament and was voted by Parliament, nobody could take exception to it, and it is

a great pity the Premier did not adopt that course. But even with all the unanimity of opinion in this House with regard to the unfortunate circumstance of the payment of this money, I am satisfied that there are a majority of hon. members who will acquit the Premier of anything like corruption. If, then, you acquit the Premier of corruption, as I certainly do, you take away the whole gravamen of the charge. I look upon the act of the Premier as a very grave mistake. I think it would have been much better, and no doubt everybody else thinks so now, if the matter had been left to be dealt with by Parliament in the ordinary way. It is possible Parliament would have voted these expenses, though it might have taken a very different view with regard to the question of remuneration. But the matter is placed in this position now, that nobody can justify the act, because it opens the door to possible fraud. In this particular instance I think it was merely an act of excessive good-nature on the part of the Premier. He erred on the side of generosity. To say that because a premier, during his five years of office, in which time he has handled some £60,000,000, has been guilty of making a mistake in paying £350 to a member of this House without first seeking its sanction—to say that for this the Government should be censured and turned out of office is to take an unnecessarily harsh view of the matter.

MR. O'CONNOR: Does the hon. gentleman think it is a question of degree, according to the amount, or does he think there is a principle involved?

MR. MOLESWORTH: Such a question is hardly necessary. The hon. member must either have a very poor idea of right and wrong, or must think I have. Of course, it is a question of principle; and I say the act was wrong. I think the Premier made a very grave mistake; but I acquit the right hon. gentleman of any corruption. Everybody acquits him of corruption; and having acquitted him of corruption, you take the sting out of the matter. You then simply say, "Here is a Premier who has been in office for five years. He has handled no less than £60,000,000 of money, and the only error—an error of judgment, if you like—that he has committed during that time is that he has spent £350 in a manner he ought

*Fifth night.*

not to have done." That is what it amounts to. If the punishment to be meted out to the Premier is that he is to be hurled from office for having made that paltry mistake in five years, then I say the punishment is out of all proportion to the offence; and I cannot understand the action of the Opposition in attempting to inflict such a punishment. More than that, I cannot understand the action of the labour party in voting against the Government, who, they acknowledge, have done such good service to the cause they have at heart. I listened with a good deal of pleasure to the speech delivered yesterday by the hon. member for Redfern. He certainly eulogised the Government in a very handsome manner. He said that the party he had the honor of leading had received at the hands of the Government assistance in carrying out many items in their programme, and that the Premier had at all times done his best to introduce legislation of a progressive character. The hon. gentleman had not a word to say against the Premier or his Government; and, practically, all he had against him was that he had made this one mistake during his five years of office. Surely, under those circumstances, with the knowledge that the right hon. gentleman had done such noble service to the cause of democracy, would it not have been more generous to say, "While we condemn you for that particular act, in a matter which we regard as one of principle, we shall not go to the extreme of putting you out of office, because you made one slight mistake in expending £350 contrary to the Constitution"? Besides, we have had these things occur over and over again. I do not say that a repetition of these offences makes them right. I sincerely hope that the outcome of this matter may be that by-and-by, and in a very short time, this Chamber may pass an act which shall prohibit members of either House from receiving fees of any kind whatever from the state, except those authorised by law. The sooner that is done the better. I do not care whether it be committees engaged in connection with the House, such as the Public Works Committee, or commissions issued to hon. members to go to other countries, members of Parliament so employed should not receive remuneration.

[*Mr. Molesworth.*

For anything they do in connection with the Government or the Parliament, they should receive no remuneration except that to which they are entitled under the Parliamentary Allowances Act. If we do that we shall remove, from this House, a cause of very great trouble. We know what trouble there is every time the Public Works Committee has to be elected. We know how canvassing goes on, and we knew what unpleasantness arises in connection with the election of that body. If there is such an amendment of the law as I have indicated, as a result of the present case, we shall have cause to congratulate ourselves. But there is no justification at the present time to hurl the Government from office. In the first place this matter of the hon. member for Paddington is the only charge that can be levelled against them. Surely it would be a paltry thing to throw out a government for an error of judgment in paying £350 away while the very gentlemen who are now doing their best to displace ministers from the Treasury benches were the men who did the same thing themselves. When Sir George Dibbs took £1,000 out of the Treasury there was no vote of censure against the Government. The only thing that was done was to compel the money to be paid back. Then there was the £1,000 paid to Mr. Suttor, and the £700 paid to a deceased member of this Chamber. In all these cases the money was paid by the late Administration, who are now doing all they possibly can to hurl the Government from power, simply because they have paid £350 to the hon. member for Paddington for expenses out of pocket. I admit that the great offence consists in the fact that some three years ago the Premier said that Mr. Neild's mission would not entail expense upon the country. But I cannot disguise from myself the fact that although hon. members opposite trust to this £350 transaction to turn the Government out of office, that is not the reason that is going to deprive ministers of their seats on the Treasury benches. It is the excuse, it is not the reason. The real reason is to be found in the fact that a certain number of hon. members are dissatisfied with the action the Premier took on the federal question, and now they are determined to have his scalp at any price.

Mr. ARTHUR GRIFFITH: Does that include the hon. member for Hastings-Macleay and the hon. member for Ashfield?

Mr. MOLESWORTH: I am not alluding to individuals, I am speaking generally. If you go back to administrations before the last one, you will find that the Administration of the late Sir Henry Parkes spent enormous sums of money without the sanction of parliament, and in respect to which their action was never seriously called into question. What are hon. members going to gain by effecting a change of government at the present time? Have the Opposition shown us what their policy is going to be? We do not know that they have any better policy to offer than that of the present Government. The leader of the Opposition has told us that he is not going to disturb the federal question; that it would be madness for him to attempt to do so. He has also stated that he does not intend to disturb the fiscal question. What about the protectionists who put their hope in him, if he is not going to disturb the fiscal question? Surely the protectionists have nothing to hope from him. He goes on to say that he does not take any exception to the measures of legislation which this Government have put in their programme. Therefore practically he has no fault to find with the Government programme. He is going to carry out the same legislation if he has an opportunity. He is not going to give us any programme of his own or show us what his policy is. Before the hon. member endeavours to oust the Government he should tell the country what he intends to do when he succeeds them. He should say whether he intends to give us any improved legislation, whether he is going to reform this House, whether he is going to reform the Upper Chamber, and whether he is going to carry out other reforms for which the country has been crying out. It appears to me that there is no reasonable excuse for a change of government at the present time. Different classes of politicians have managed, it appears to me, to get together under the wing of the leader of the Opposition at the present time. I want to know how long that party will remain united? Is it possible to expect that gentlemen holding such diverse opinions are likely to remain long together as one

compact party? We find amongst them federalists at any price, we find anti-federalists at any price, we find protectionists, we find freetraders, we find labour members, and we find the old-fashioned Tories. Every section of the House is represented in the party. Can anybody prophesy a lengthy continuance of that party as a compact whole? It simply means that this House will be found practically incapable of governing the country, and sooner or later, and I think the sooner the better, we must go to the country. If the Opposition are so certain that the Premier has not got the promise of a dissolution from the Governor, it follows, as a matter of course, that when the hon. member for The Hume comes across to these benches he will find it impossible to control the House, because he really has not a majority of his own. I can never conceive that the free-traders will stop long with him, or that others who hold opinions contrary to his own will remain long with him. Therefore, he must seek a dissolution, and if a dissolution is to come, the sooner the better. Let us go to the country. Let us go before our constituents. Let each party go to the people with a distinct policy, and let the electors say which party is to control the public affairs of New South Wales. It must be patent to all that any attempt to introduce the fiscal question at the present time would be scouted by three-fourths, if not four-fifths of the community. The people feel that the fiscal policy must be settled by the federal parliament in a short time, and to attempt to disturb the fiscal policy at the present time, with the possibility of raising the question again two years' hence, would simply be to throw the whole commercial affairs of the country into confusion. From my experience I believe the commercial people of New South Wales do not want to disturb the tariff. There will not be a great disturbance of the tariff; there will be more a settlement of the tariff under the federal than under the local parliament. I hold that, although the Premier made a mistake in paying that £350 to the hon. member for Paddington without waiting for the sanction of Parliament, there was no corruption in such payment. It was merely a mistaken act of good nature on the part of the Premier in anticipating a vote of

*Fifth night.*

Parliament. So far as the other charges are concerned, they have been dropped, or, at any rate, they have been altogether disproved, and it has been acknowledged by nearly every party in the House that the measures which this Government have brought in have been beneficial to the country, and that ministers have done all they possibly could to introduce much-needed reforms. They have accomplished a greater amount of valuable legislation than was ever previously carried out in a similar period. I can only say that I sincerely regret to see a government go out of office that has such a magnificent record as the present Government in having done such faithful service to the country, the Premier having such a noble record with regard to the management of the finances of the country, such as I undertake to say no previous treasurer ever had in this colony for keeping the expenses within the revenue. I am sincerely sorry that they have to go out on a question of this kind. I would rather see them defeated on a question of policy, because the country would then have an opportunity of saying whether or not the Government were deserving of censure. I think the country will soon come to the conclusion that the Government have not been fairly treated, and that the punishment of hurling them from office for the payment of this £350 is altogether out of proportion to the offence which they are said to have committed.

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK (Rylstone) [5-52]: For some considerable time no one could have much doubt as to the course which I should pursue in regard to a motion of this character. Although for some years I have been a supporter of the present Government; although I gave them a loyal support during periods of great political crises, and assisted them as far as I could in the achievement of many democratic reforms which they have placed to their credit on the statute-book, still I feel that at present I should not be doing my duty, either to the country or to myself, if I pursued any other course than that which I propose to do, namely, to cast my vote against them. I may say that, as far as I am concerned, it is with feelings of the greatest regret that I have to do so. I may say that there is no feeling of a personal nature animating me in the course which I am taking. I have feelings

[*Mr. Molesworth.*

of the greatest regard for every member of the Government. I have not had to ask any favour from the Government. I owe them nothing, as a matter of fact, more than any hon. member who sits in this House and endeavours to secure those benefits for his constituents to which they are really entitled. I have never asked them for anything that any reasonable and honest man could not justifiably ask them for, and, as I have not done that, I conceive that I am at perfect liberty on an occasion of this character to pursue that course which, as a member of the House I feel it my duty to pursue with regard to the motion of censure. Charges have been made by certain hon. members, particularly the hon. member who does duty as the Government whip, that hon. members were deserting a sinking ship. I have no desire or intention to enter into personal antagonism with, or to be personally offensive to, the hon. member for Leichhardt or anyone else, but I want to point out that a distinction appears to be made between members who change sides, according to the side on which they sit. If an hon. member who has been supporting the Government for a number of years feels it incumbent on him to pursue a course that will land him on the other side when a direct motion of censure is moved, he is a renegade, he is a "rat"; but if a member comes from the Opposition side and lands over on the Ministerial side for the purpose of defeating a motion of censure, he is a man possessed of a great political conscience, a man who feels that his duty is to look after the best interests of the community, a man who is worthy of the esteem of every other man who has any conscience of his own. I say there are a certain number of hon. members, and I am justified in including myself amongst them, who are possessed of just as sound political principles as those who decry them at this crisis, men who have stuck rigidly, strongly, and virtuously to those principles on which they were returned to the House. I will say this much also, that if they pursued any other course than that they propose to pursue to-night, they would render themselves liable to be held up as objects of scorn to every honest man in the community. I do not think, under the circumstances, that it will be necessary for me to make any apology for my change

of side. It is not I who has changed. There is not one principle which animated me when I came into the House five years ago in regard to which I have changed. The change that has taken place is on the part of the Ministerialists. I am amongst the number of those who stood loyal to them in time of great political tribulation, trial, and responsibility, and it is they who have changed their principles, not the men who have left them. It has been said, and very rightly said, that the Premier has been responsible for a great amount of democratic legislation being put upon the statute-book. There is not the slightest doubt about it. To give the Premier and the Cabinet their due, the Administration has been the most democratic administration that ever existed in this colony. They have, as the Premier very properly pointed out last night, placed on the statute-book measures which redound to their credit—measures which had been promised by many administrations in years gone by, but measures which those governments did not attempt to carry into effect. His party are responsible for a great deal of good democratic work; but it must not be forgotten, at the same time, that the Premier and his eight or nine ministers could not have carried out that democratic work if it had not been for the fact, that behind them sat forty or fifty men who possessed the same political principles as animated the Ministry, and who sat here night after night and assisted them very materially in their legislative labours. It would have been absolutely impossible for the Ministry to have done that work had it not been for the band of followers who sat behind them night after night and faced the opposition which was offered to them. In reference to the matter affecting the hon. member for Paddington, I do not think there is any member of the House who will honestly and conscientiously charge the Premier with having been personally corrupt. But there is one thing which may be said, and that is that certain acts which may not be regarded as personally corrupt acts are of such a nature that severe punishment must be imposed upon the perpetrators of them; and, though it may seem hard that the Ministry and the Premier, who have done good work in the interests of the country, should be ousted from office because the

right hon. gentleman misused his powers, whilst it may be said that it is hard for the Ministry to have to suffer the punishment which certainly will be inflicted upon them to-night, I think no one can honestly say that it would be right for hon. members who possess sound political feeling to do anything but pursue the course which is proposed. I do not desire to prolong this debate. I have a certain amount of feeling in connection with the attitude forced upon me, and I have experienced a great pang of regret that, after having sat behind the Ministry for the period that I have done, I should be compelled at this juncture to break away from them, and to vote for their practical political extinction. But, as I said before, that duty devolves upon me, and, seeing that I have loyally endeavoured during the time I have been in the House to carry out the dictates of my political and moral conscience, I find no necessity whatever to make any apology for the course which I shall certainly pursue on this occasion.

[*Mr. Speaker left the chair at 6 p.m. The House resumed at 7 p.m.*]

MR. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: I propose to say very few words in reference to the charges that have been made against the Government during the course of this debate. Of course, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that very serious allegations have been made in reference to the administration of public affairs. But at the same time, I rather incline to adhere stringently to the particular matter at issue, having reference to the hon. member for Paddington. That the Premier was actuated by any corrupt motive, I do not believe. I have such a high estimate of the probity and general character of the right hon. gentleman, that I do not think for a moment that he would use his power and influence for the purpose of endeavouring to secure support by that particular course. But at the same time, it devolves upon the House to express its objection to the continuance of a system of a kind which might be used by one occupying the high and responsible office of Prime Minister, to secure adherence and support in certain directions, where such support might otherwise not be given. These charges have been made, and it has been pointed out, by many hon. members on the Government side of the House, that

*Fifth night.*

large sums of money were expended behind the back of Parliament by previous governments. As I was not a member of this House when the money was expended, I cannot be supposed to have had anything to do with it. It only rests with me to take cognisance of the acts done by the right hon. gentleman whom I have followed during the four or five years for which he has been leader of the House, and I do not think that I should abrogate any great principle to which I have adhered in the past if I vote for the extinction of the present Government, and the placing in power of a government formed by the leader of the Opposition. I have hitherto always endeavoured, so far as my limited ability would enable me to do so, both by my votes and my speeches, to prevent the leader of the Opposition from coming into power. Not because I had any objection to him personally, because I believe that his actions during the past eighteen months have proved him to be a stringent adherent of principle, but because I being a free-trader and he a protectionist, I would not give a vote which would have the effect of enabling him to displace a free-trade government. But now that federation, despite the efforts of the anti-billite party, has become an accomplished fact, I have come to the conclusion that, so far as this Parliament is concerned, the fiscal question is practically dead and buried, and therefore that it is quite within the right of even a freetrader to consent to the placing in power of a gentleman of the political proclivities of the hon. member for The Hume. The Premier introduced into this colony a free-trade policy which went beyond anything of the kind then in existence in any English community. But not very long ago he broke away from his principles, and proposed the imposition of duties upon sugar, jams, and other articles. It was at that time that I first broke away from the party, because I did not think it was right that the Premier, having wiped out of existence the Dibbs duties, and having brought into operation a policy of direct taxation, should go back on his principles. Practically, I have been in opposition to him ever since; and now that the fiscal question is dead, there can be no breach of principle upon my part in voting to place in office the hon. member for The

[*Mr. J. C. L. Fitzpatrick.*]

Hume, who, besides, has distinctly promised that he will not consent to the raising of the fiscal question during the life of the present Parliament. I have upon several occasions since federation has been in the air spoken as I felt in regard to the hon. member for The Hume. I think that every hon. member, whether federalist or anti-billite, must commend the hon. gentleman for the course he took in regard to the bill. During the last five or six months sneers have been thrown at hon. gentlemen, who felt it their duty, in the interests of the country, to oppose the Federation Bill. We have been called anti-federalists, but I do not think that the charge that we are such would bear investigation. A man who did not belong to the fold of any particular branch of the Christian religion might just as reasonably be called an anti-Christian. It would be just as reasonable to say that because I am not a member of the Salvation Army I am antagonistic to the great principles of Christianity, as it is to say that because I and others have opposed a certain set of provisions having for their object the formation of a federal constitution we are opposed to federation. On the contrary, I am as strong and vigorous a federationist as any man who is prepared to swallow any proposal for a constitution that is put forward. The attitude which the hon. member for The Hume took up in regard to the Federation Bill was an attitude which was also taken by 82,000 of the electors of the colony, and if we who fought against the bill which I have always regarded, and still regard, as a most iniquitous measure, are to be called anti-federalists, then there must be 82,000 anti-federalists in New South Wales. The hon. member for The Hume has promised that he will introduce certain domestic legislation; but, even if he were not ready to take such a course, though I believe he is, he will, when he comes into power, have behind him the members of several parties in this House, who will make it their duty to see that good and honest legislation is placed upon the statute-book; so that I do not think there is any reasonable ground for fearing that the hon. member's promise will not be kept. All the democratic opinion in the House is not represented by the members who support the Government, and during the last four or five years hon.

gentlemen who have been sitting upon the left of Mr. Speaker have assisted as willingly in the carrying into effect of democratic legislation as have hon. gentlemen who have sat upon the Government side of the House. Threats have been made, in connection with the motion of censure, that we shall be compelled to go to the country. A dissolution has been foreshadowed by a number of hon. members, and even the Premier, in one or two of the speeches which he has made in the country, has referred to the fact that the representatives of the people will very shortly be called to account for their doings before the electors of New South Wales. Without being guilty of the humbug of asserting that I desire a dissolution—because I am sure that there are not five hon. members who can honestly say that—I feel, as I believe hon. members generally feel, that I have nothing to be ashamed of in the course which I propose to take. There is no discredit in pursuing the course which one believes to be right, and if, with other hon. members, I have to face a dissolution, I shall be ready to do so, and willing to accept the result. The acts of other governments have nothing to do with the question now before us, and though the raking up of political history is a recognised means of party warfare, carried out not only in this House but I suppose in every house of legislature in the civilised world, it is known that the wrongdoing of one set of political leaders does not justify the wrongdoing of another set, and if the hon. member for The Hume comes into power it will be one of his first duties to prevent those who occupy high and responsible positions from continuing practices like that which has produced such disastrous results for this Government. I think that all men should be put on the same plane in regard to the acceptance of fees from the Government. There is no justification for allowing a member of Parliament who is a member of the legal profession to accept fees from the Government without endangering his seat and refusing men of other callings and occupations the same right.

Mr. O'CONOR: —————

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: It is asserted that a solicitor, who was a member of Parliament, would not be allowed to accept fees from the Government of

the day, and to me it is a strange thing that any exemption should be made from the rule which provides certain pains and penalties for the generality of members of Parliament who accept payment from the Government for services rendered to the country in any direction. The hon. member for The Hume should take the first occasion that offers after he comes into power to introduce a measure which will put an end to the distinction which I complain of, and will prevent the practices to which objection has so often been taken. So far as expenditure of public money in the entertainment of distinguished visitors is concerned, all governments are supposed to pay that tribute to men of high distinction coming from other parts of the world; but the practice has been carried beyond the grounds of reason, and it would be as well to place the occupants of office above the charge of improper expenditure in that direction. I believe that the Premier honestly desires to recognise the services rendered by the hon. member for Paddington to the community, but I think that as the payment was made a considerable time after the services were performed, it might have been allowed to wait until Parliament had had an opportunity of expressing an opinion in regard to it. Our complaint is that after distinct promises had been made by the leader of the Government and the Chief Secretary that the hon. member for Paddington should not be paid, the Government paid him behind the back of Parliament.

Mr. BRUNKER: I made no promise!

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: The hon. member stated in reply to a question by the hon. member for Deniliquin, that no payment has been made to recognise the services of the hon. member for Paddington, and that statement was taken in conjunction with the statement made by the Premier when the hon. member for Paddington was given authority to frame his report, that the colony would be put to no expense in connection with the work of the commissioner. It has been pointed out by the Premier, in the course of one or two speeches that he has made, that he indorsed the letter of appointment that was given to the hon. member for Paddington with the statement that the hon. gentleman was expected to carry out the duty he had undertaken without anything

*Fifth night.*

in the shape of payment being expected by him. Under those circumstances, it would certainly have been wiser—the Premier admits it now—to have waited until a declaration was made by this House as to its feeling on the matter before making any payment.

Mr. BRUNKER : It has been proved, by evidence on oath, that what I stated in my answer was absolutely true !

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK : I admit it has been proved that the Chief Secretary's statement was absolutely correct at that time. There is no doubt about that. I have no desire to do an injustice to the hon. gentleman, nor to any other member of the present Government. From the Premier and the Chief Secretary down to the member of the Government who has been for the shortest period in office, I admit that I have received every courtesy, and it goes very much against the grain for me to have to make remarks such as I have made to-night. I am sure that those hon. gentlemen will acquit me of any desire to do them an injustice, or to say one unkind word in reference to them. I have received much kindness at their hands, although I have received nothing in the shape of any grant or gift to which my constituents were not honestly and justly entitled. Therefore, I feel rather keenly the necessity that arises for me to make these remarks. The party to which I belong has been designated the "stiletto party" or the "red Indian brigade." The Premier called us, the other night, the "party of revenge." I can assure the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government that there is no feeling of revenge in my mind. The right hon. member knows too well the cause of my secession from his party, and also of the secession of a number of other hon. members from it, and he also knows that not one of those hon. members who have been designated the "stiletto party" has during his occupancy of a seat in this House pursued any course that would justify its being said that he belonged to a stiletto party. There has been no stabbing the Premier in the back. From the time we thought it absolutely necessary to sever our connection with the right hon. gentleman's party, we came out into the open, and let it be distinctly seen that we could no longer sit behind a Government which we conceived,

[*Mr. J. C. L. Fitzpatrick.*]

rightly or wrongly, had abandoned those principles upon which we were elected. On the question of federation—which I do not propose to touch upon to-night as regards its virtues or its ills—I broke away from the Government, and I glory in the fact that I had sufficient political courage to pursue that course. I would do the same to-morrow, notwithstanding the fact that a large proportion of the people voted in favour of the Federal Bill, if that measure were presented to the people of New South Wales exactly as it was presented to them on a previous occasion. Therefore, I have nothing to fear, nothing to blame myself for, in regard to that matter. But as regards doing anything for the purpose of preventing the accomplishment of the desires of the people, so plainly expressed through the medium of the referendum on the 20th June last, I would not lift one of my hands for the purpose of preventing that measure from being carried into effect.

Mr. Cook : Do I understand the hon. member to say that his only cause of complaint against the Government is because they departed from their principles in connection with federation ?

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK : I said distinctly that the breach between me and the Government was created in the first place because the Government broke away from its free-trade principles and in the second place because of their attitude on federation when they broke away from the principles which they had advocated at the referendum in 1898.

Mr. Cook : That is candid !

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK : I want to be candid. I do not want to stand up here in a false position. I should be very sorry indeed not to pursue a course which I thought was honest and fair as regards both the House and the Ministry, and last but not least, so far as I am concerned personally. I feel that whilst I occupy a place in this House it is my bounden duty to do all that I possibly can to show that I act on principle. I cannot recollect one vote that I have given during the last five years which was against the principles I enunciated when I first went before the electors. I adhere to what I have said with regard to federation. But I also say that, seeing that so great a majority of the people voted in favour of



the bill of 1899, and seeing that I have always been an advocate of majority rule—even although majority rule does not find a place in any of the 128 clauses of the bill of 1899—I certainly would not, even if it rested in my power, do anything which would jeopardise the carrying into effect of the great measure in favour of which the people have spoken.

Mr. Cook : But the hon. member would punish the men who did it !

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK : I do not see how it is punishing the men who did it. I am punishing the Government in a measure, because, after stating that they were distinctly pledged to have incorporated in that bill certain principles, they went back on those principles, and allowed the bill to be presented to the people destitute of some of the most democratic principles that should have been placed in it before the people were asked to accept it. But my vote does not go against the Government solely on those grounds.

Mr. Cook : That is candid !

Mr. HAYNES : The only thing they did not turn their face on was office !

Mr. Cook : The hon. member never had a chance to do that !

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK : Under the circumstances I feel that the assertion that I belong to a stiletto or red Indian brigade or party of revenge is absolutely unfair. It is also an unfair aspersion to cast on other hon. members who seceded at the same time as I did from the Government party. It is because I feel that the designation "stiletto party" is an unjust one that I have made reference to it to-night. We have had many parties in this House recently. We have had the Government party, the Opposition party, the stiletto party, the independent party, the solidarity party. So as to distinguish the independent party from the solidarity party I think we may just as well refer to it as the "liquidity" party. I am sure that so far as the independent party is concerned my hon. friend the hon. member for Ryde will be able to speak for it, and will do so in a fashion which will leave no doubt as to the course it will pursue, when it is brought face to face with the necessity of casting a vote on this occasion. Despite all that may be said to the contrary—despite the sneers that have been

hurled at us for having left the Government party, it being said that we were desirous of doing something with the object of imperilling the great cause of federation—I think it is generally admitted—the hon. and learned member for Hastings-Macleay seems to recognise the fact, and other members of the Opposition who were federalists first, secondly, and lastly, also seem to recognise the fact—that federation is absolutely safe. Even although the leader of the Opposition had the power, I do not think that he, recognising the great principle of majority rule, would attempt to wipe out the result that has been achieved through the vote of the people on the 20th June. I desire to make reference to a remark made by the hon. member for Randwick a few minutes ago during the course of his speech. This hon. gentleman set himself up as one of the parliamentary purists in this House. In the first place, he said he was altogether opposed, I think, to the principle of payment of members. I do not know whether the hon. member accepts his payment or not. He was also, he said, altogether opposed to the franking system that has been adopted in regard to the correspondence of hon. members, and he made charges which were not levelled against all the members of the House apparently, but which seemed to be levelled against the members of one particular party in the House. I do not know why he should have pursued that course. Seeing that the issue of the franked envelopes has been recognised as a reasonable concession to grant to hon. members—whatever qualms of conscience some hon. gentlemen may feel in regard to it—I think that the hon. member, instead of standing up here and lecturing other hon. gentlemen because they happen to have accepted these franked envelopes, should have allowed some one else to take that course. If that concession is wrong here, it is also wrong in all the other parliaments of the colonies, and the same system has been in vogue in the other colonies, not for two or three months as it has been in New South Wales, but for some years past ; and if it is in vogue there I do not know why the hon. member should have come here to-night and pose as a political purist, for the purpose of defaming other hon. members and degrading them in the eyes of the people.

*Fifth night.*

Mr. WILLIS: He said one hour before he came into the House he was going to vote against the Government!

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: He has sat on so many sides of late years that there is not another side for him to sit upon now, and the result is that he will probably pursue the course adopted by another hon. member, and will require a room in a certain portion of this building for the next party, which will be a party of one, consisting of the hon. member for Randwick himself. I wish to say a few words in reference to the necessity of passing certain measures of domestic legislation. During the last year or so, when federation seems to have been about the only question which the Ministry felt it incumbent upon them to deal with, domestic legislation has been left absolutely in abeyance. In one of the daily papers during the last few days appeared a leading article, pointing out that a change of Government at the present juncture would be altogether out of place, seeing that a number of domestic reforms are necessary of accomplishment, and that the Reid Government are the only party capable of accomplishing those reforms. It is a most peculiar thing that the papers which publish articles of that kind seem, during the past two years at least, to have altogether overlooked the necessity for these domestic reforms. They have not printed leading articles and inspired paragraphs with the object of proving the necessity for these domestic reforms, although we have been languishing for several years for the want of certain measures to be placed on the statute-book, which have been demanded by the people. So much time has been taken up on the great question of federation, that the Ministry have been unable to meet the demands made by the people, and the result is that New South Wales stands today, except in one or two regards, in a more backward state so far as domestic legislation is concerned than all the other colonies in the Australasian group, barring, perhaps, Western Australia. I hope that the leader of the Opposition, when he does get into power, will hasten on some of these measures that have found places on the business-paper for a considerable time past, and I am sure that he will receive all possible assistance from hon. members. I

[*Mr. J. C. L. Fitzpatrick.*]

think the hon. member for Erskine Division made the statement to-night to the effect that it would be impossible for any government to carry on for any great length of time, seeing that the parties in this House were so mixed. How have parties been during the whole of this Parliament? How were they during the whole of last Parliament? Were they not mixed to such an extent that it was impossible to discover who was who? Many parties have sprung up, and a number of hon. members have been supporting the Government who certainly did not belong to that party. The right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, when the first motion of censure was dealt with, had a majority of 4, but he was still able to carry on, and with the loyal assistance of a number of members on the Opposition side of the House he was able to place certain measures on the statute-book, which they might have prevented from being carried into law. I have no fear but that this House, constituted as it is at present, even with a change of government, will be able to bring into existence measures tending to the good government of the country. In conclusion, I have once more to say this: that I have been forced to the necessity to vote for this motion of censure by the feeling that I could not honestly pursue any other course. Without making any vainglorious boast of my possessing any great fund of political honesty and principle in comparison with other hon. members, I say that, as in the past, I have supported the Government because I believed their measures were calculated to advance the interests of the colony, so I vote now to put that Government out of office because they have to a certain extent broken faith with principles which I regard, and always have regarded, as dearer to me than is my place in Parliament. That being so, I have felt that I could not pursue any other course than that which I shall pursue to-night—that of voting against the Government.

Mr. CARRUTHERS (St. George), Colonial Treasurer [7.36]: The speech delivered last night by the leader of the labour party in this House was a speech which may be characterised as one full of justice without being generous. It was a speech upon which any government may fairly place their record before the people of this coun-

try and appeal to them for a decision upon their conduct, upon their legislation, and upon their administration. It did credit to the hon. member as one who will vote against the Government at this crisis that he had the manliness to admit what very few persons have admitted who have attempted to drag us down, to besmirch our reputations—that our legislation has been of a progressive character, and that our administration has been in the interest of and has tended to the well-being of the people of this country. Very few governments which have had to face a crisis of this character—very few governments with the prospect before them which faces this Government to-night—have been spoken of by an opponent as this Government was spoken of last night by the hon. member. There are hon. members who in their own consciences must admit that every word which the hon. member for Redfern uttered last night was perfectly true, and yet who, taking our five years of progressive legislation and progressive administration, have not had the common honesty to say a solitary word in favour of our career. The hon. member for Wickham, who moved the amendment which has, so to speak, cornered the Government, had been a supporter of ours for four and a half out of this five years, and his speech from beginning to end was an attempt to show that the career of the Government had been so worthless as not to merit any praise or recognition whatever. I set against that speech the manly speech of the leader of the labour party, and I say that there has been no government in existence in this country, no government having to leave office which has left it with a record such as we have had, indorsed from the lips of an opponent, because the hon. member for Redfern stands here as an opponent of the Government, voting as he intends to do to put us out of office. No government which has hitherto existed in this colony has left office with a record so clean or with a eulogy pronounced upon it such as that which the hon. member pronounced last night. The hon. member's speech will find, I think, a re-echo throughout this country if there should be an appeal to it—and that is a matter which no man can foresee or foretell—an appeal to that grand jury which stands as a higher tribunal of appeal behind the back of this House.

When the honest truth has been told, wrung out of the lips of an hon. member voting against us, and when the decision has been given, I am satisfied that it will be that decision which always ought to be given to those who have performed faithful and honorable service to this country. I have said that the hon. member's speech was just but that it was not generous. He spoke of what might be expected from the successors of the Government. But there may be a longer road, a harder road, to journey before the hon. member can speak of the successors of the Government. The end of this Government has not yet arrived. The time for inspecting ministerial rooms has hardly come yet, and when we have a speech of this character delivered by a man who voices the opinion of a party, which, as the result of its deliberations, will be the party which will bring the Government down in this House—I think it shows that the road is a little bit harder than some hon. members may imagine. I think it was well said by one hon. member that a sudden spasm of purity has come over our parliamentary life on this occasion. I am not one to have the least objection to these spasms of purity coming over the public life of this country, and if the result of this motion be that our public life is purified, that it is made more difficult for men to go ever so little wrong in administering the public affairs of this country, then this debate will have been justified, this motion will have been justified, this crisis will have been justified. But I am one of those who have to look at the price which has to be paid—at the sacrifice which has to be made—and I, for one, while I do not desire to cling for one moment to my office—while I shall be delighted, as far as I am personally concerned, to take my seat in the cool shades of opposition, and have some rest there—I feel that it ought to be made clear with regard to the Government and every member of it, that if a practice of the past—which has obtained ever since we have had our Constitution Act—is to be declared a bad one, which needs to be remedied, it shall be made plain, I say, that, although the practice may be wrong in principle, there is no corruption—no impurity in the action of ministers—in this particular case. There is no doubt that there is a principle involved at the present juncture.

*Fifth night.*

Many men, knowing that this principle is involved, imagine that there is to be a clear line of cleavage upon this division, which is to put a past-time bad practice aside, and to substitute for the future a good practice. Sir, whatever resolution this House might pass, there would be nothing to prevent another government to-morrow from continuing the practice which has obtained in the past.

AN HON. MEMBER: Except the force of public opinion!

MR. ARTHUR GRIFFITH: And the fate of this Government!

MR. CARRUTHERS: Hon. members, in a fit of virtuous indignation—all parties combined—parties to which I shall refer in my address to-night—may condemn this past practice. But it will still continue, and it may not be convenient to have this spasm of purity to get rid of a government, and to make room for another government. There is only one way of stopping these so-called unconstitutional acts—the Constitution does not make them unconstitutional—and that way is not by an abstract resolution, it is not by making a scapegoat of the hon. member for Paddington; it is not by using him as a stalking-horse; it is not by attacking the Premier, with a view to damaging his federal prospects; it is not by using him as an instrument. I shall show to-night what the real intention is; my words will ring throughout this country, and there will be thousands upon thousands who will understand what is the real motive not of all, but of many hon. members. It is all very well to use Mr. J. C. Neild as a stalking-horse for the party of revenge to get behind, in order to fire at a man on whom they desire to be avenged. This resolution will serve that purpose. But that will not make unconstitutional a practice which is bad, which I have never defended, a practice which is made illegal under the constitution of federated Australia. There is only one way in which to remedy a practice such as this. While the matter is in doubt the practice will be pursued, and the parliament which neglects to make illegal that which is doubtful, is a parliament which should be punished, and not those who act in accordance with the practice which parliament has never made illegal. This practice has gone on unchecked in every parliament which has existed since

[*Mr. Carruthers.*

1854; from start to finish this practice has been observed, and no parliament has done that which it has had the power to do—to pass a law to make the practice illegal. Parliament cannot legislate by resolution. Parliament cannot speak by mere votes of censure. They are the words of a day which pass away. Parliament has but one means of utterance, and that is the statute-book and the statutes which are ingrossed upon it. This resolution to-night places nothing upon the statute-book which will make it illegal to-morrow for the same practice to be carried on. What guarantee have we that those whom one hon. member has spoken of as our successors, what guarantee have we that our probable successors, who sit on those benches opposite, will regard the resolution of this House, and that this practice will be put a stop to? Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones. Men must be judged by their past doings, their past careers. You would not take a culprit who has been once or twice convicted and put him in the place of a man about whose deeds you may have some doubt. It is a nice way of commencing reform to put in place of a government which has followed an old practice in cases which when analysed will be shown not to be so bad as other cases which have occurred—to put in place of this Government men, with a majority of whom, so far as their past career is concerned, the practice for which we are condemned has been quite a common thing. I have here a document which, I suppose, as I intend to quote from it, I must, according to the rules of the House, lay upon the table. I will let it remain on the table of the House. It is a document showing the royal commissions, inquiry boards, and committees which have been in existence in this colony for the past ten or fifteen years. When hon. members see that document and examine it for themselves, they will wonder what strange panic has come over them; that, suddenly aroused to a sense of virtue, they are going to make a scapegoat of the Premier when the practice, as disclosed by this report, has been going on unchecked for years and years. If we take the last administration that was in office, I can show from this document that with members of that administration it was not a

question of paying the fees but a question of taking the fees themselves. In 1893 and 1894 the Hon. Dr. MacLaurin was a member of the Dibbs Administration, holding the office of Vice-President of the Executive Council, a position which carries no pay, but at the same time carries with it all the obligations as to the observance of constitutional usage which apply to ministers of the Crown. Dr. MacLaurin, at the time he held that office, being a member of the Legislative Council, was receiving fees as a member of the Board of Health, and receiving fees for the medical examination of officers retiring from the police force. I pass those by as a mere trifle compared with this—done, mind you, with the sanction and knowledge of the hon. member who has moved this resolution, because he was a member of the Executive Council which issued the commission I am about to refer to. The commission was issued on the 17th November, 1893, and the report was furnished on the 13th January, 1894. The commission was issued with a view of advising the Government as to the necessity of removing the Benevolent Asylum in Sydney. It consisted of the Hon. H. N. MacLaurin, the Hon. C. K. Mackellar, Dr. Foreman, and Professor Anderson Stuart. Professor Anderson Stuart was the Medical Adviser to the Government, and he acted without fee or reward of any kind. I have here, to-night, the vouchers signed by Dr. MacLaurin, in which he puts in his account for acting as a member of a board—to do what? To advise the Chief Secretary, his colleague, “On certain matters relating to Benevolent Asylums, £21,” and there is the receipt for the payment of the sum of £21. That has never been put before Parliament. Parliament never voted that amount. It was done, and the practice was in vogue at that time. If there is any blame or censure upon this Government for paying a sum of money to a private member, no one accuses the Premier of putting his hand into the public purse and taking the money, or any portion of it, for himself. But here is a different case. We heard, last night, of the potentialities of the situation. What grand potentialities are there in the situation when ministers may appoint their colleague here as a commissioner, and their colleague there as a commissioner, to ad-

vise another colleague, and pay them each a fee of twenty guineas for doing it! The potentialities of the two cases cannot be compared. This commission was issued by the Executive Council, of which the hon. member for The Hume was a member. It is proposed to unseat this Government and to put in, as their successors, a government led by that hon. member, who, as my hon. friend the member for Grenfell tells the press to-day, has promised to see passed measures of democratic legislation. These promises may be very good, but what is at stake to-night is not a question of democratic legislation. The leader of the labour party has said that no government that has ever existed in Australia has given to the people such liberal legislation as this Government has done, and that no government has ever administered the departments on lines of such true democracy as this Government has done. The issue is not who is to give democratic legislation. The issue to-night in the hon. member's speech is a principle at stake as to the payment of money to members of Parliament behind the back of Parliament, and the man who is to vindicate that principle, the leader of the Opposition, was a member of a government which violated the principle time after time. That is one case with regard to that Government. Now we will take another. Another member of the same Government was the hon. member for Bathurst, Mr. F. B. Suttor. I am not saying that in any of these particular cases there was anything corrupt, that there was anything dishonest; but if the principle is one which is to be affirmed to-night then the principle was violated in the cases I have cited. The hon. member for Bathurst, while a member of that Government, left the colony as a commissioner on a postal conference. He was in receipt of his salary as Postmaster-General, and, without the authority of Parliament, £1,000 was paid to him by his colleagues for expenses in regard to that commission. That money was paid in May, 1894. It was not voted by Parliament until December, 1894. And at whose instance was it voted? It was voted at the instance of this Government when wiping off the legacy of debt left to us by our predecessors. That is the second member of that Government. Then I need hardly refer—

*Fifth night.*

and I would not refer to it to-night but for that unmanly speech last evening by the hon. and learned member for Hastings-Macleay—to what is a matter of record and a matter of history as to the conduct of Mr. Barton, as Attorney-General, in receiving fees from the Government. I have here documents to show that immediately the hon. member left that Government, and while still a member of this House, he drew fees for appearing for the Government in many and various cases in the law courts. Then we have the late Minister for Justice in that administration, Mr. R. E. O'Connor. The same may be said of him as may be said of Mr. Barton. That is four members of that administration. Then we have the case of the late leader of that government—a case which is well known, and to which I need not further refer. That makes five members of that administration. And the hon. member for The Hume himself—not while a member of that administration, but while a member of the Water Conservation Commission years ago—drew from the Government, or had paid to him, his travelling expenses while attending to his duties as a member of that commission. That brings us to six members of that government. The hon. member for Camden—also a member of that government—was a member of another commission which drew fees—not fees in the ordinary sense, but a reimbursement of their travelling and other expenses. So that, if you take that administration, it will be very hard to find even one member of it who had not been in some fashion or other a party to the violation of the principle which the House is asked to affirm to-night. What I want to call attention to is the gross inconsistency of hon. members. Though this practice has gone on for forty-five years, and no government has been punished for it, hon. gentlemen opposite now say “Here, at last, we have got you. It is the first case we know of against your Government; and now, after forty-five years of winking at this practice, we are going to make an example of you.” I say the practice will not be stopped by any bald resolution of this House. There is only one way of stopping it, and that is by acts of legislation. You will not cure the principle by putting men into office on this side of the House who have been the greatest culprits, as regards

[*Mr. Carruthers.*

a breach of the principle, of almost any hon. members in this House. During the course of the debate another question has been introduced in regard to these payments to members of Parliament, and especially to legal members who draw fees from the Government for appearing for the Crown in various cases; and how studiously the attempt has been made that the references should be directed to the hon. member for Woollahra and the hon. member for Petersham—who has not drawn a penny-piece from the Government in spite of the assertions to the contrary, who never asked for a penny-piece from the Government, who was not entitled to a penny-piece from the Government, and who never worked for the Government. But these two young members, who perchance may be voting for the Government, are singled out. The hon. member for Ashfield, who spoke as prospective Attorney-General in the government of purists who are to succeed us, so far as this House is concerned, is the greatest culprit of all. The hon. member had the manliness to tell the House that even if he is going to be Attorney-General he is not going to alter his practice until Parliament alters the law. He said so here, and he will tell the House to-morrow that so long as he is a member of the bar and briefs are offered to him for the Crown he will take them and will take the money too. That is the way you are going to destroy the practice—by making room for the men who have followed the practice to their own benefit, that they may vindicate the honor of Parliament and the purity of public life. When we hear of the potentialities of the case from the hon. member for Hastings-Macleay, I cannot help recalling to my mind the fact that it is only a few weeks ago when the hon. member received a fee of 20 guineas from the Government for advising in regard to a very complicated question in reference to the government at Norfolk Island. Will the hon. member who is so ready to impute acts of corruption to the Premier and the hon. member for Paddington, say that the payment of that 20 guineas or the offer of that brief was made with any intention of corrupting him? It was necessary to have the advice of a constitutional lawyer in order that the name of the lawyer himself would be a guarantee to the people

of Norfolk Island of the value of that advice, and it was only those who were public men, with names beyond the borders of the colony, that the Government could really apply to for advice to satisfy the people of Norfolk Island, who were claiming the whole of the island by virtue of some equitable arrangement made when they went from Pitcairn Island to Norfolk Island. The feeling of the hon. member for Hastings-Macleay for his advice was free from any corrupt motive or impure view whatever; and whilst no man assailed his honor in connection with that transaction, the hon. and learned member should have been the last to assail the Premier, or anybody else, in regard to a transaction which was just as pure and as much above suspicion. I have pointed out, with regard to these hon. members, most of them members of the late Administration, many of them men who are clamouring for the blood of this Government, and who probably would be the successors of this Government, and who seek to vindicate the honor and purity of public life, that they are seeking to put out this Government for one act, whereas those hon. members have been, not once or twice, but thrice convicted. They are going to punish the Government for one act in five years, and to reward those who had lapse after lapse, by putting them into power to vindicate the honor of Parliament. Well, the country will not be so blind, perhaps, as Parliament, and I venture to think, whatever the issue of this debate may be, that there will be a clear issue demanded by the people: that this practice should be made impossible, that Parliament should speak by legislation. The bitterest speech made last night against the Government was by the hon. and learned member for Hastings-Macleay. The hon. and learned member is going to put this Government out in order that its successors may pass into law something which will prohibit the continuance of this practice. Do we not remember how the hon. and learned member resisted most strenuously the amendment which I proposed in the federal constitution to prevent practices of this kind? The bitterest opponent that I had to that proposal was the hon. and learned member for Hastings-Macleay. The hon. and learned member has now joined his forces with the forces

of the hon. member for The Hume in order to defeat the Government, and they have got the alliance of the forces of the hon. member for Redfern in order to do what? Not one of the three parties are agreed upon what they want. The leader of the Opposition does not want the Government out of power in order that he may pass into law something which will prevent these payments being made to members of Parliament. He has shown that he does not. The leader of the federal party, the hon. and learned member for Hastings-Macleay, does not want this Government out in order to pass that into law. It is the farthest thing from his thoughts. The hon. and learned member for Ashfield declares, with a manliness which I admire, that he will take the fees whenever they are offered to him; but a government is to be brought into office in order to prevent this practice. So here is a dilemma; here are three parties with no cohesion, no contact, no common platform. The flag is raised upon one great issue. There is a proper method if Parliament desires to censure those who have carried on this practice, that is to censure all who have carried it on. Do not single out one offender and censure him. Example after example has been set to the present offenders, and Parliament is going to reward those who set the examples by putting them in the place of those who followed those bad examples. This is no time for mincing matters. A great fuss is made about Mr. Goldstein by people who forget Mr. Tennant Donaldson. Mr. Goldstein was never secretary to Mr. Reid; that I know. Mr. Goldstein was paid for acting for a few weeks as secretary to an election committee, but Mr. Tennant Donaldson was for years placed on the tax-payers of the country as secretary to the premier of the day, and when the premier left office he was put into the Government Statistician's office.

MR. REID: That is when the Government Statistician reported that he did not want him!

MR. CARRUTHERS: The Government Statistician protested against Mr. Tennant Donaldson being put there, because he had no work for him to do. I do not bring up this question to blame Mr. Donaldson, or anyone else, but I am one of those who, when they are hit, hit

*Fifth night.*

back. If it is good enough to be reviling the Government for things of this kind, the people who do it should remember what is said about those who live in glass houses. We must recollect, too, that another old identity who voted for the hon. member and his party was rewarded by a permanent billet in the public service, not to report on charities, but as an inspector of scaffoldings. As for Mr. Goldstein, I think it is the hon. and learned member for Ashfield who was the strongest advocate on his behalf, who was continually worrying the Government that something might be done for Goldstein. What for? Because Goldstein had testimonials, showing that he was well qualified to deal with particular matters in regard to the administration of charities. The utmost that the Government did was to give him a commission, not such as Dr. MacLauringot, to advise about the removal of the Benevolent Asylum, but to obtain information with regard to some charities. Then I am reminded of a gentleman, who was spoken of as the probable treasurer in the Dibbs Administration, who was rewarded with a seat in the Upper House, and who at the same time got an appointment as President of the Hunter River Water Board at a salary of £500 a year.

Mr. LYNE : Who is in his place now?

Mr. NORTON : The Premier's brother !

Mr. EDDEN : And he is also on the Newcastle Marine Board !

Mr. CARRUTHERS : Mr. Walsh, Government officer, is chairman of the Hunter River Water Board. The great principle at stake to-night is, not the appointment of brothers, but the payment of fees to a member of Parliament behind the back of Parliament. The gentleman to whom I refer was never appointed by this House. Parliament strenuously resisted the appointment year after year, and cut the salary down; and we were told that we could not cut it right off, because a legal compact had been entered into. A royal commission was appointed to hold an inquiry with regard to the Baldwin engines. The commissioners received fees—Mr. Rogers, Q.C., 10 guineas per sitting; Professor Warren and Mr. Alexander Brown, 7 guineas. This was not a mere question of travelling expenses. The hon. member for Paddington did not receive 7 guineas a sitting. That is the record of the past. That is the re-

[*Mr. Carruthers.*

cord of acts which Parliament has taken no steps to signally punish. Parliament cannot obliterate it to-night when it goes to a vote; and unless Parliament is blind, and refuses to see that the practice is to be censured from the time it commenced up to the present time, Parliament will be stultifying itself if it closes its eyes to the misdeeds of those opposed to the present Government, and merely looks at the one particular act of this Government. Parliament may be blind to these things. Party issues may obscure facts from the minds of hon. members; but behind Parliament there is a tribunal, which, I venture to say, when it gives its verdict, will say that, if punishment is meted out at all, it should be to all offenders, and that provision shall be made by law that such offences should not be committed again. The practice may be condemned to-night; but to-morrow a party may come into office who will have an opportunity of continuing the practice. Last night the hon. and learned member for Hastings-Macleay was very eloquent in his condemnation of the administration of the finances of the colony. One of the great crimes that we have committed in regard to the administration is, according to the hon. and learned member, that we have appropriated trust funds for loan purposes. But the hon. and learned gentleman could not say that that was altogether wrong, because he has brains enough to see that it was a wise thing to do, inasmuch as it saved the colony from the payment of unnecessary interest; therefore he made it the gist of his complaint that, having done what I speak of, we had not come to Parliament to be indemnified. We could not get an indemnity from Parliament because the movement of which the hon. and learned gentleman calls himself the watch-dog—the federal movement—blocked much business of that character. But the hon. and learned member was a member of a government which, seven years ago, spent £13,000 in paying off a debt of the municipality of Penrith, but from the day the money was spent up to the present time, no attempt has been made to have that expenditure ratified by Parliament. Although the hon. and learned member says that our censurable action in regard to the finances is that we did not get an



indemnity for a certain course which we took, he was a member of a government which has gone without such an indemnity for the long time that I speak of. The leader of the labour party said last night that one of the matters of our administration which deserved the gratitude of Parliament and the people concerned the employment of day-labour, and I believe that when the facts come to be thoroughly known it will be seen that, not merely has there been a saving in the cost of public works by the adoption of that system, but that there has also been a saving of fabulous sums of money by the prevention of litigation. I do not say a word against the honesty of the Government contractors, because I believe they have fought for what they deemed to be their rights. But, unfortunately, there must continually be, between the contractors and the Government, conflict of testimony and opinion, and for that conflict the country has to pay. One of the last reasons which should move any government to the extension of the day-labour system is the fact that upon the occasion of the most recent of these conflicts the Government were confronted with a bill of costs amounting to £60,000, in which one item alone—instructions for briefs—came to £10,000. £60,000 would have given employment under the day-labour system to 500 men for at least a year.

Mr. SLEATH : The Government seemed quite satisfied to let that go on until they were interfered with !

An HON. MEMBER : Who were the lawyers who got the money ?

Mr. CARRUTHERS : I am not going to mention names. Does not the hon. member for Wilcannia see that what the Government has had to do is to continually fight against the existing state of things. The contract system did not crop up during the existence of this Government, and it was not created by this Government; but we have had to fight against it. The day-labour system has been justified by the Railway Commissioners; because, although it may be shown upon paper that the contract system was cheaper than the day-labour system, it is not to be forgotten that the termination of the contract, and the payment of the money agreed upon, do not end the business.

Mr. REID : The contract system is not cheaper than the day-labour system even on paper !

Mr. CARRUTHERS : It is the charges for extras here, and the disputes in connection with extras there which make the bill mount up so that, even if the day-labour system cost a little more in the first case, it is to be remembered that when the labourers have finished their work no more payments have to be made, and there can be no expensive arbitration.

Mr. DONALDSON : The hon. member will acknowledge that the enormous payment to which he has referred was due to the pigheadedness, the venom, and the animus of the Government officers towards a particular contractor !

Mr. CARRUTHERS : That may be so ; but there is not that pigheadedness and animus when the day-labour system is followed, or, if there is, it is the unfortunate labourers and not the Government who suffer. I suppose many Government officers are pigheaded and full of animus, and when they meet a contractor who imagines that his rights are being ruthlessly invaded there is bound to be a fight, and then the Government has to stand by and pay the piper. But nothing of that kind occurs under the day-labour system.

Mr. ARTHUR GRIFFITH : The Government pay their day labourers less than the contractors pay. The Government only pay 6s. a day, whereas the contractors used to pay 7s. a day !

Mr. ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL : I know that it has not been so in my district. The statement is absolutely untrue !

Mr. COOK : The statement is untrue, and the hon. member knows it !

Mr. CARRUTHERS : The Secretary for Lands tells me that the rate of pay in the Works Department was always 7s. a day.

Mr. ARTHUR GRIFFITH : I was talking of the railways !

Mr. CARRUTHERS : Of course a detail of that character cannot be inquired into in the course of a debate ; but I feel sure that the commissioners pay the current rate of wages.

Mr. ARTHUR GRIFFITH : They pay 6s. a day !

Mr. CARRUTHERS : I recollect that when the Canterbury railway was being constructed—it was being carried out

*Fifth night.*

under the contract system—some of the men employed on the work assured me that they were not earning 2s. 6d. a day. If the hon. member thinks that the day-labour system suffers by comparison with the contract system, he has a very poor reason for supporting it.

Mr. MACDONALD: Under the day-labour system, the men are sure of their pay!

Mr. CARRUTHERS: In connection with the day-labour system, I would like to read the following question which appears in *Hansard*, volume LXV, page 6281. On the 20th April, 1893, Mr. Johnston asked the Secretary for Public Works, in connection with the wages paid by Messrs. Hoskins Brothers:—

Will he, in future, when accepting tenders, stipulate that the ruling rate of wages be adhered to?

To which the hon. member for The Hume replied:

I cannot undertake to do this.

Then, on the 27th September, 1893, Mr. Bavier moved the following motion:—

That, in the opinion of this House, the following clauses be inserted in all forms of tender for Government contracts:—

All workmen employed on Government works shall be paid not less than the recognised minimum rate of wages of their respective trade or calling current at the time of the contract being signed.

The hon. member for The Hume was still Secretary for Public Works, and he said:

I shall not debate this matter; but I shall simply say that this is a motion I cannot agree to on any account.

Mr. ARTHUR GRIFFITH: He has reformed since then!

Mr. CARRUTHERS: There is case after case of a similar character. Last night the hon. and learned member for Hastings-Macleay took credit because he came into the House pledged to assist in the carrying out of federation, and had supported the Premier, to use his own language, to keep him straight. But we all know why he supported the Premier; it was because he could not have him kicked out of office. If he could have had him kicked out of office, his support would have been withheld at a moment's notice. He tried all he knew to get him out of office; but, having failed, he had to accept Hobson's choice and support him. Under those circumstances, the hon. and learned member cannot take very much credit for doing

[Mr. Carruthers.

what he did. I cannot help recalling the few words in which he expressed himself to a newspaper interviewer on Monday last. He then spoke of the Premier's doubtful attitude, and of his attempt to take up this position and that position. But this week the hon. and learned member has turned more somersaults within a short period than any other public man I have known. Upon Monday he said that the payment of the hon. member for Paddington was an act of corruption which Parliament would not overlook, and that he declined to adhere to the proposition that an act of corruption should not be dealt with as a party question. Let us analyse those sentences. The proposition that Parliament should deal with an act of corruption on party lines is a monstrous one, and yet the late leader of the Opposition gives his adherence to the doctrine that when a charge of corruption is brought into Parliament it should be decided upon strict party lines. When the hon. and learned member is face to face with the Premier, he says that he meant no personal corruption, but that what he said was to be taken in the Walpolean sense. Sir Robert Walpole is known as the personification of corruption, so far as the constitutional history of the mother country is concerned; and, although I do not think that the hon. and learned member, when he said that he did not accuse the Premier of personal corruption, but only of such corruption as is spoken of in connection with Walpole, intended to still further insult the leader of the Government, his speech last night reeked with insinuations and innuendoes such as would be a disgrace to any public man, unless he was prepared to make clear charges, and give the House the evidence upon which those charges were based. During the thirteen years I have been in Parliament I have never heard a speech which, if it were believed, would have done more to ruin the reputation and character of the person whom it attacked, than the speech of the hon. and learned member for Hastings-Macleay against the Premier last night. He made insinuations about the potentialities of the interview between the hon. member for Paddington and the Premier, and said that six months before the payment was made the hon. member for Paddington did not come down to the

House to vote on a motion of censure. Then he mixed up dates in October and November, and said that in October, when the hon. member for Paddington moved an amendment in connection with the recent Hastings-Macleay election, the Premier had agreed to pay him for his report ; but the Premier immediately pointed out that in October he had not read and had not seen the document.

Mr. NEILD : He had not seen a page of it !

Mr. CARRUTHERS : Yes, and that he had not any conversation with the hon. member for Paddington upon the subject of payment. From start to finish, the hon. and learned member's speech reeked with venom and attack. When these two men had fought side by side in the greatest struggle Australia had ever known for the greatest principle Australians could ever fight for, when these two allies in the federal cause had won the battle, fighting side by side, what motive could there have been for the attack by one against the other, unless it was the motive of jealousy—an attempt to injure the reputation of a rival so that in future he should not stand in the way of another ?

Mr. HAYNES : Cain and Abel again !

Mr. CARRUTHERS : I could have quite understood if the hon. member for Wellington had descended to foul imputations, to an accusation of corruption against the Premier. I could have understood it from him, because he has been fighting against the Premier. He has been fighting in the enemy's ranks for months past, and he, having lost, you might think that he bears all that a loser would bear—motives of revenge ; but you would hardly expect it to come from an ally who has been leading the battle. You would expect from him—knowing how well he had fought with him, how loyally he had stood by him — justice, if not generosity. It says much for this House that out of the 125 members you could not, I suppose, get two members who would stand side by side with the hon. and learned member for Hastings-Macleay and say that there is any foundation whatever for the gravamen of his speech last night ; for his attack on the personal honesty and integrity of the Premier. I do not propose to deal any further with the hon. and learned member for Hastings-Macleay. I

think that the public have enough wisdom and keenness to see that this conflict is a semi-triangular duel, not a struggle merely between the Opposition and the Government, but a struggle between the many varying parties into which this House is riven asunder. There is no line of cohesion between the parties. There is the party of revenge, who are punishing the Government for what it has done in the cause of federation. The hon. member who last spoke said so. He said that he would punish the Government for having deserted its principles in the cause of federation, and the hon. and learned member for Hastings-Macleay, who is supposed to lead the section of the federal force on that side of the House, has linked himself arm in arm with the arch-enemies of federation, doing everything he can to destroy the man without whose help federation would never have been accomplished. The hon. and learned member for Hastings-Macleay could have fought for federation for ten or fifteen years to come, and it would never have been accomplished if the Premier had not helped him. The Premier is being punished by members of his own party for what they call the sacrifice of his provincial politics in the cause of Australian unity, and there are men who are ready to reap the fruits of victory, who will take all the honor and glory, who travel throughout the length and breadth of Australia, and take the credit of the halo and the titles of Australia's noblest son ; and then put under their heel the man to whose work the triumph of the cause is to be attributed, and who is paying the penalty of his work in the opposition, and the defection, of his own supporters. There is the proof of the sincerity of the right hon. gentleman. Knowing that his party would be rift asunder, he went straight on the track to federal union ; day by day he saw men shifting away from his standard, but he went on with the fight. Now is he paying the penalty for it. His party is torn asunder.

Mr. MACDONALD : He trusted the wrong men !

Mr. CARRUTHERS : That is the price he has paid for it, and the man who saw the sacrifice made by his fellow leader, rewards him how?—by attempting to besmirch his reputation as a minister, and to

*Fifth night.*

send him out of office to face the electors of Australia at the outset of federation, a man branded as corrupt by his ally.

Mr. CRICK: Who said he is going to face the electors?

Mr. CARRUTHERS: Against all that was done by the Premier in the federal movement you can put the record of the hon. and learned member for the Hastings-Macleay. I sat in this House when the hon. and learned member had the keeping of the federal cause in his hands. I sat in this House when the late Colonial Treasurer, then in opposition, moved a resolution in favour of protection, and the hon. and learned member for the Hastings-Macleay rose from the Treasury benches and called Sir George Dibbs a political conundrum, and told the hon. member for Grafton that his proposal to introduce a policy of protection meant the unsettlement of our commercial interests, and the destruction of federation. Within six months the hon. and learned member for the Hastings-Macleay joined hands with the "political conundrum," and with the hon. member for Grafton. Within six months the hon. and learned member for the Hastings-Macleay, having the standard of federation in his hands and his keeping, furlled the standard again, and allowed the hon. member for Grafton to introduce the policy of protection which unsettled our commercial interests as had been prophesied, and delayed the consummation of federation for years. That is not a record of yes-no, but a record of no-no-no—a record of alliance with the enemies of federation; with Sir George Dibbs, who did all he could to destroy federation from his first entry into public life right up to to-day. Has the hon. and learned member for the Hastings-Macleay so much to boast of that he can afford to question the motives and services of the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government?—a man who, perhaps, had the reputation of being against federation, but who has accomplished what Sir Henry Parkes, with all his sagacity, his wisdom, and his great reputation, never achieved.

Mr. GILLIES: Who blocked him?

Mr. REID: No one can block me!

Mr. CARRUTHERS: As I have already said, if the Premier had only lifted his little finger against the hon. and learned member for Hastings-Macleay in connec-

[*Mr. Carruthers.*

tion with the federal cause, federation would not have been accomplished. Hon. members may ask who blocked Sir Henry Parkes. The idea seems to be strong in the minds of hon. members that the Premier, when in opposition, could block anything? Hon. gentlemen attribute to him what is not correct, because the men who destroyed Sir Henry Parkes and his government when he was carrying on the federal movement were the hon. and learned member for Hastings-Macleay and his friends in the Opposition. The hon. member who destroyed federation was the hon. and learned member for Hastings-Macleay, when he was sitting behind Sir Henry Parkes' Government. The hon. and learned gentleman joined hands with those who destroyed the Parkes Administration. To the Premier is due the credit of having passed to its present stage the federal movement. I will, in conclusion, very briefly point out that the record of the present Government is a record of which no one need be ashamed—a record of five years' administration which, when the history of this country is written, will be shown to be a record of pure and honest conduct of public affairs, and the advancement of the public interests. Our great achievement, the penalty for which we are now paying, has been the accomplishment of federation and the dispersing of the enemies of federal union. That task was not achieved without our putting much in the background which we might otherwise have accomplished. To this Government is owing the adoption of our system of direct taxation. Do hon. members think that the hon. member for The Hume will champion the system of land and income taxation if he gets into office? Day by day is this system being assailed by all the legal ingenuity of the country in the law courts, where capital is combining to attack that system and destroy it by legal quibbles and refinements. If those quibbles and refinements succeed in breaking down the machinery of the law, will the standing orders of the House be suspended by the hon. member for The Hume in order to validate any particular matter with regard to that act? Do hon. members expect that that which is the first plank in the democratic platform of the country—land-value taxation—will be safe in the custody of the hon. member?

Mr. J. C. WATSON: Yes; he will want the money!

Mr. CARRUTHERS: The achievement of that principle is one of the records of the present Government. The Public Service Act—removing from political influence and control the public service—is another; so is factory legislation. Hon. members have said that the Government have done nothing in regard to water conservation. But the Water Rights Act has been made the basis of the only sound system of water conservation we could have in this country. We have also passed legislation to restrict the influx of undesirable aliens. Our land legislation and administration have been full of humanity, and although I have been assailed by men who have never dared to assail me in this House, I say that the administration of the Lands Department has been as honest as any human being could make it. As one who has been five years in the Lands Office, I say that the land legislation passed by Parliament—to whom be all the credit—and the administration of it at the hands of the Minister have been full of sympathy for those who have been struggling on the soil, lending them a helping hand, assisting them in their difficulties, which have been great during the adversity of the last four or five years. The generosity and justice of this House will acknowledge that, so far as the legislative achievements of the present Government are concerned, they have been honest and true to the best interests of the people. I do not know what the issue of this motion may be. If we have to leave office, we shall leave it with a knowledge that we have performed our duty faithfully and well, and that those who come into office after us can search the records, and will find nothing there of which any one of us need be ashamed. I am going to say a few words in regard to a personal matter. I hold very strong views with regard to the payment of fees to any member of the legislature, either as a commissioner or for work performed by him as a member of the legal profession. That is no new thing for me. My reason for the views I have held has been, as the hon. member for Hastings-Macleay put it last night, that the potentialities for corruption are there, and should be removed. But I practise what I preach. The Premier knows that

I received a commission—not from this Government, but from the Imperial Government—in regard to the affairs of Norfolk Island. I was offered a large fee—a fee of some hundreds of guineas; and although not one penny of it would have come out of the public funds of this country, but all of it would have come from the Imperial authorities, I told my colleagues, and I told the Imperial officer who offered the fee to me, that I would do the work, but that on principle I declined to take any fee. I did the work.

Mr. LEVIEN: The hon. member is the only lawyer I have known to do work for nothing!

Mr. CARRUTHERS: I was not acting as a lawyer. If I were acting as a lawyer the hon. member might rely upon my being true to the traditions of my profession. I was acting on this occasion as one of the ministers of the Crown, and I recognised that it would have been unwise for me to set an example of that character. I will now leave the matter in the hands of the House. So far as this Government is concerned—whatever the verdict here may be, whatever may be the verdict of that higher tribunal which exists behind this Parliament—although we have to give place to successors on these benches, we shall leave office with no fear or misgiving as to our reputations. We have done our duty faithfully and well, and if Parliament makes us suffer in its desire to vindicate a principle which has been broken with impunity for forty-five years past, we shall content ourselves with saying that we are the victims of circumstances, and that our reward has yet to come, in the grateful appreciation of the people whom we have endeavoured to serve honestly and faithfully as true public servants.

Mr. DONALDSON (Tumut) [8-53]: It is well known that I came into this House as an ardent, I might almost say an extreme, federalist, and necessarily a most sincere follower of the hon. member for Hastings-Macleay. When I came into this House that hon. member had had the misfortune to be defeated, but knowing that it was only a question of a month or two, when his great abilities and the services he had rendered to the cause then paramount in every man's mind would be recognised—knowing that

*Fifth night.*

in a short time the hon. and learned member would be here, I said that no matter where he came from, no matter what party he led, whether it were a party of two or a party of fifty, his follower would be myself. In the face of that statement, the fact that I feel bound in this particular case not to follow him as closely as I could wish needs some little explanation. Matters went along, as hon. members know, for some six or eight months with the hon. member for Hastings-Macleay as leader of the Opposition. During that time we fought for and obtained the accomplishment of federation. I do not think I shall be giving away the secrets of the Opposition—I shall carefully avoid saying one word which anyone might say came from a caucus meeting—but it is generally known that a majority of the Opposition were desirous that we should enjoy the blessings of protection during the time intervening before the accomplishment of federation. It is well known—I am disclosing no secret—that it was proposed that such a thing should be attempted. The hon. member for Hastings-Macleay at once said that he, in common with some of his followers, had guaranteed to the electors of the colony that they would not raise the fiscal issue during the lifetime of the present Parliament. It was then hinted to him that it would be perhaps advisable for him to stand down and make room for some gentleman who was not under such obligations.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: That is not correct!

Mr. DONALDSON: It did not occur while I was present. In a short time the hon. member stood down and the hon. member for The Hume was elected leader of the Opposition. I was then, with many other true federalists, placed in a dilemma, and the more so when we heard that the hon. member for Hastings-Macleay had agreed to ally himself with the hon. member for The Hume. I was then put in this dilemma—that I was to follow a gentleman whom every man in this colony respects for his personal character, but who was as opposed to me in the matter of federation as are the two poles. When, as I say, the hon. member for the Hastings-Macleay allied himself with the hon. member for The Hume, I was in this dilemma, and I felt that I must be either false to the hon. member for Hastings-

Macleay, or false to my principles. I have chosen the part, that no matter what happens, I will not be false to my principles, and I will not therefore vote with the hon. member for The Hume. That hon. member, as we all know, was, if not the most powerful enemy, at least as sincere an enemy as any to the consummation of federation. For that reason alone I could not follow him. On no consideration could I give him a vote which would put him in the position in which—I do not think he could now do so—he might endanger the consummation of federation. Having stated how I will vote upon the motion, I come now to a harder nut to crack, in the amendment of the hon. member for Wickham. In voting for that amendment, I take it that I should show that I indorse the shameless innuendoes which have been cast out here as to the personal integrity of the Premier, and that I will not do. However, I may own that the Premier blundered in this matter, and I believe it was a blunder dictated more by the large heart which we know him to possess than anything else. If I were to vote for the amendment I should be one to brand the hon. gentleman with a stigma which in my heart and soul I know he does not deserve. On the other hand, if I vote against the amendment I indorse a line of conduct which I do not think any straight-going man can indorse, because it will establish a precedent which may be used very often. I have heard a good deal of valuable information in this House to-night and last night; it makes me waver a good deal, and I shall wait until I hear a little more before deciding how I shall vote—for or against the amendment. Possibly I may not vote at all. I will not help to attach any blame, shame, or stigma to the Premier; and, on the other hand, I am reluctant to put upon the records of this House my indorsement of an action of which I cannot thoroughly approve. That is the position in which I find myself. I am somewhat in the position of Diogenes. With a very feeble lamp, I am groping round for truth, and from what I have heard in this House I am inclined to think I am in the wrong place to find it. I know that there is a big combination upon this side—a combination justly described by the Colonial Treasurer just now as having one common object—to down the Prime Minis-

[Mr. Donaldson.]

ter. The cry is, "Away with him; crucify him," and if this question of the payment to the hon. member for Paddington had not cropped up some other pretext would have been brought forward. We must judge men by their motives, and I do not think there is sufficient justification for banishing ministers from public life with a stain attached to their names. It does not seem to me to be fair. I came into this House without any hereditary views. I had not been identified with any of the unpleasantnesses between the various parties, and, therefore, I am perfectly at liberty to judge the action of those parties exactly as I have found them since I have been here. It would be a very hard thing for me to join a party or piece of machinery, the driving-wheel of which, the motive power of which, I know to be the *Daily Telegraph*, that powerful fighting journal which, since the crushing defeat which it sustained on the 20th June, has had no other object in view than to crush and humiliate the man who brought about that defeat. I am quite certain that that journal will stop at nothing to compass its end, and I congratulate it upon having as its editor a modern Robespierre. The men whom he dislikes he kills politically. I congratulate him upon his power, and upon having in his office a machine as fatal as ever the guillotine was. He will never "sool" me on against any person he wishes to annihilate. That is one of the reasons why I am so reluctant to ally myself to a party who have this one common end in view—the destruction of the Premier and his Government. I do not agree with the payment to the hon. member for Paddington. It was no doubt a blunder, and the Premier is deserving of censure on that account; but I do not think a punishment should be meted out to him which would be entirely disproportioned to the gravity of the blunder.

MR. MACDONALD: That is not our fault!

MR. DONALDSON: I think it is time something took place to give domestic legislation a show. When I look back at what has occurred here during the past thirteen months, when I think of the actual amount of work we have done, I can honestly say that, from a commercial point of view, we have not earned our right to travel free on the trams, to say nothing of

our salaries and other perquisites. We have been here night after night, and month after month, and we have brought forward one wretched little bill—a mere abortion of a bill—the Relief to Settlers Bill. That is all we can point to as the result of thirteen months' work by 125 members drawing £40,000 a year. I ask hon. members, who have occupied so much time in talking, whether they have only one end in view—the advancement of their personal interests? What good have they done during this thirteen months? What have they done towards perfecting necessary measures of legislation? What have they done towards furthering a short land bill, whose chief feature was to be a provision for the reappraisement of land? I would ask these hon. members, do they ever leave the comfort of this House? Do they ever get away from the restaurants and the good hotels where they board and go away into the country? Let them go away into the Riverina, where water is scarcer than whiskey, and see the condition of the people there, owing to the last drought. Let them go out to the back country, to Tumberumba, and up the hills there. They will find that the men must have had the hearts of lions to tackle the forest and the scrub to endeavour to get a home for themselves and family. Let them go and see the condition these people are in, paying 1s. an acre for land—the very same price that was charged twenty or thirty years ago when men took up the frontages. These people are still paying a rental of 1s. an acre for wretched land that is not worth 1s. an acre freehold. They were obliged to go there owing to the infamous land laws under which this country suffered in the old days, and under which all the best land was alienated. Do not let hon. gentlemen go out there with their guns, with a big hamper of provisions and bottled ale, and only with a desire of seeking a picturesquespot on which to have lunch; but let them go out there to see the serious condition of the women and children, see the hardships they have to endure and the privations they have to suffer, and then let hon. gentlemen ask themselves, are not the wants and requirements of these people of far greater importance than this eternal squabbling, this eternal grab for office? I say it is a shame and a disgrace. Let hon. members go out beyond the radius of

*Fifth night.*

this city. Let them go away to Riverina, out on to the Bland, up Moree way, on to the dry country, and then away to the mountains. It is a standing disgrace to think that we have never made one effort to ameliorate the condition of these people, to reappraise their lands, to revalue their holdings, and give them a chance to live. When the representatives of these places, the representatives of the selectors, go out into the country and meet these people, they should be afraid that they will shout "Judas" at them, because they have been Judases—they have not been true to their pledges. Any member who neglects the great opportunities afforded him in this House to better the condition of the people on the land is a worthy disciple of the arch-traitor Judas. I should like to refer to my hon. friend, the member for Pymont Division, Mr. Sam Smith. It is not Mr. Sam Smith he should be called. He ought to be taken down to Mort's Dock and christened "Sam Plimsoll," for he is the Samuel Plimsoll of this colony. He has done more in his short time to better the condition of the sea-going people; he has done more during the short time he has been on the Marine Board than was done in all the years before; and, if there is one act for which the Premier should belauded it is in having placed a practical, sympathetic man like the hon. member for Pymont Division amongst those who constitute the Marine Board.

Mr. MEAGHER: He was condemned by the capitalists and ship-owners for doing it!

Mr. DONALDSON: He is a game man to fight the ship-owners, the capitalists, and the Sydney insurance companies. The hon. gentleman brought a piece of plate into this House, which, as he graphically expressed it, he could put his foot through, and that was all that stood between the passengers and seamen and eternity. All honor to Mr. Sam Smith. I should like to pay him my tribute of praise. What has this House done to improve the Navigation Act? Nothing. That can go by the board—it is of no importance. There are other measures here, and wretched little attempts have been made to carry them through. There is, for instance, the Early-closing Bill. These unfortunate shop assistants receive the magnificent pay of from 8s. to 12s. or 14s. a week. They have to leave their homes far out in the suburbs—they

[*Mr. Donaldson.*

cannot afford to pay high rents nearer to their work—they have to come into the city at 7 or 8 o'clock in the morning and stand all day behind counters or work in factories, and at night they cannot afford to take a tram home. You will see them streaming out to Newtown and to Waterloo, and other suburbs. What has this House ever done to try to better their condition? A bill has been brought up here, and somebody has raised a miserable point of order and the whole thing has gone by the board. And then with regard to the mining laws. We have a chance now to do something to improve the mining laws. There are no laws in the world that want amending more than they do. We have a new industry now starting in connection with gold-mining, the dredging industry, and people look to Parliament to make laws to allow this great industry to proceed in places where it will not interfere with agricultural land. I have nothing to say about the finances, and the way in which the Premier has conducted them, except that according to the accounts I have read, and what the right hon. gentleman has said—and which has not been contradicted—I consider that he shows to-day a healthier state of the finances than any of his predecessors ever did. Unless he tells us what is utterly false—and he has been corroborated by the Government Statistician and the Auditor-General—he has lived within his income. People have tried to saddle upon the hon. gentleman the burden of the money in connection with the Post Office and Centennial Park; but he has explained that matter to my satisfaction. It will no doubt be said, "It is wonderful how Donaldson sticks to the Premier now." All I can say is that during the thirteen months I have been in the House I have only asked the Premier for one thing. It was to give me a letter to try to get a young lad a job that would bring him in 10s. a week, and the Premier point-blank refused to do it. He rather surprised me; but I saw he was in earnest, and I did not press the request. He point-blank refused to do the only thing I asked him, and I think that should exonerate me from any charge of personal interest in speaking as I am doing at present. It is a wonder that the finances are in the condition in which they are, considering the scandalous waste of



money brought about by understrappers in the offices. I speak feelingly and strongly of the understrappers of the Crown law office. I know these men have wasted the public funds—money wrung from the tax payers—in prosecuting a most disgraceful action against one of the squarest men that ever lived; and that is James McSharry. That man has been subjected to the most scandalous persecution. He has been fought with the funds of the colony. Siege has been laid against him, thinking that his money must some day give out and he must capitulate; but, thank God, we have gentlemen on the bench who have given him fair play. Thank God, we have a Chief Justice in this colony of whom any country in the world might be proud. This contractor to whom I refer has at his hands received the utmost fair play. But it is a disgrace to the law offices. It stands out in bold relief as the greatest scandal of our law courts, that this man, seeking for his rights—only seeking for an impartial tribunal to inquire into his case—was subjected to a protracted trial, owing to machinations of men who were drawing fabulous fees in keeping the case going month after month and year after year, until the country was confronted with a bill of about £100,000 for expenses. It is a disgraceful thing. If any government comes into power which will bring down a measure doing away with the iniquitous influence of these understrappers in the offices, they will have performed a herculean task for which the whole country will be grateful. I will not take up the time of the House any longer. If I have said anything that was a little heated, I am no worse in that respect than others in this House. I would not willingly say a word to offend the sensibilities of hon. members or to wound the private feelings of anybody; and I am very much obliged for the patient hearing accorded to me.

Mr. LAW (Balmain South) [9.15]: I may say at once that I do not intend to follow the bad example set last night and the night before of making a reckless use of the word "corruption" and the words "political corruption." I would not insult the Premier by using either word in connection with his name. In justice to the right hon. gentleman, I should like to mention some of the grand enactments he has

placed on the statute-book of the country. It is only simple justice that I should do so. In the first place, we know how he tackled the great landed and capitalistic interests of this country. That was no small undertaking. We know that the right hon. gentleman had a strenuous fight to pass the measure through this Assembly, and that when it was sent to the Upper Chamber it was rejected. What occurred then? Something unprecedented in the history of this country. The right hon. gentleman was not going to be baulked by the Upper House, and in order to carry to fruition those principles which brought him into Parliament with a triumphant majority he went to the country and came back victorious. That is a thing that stands out in the political annals of this country to the credit of the Prime Minister. It was no small undertaking. There is another thing. There have been many ministries in this country, but not one has ever dared to tackle the civil service of this country. Governments have spoken about this reform for years. All other governments have been profuse in promises, but their performances amounted to nil. The Premier not only promised this grand reform, but he brought it about. What has been the result to the tax-payers of the country? A saving of £300,000 a year. This was done through the instrumentality of the Premier, backed up by the solidarity party of New South Wales. With every man now in the service it is a matter of merit or demerit. The right hon. gentleman can say that he has maintained his position in this country, not by political patronage, but by merit, and by merit only. This Government has inaugurated another grand reform, the importance of which no democrat can deny, and that is the adoption of the day-labour system. I may, perhaps, be excused for referring to this matter, because I do not think it has been amply dealt with, and it is a matter of greater importance to the working-classes of this country than most members appear to think. I have had ocular demonstration of the utility of the system of day-labour. In my own electorate there are 200 or 300 men employed who, in consequence of the day-labour system, are in receipt of 7s. a day, instead of 5s. or 6s. Though it may be only 1s. a day more than what they would receive under the contract system, it must be remembered

*Fifth night.*

that Balmain is a great working constituency. But I am not talking about Balmain in particular. If there are 300 men at work, and they get 7s. instead of 6s. a day, look what a godsend it is to the family when the wife can go out on Saturday night, and have so much more money. The inauguration of day-labour is strictly in accord with the principles of humanity, and that is a direction in which, in my view, the Premier is always tending. I should like to explain a little about this day-labour question. There are thousands of men now employed throughout the length and breadth of this country under this system—men on the railways, on the railway deviations, men employed at the Government Printing Office, men employed at the causeway, and on other works. In all these cases the men generally receive 1s. a day more. Now who is the sufferer? It has been indicated to-night that litigation has amounted to the enormous sum of £60,000 in connection with contracts. The contractors are the men who profit by the contract system. The difference under the day-labour system is that the money formerly paid to a contractor is distributed among the working-classes. This is the way in which this day-labour system is carried out. Suppose that a causeway which is being built at Balmain, is done by the contract system. What is to prevent the contractor even if he gets men at 6s. a day in the first instance. He takes the contract with the idea of making as much as he possibly can out of it. He gives his men 6s. a day at first, then if fifty men come over the border from Victoria and offer their services at 4s. 6d. a day there is nothing to prevent him from giving his men the sack. That is one of the things which cannot eventuate under the day-labour system, which is essentially in the interests of the democracy of the country. In regard to the tactics of the Premier, it is said that he wants to catch the working-classes. Well, that is what the other side want to do, only they do not know how to do it. With regard to the safety of ships, I may point out that the owners of ships will be under the necessity, before taking their living freight to Manly, to have their ships in such a state that there will be no possibility of accident happening. That is another thing in the cause of humanity which has been

[*Mr. Law.*

brought about by the Premier. I find that the Premier has passed into law nineteen out of twenty things that I desired to see brought about. Of course, on federation, I was opposed to the Prime Minister, and I did what I believe to be in the interests of New South Wales and of Australia. The fact remains that the Premier differed from me on that subject; but we have the irrefutable fact that when the question went to a vote of the people it was carried by a majority of 25,000. That having been done, unfortunately, that question is settled. As regards the Neild affair, I say that if the Government is thrown out on that it will be thrown out on the most flimsy pretext on which a government was ever defeated. We have heard a great deal about corruption, and I have been struck with the absurdity of some of the remarks of hon. members on that subject. What would they think if I said that there was a previous government of this colony so corrupt that if Mr. Shadler, the well-known baker, made a loaf of bread big enough to feed a thousand men for a week, and converted it into a gigantic poultice, it would not be large enough to absorb the corruption of that Government. I am only pointing out the ridiculousness of making such statements as we have heard here. The remarks with regard to corruption have been ridiculous. It is only a matter of degree. When a ministry is going to be defeated on a principle like this we have arrived at such a stage of corruption that it is something alarming. All I can say is that if they go on at the same rate of progression in the purity line, in another five or ten years every member will come here with a prayer-book under his arm. Then we shall have arrived at that stage of hypocrisy when it will be time to give up politics altogether. I was going to say that if the Prime Minister has carried out nineteen out of twenty of the reforms which I desired to see brought about, it is only a narrow-minded man who would not be satisfied. Of course, one peculiarity about all this is the fact that I am going to vote against the Premier. The Prime Minister is a grand man in my estimation; but the best man that ever lived in Australia is only second to the fidelity to the solidarity party. I am giving fidelity to the cause. I say, while

speaking thus, I honestly believe that the people of Balmain have the same opinion of the Premier that I have.

MR. REID: If every one was as true to their pledges as the hon. member, the vote would have been the other way!

MR. LAW: I believe I am speaking in conformity with the general aspirations of the majority of the people of Balmain. Even as regards this amendment which has been moved, the labour party can claim the credit of having the matter to which it refers dealt with for the simple reason that it was one of our number who brought the matter forward. I honestly think that the matter should have dropped then. But we know that there are a number of sharks that see the 1,500 baits sticking out. I have been informed that this amendment did not originate in the fertile brain of the hon. member for Wickham. I believe it was put in the hands of four or five hon. members, and the first man to catch Mr. Speaker's eye was the man who got the credit of it. They say there is a tide in the affairs of men which taken at the flood leads on to fortune. Whoever put that into the hands of the hon. member for Wickham the probability is, that in consequence of the amendment he may be in the next ministry. If he does get in he will perhaps be known as the accident in the ministry. I say the hon. member for Kahibah can claim the credit of dealing with the case of the hon. member for Paddington, and he was the man who brought the matter forward first. But I consider that he went far enough on that occasion. The hon. member for Broken Hill, another member of the labour party, was responsible for the reduction of the number of members of the Public Works Committee and for the reduction of their honorarium. I omitted to mention another point. It is that the Premier took another departure for the first time in the history of this country and that was in regard to the appointment of labour representatives to the Upper Chamber.

AN HON. MEMBER: He promised to reform it!

MR. REID: That was a good way of reforming it. If there were more labour members it would be a better House!

MR. LAW: It cannot be denied that throughout New South Wales things are in a better state of prosperity than they

have been for a long time. We know that manufactures are springing up everywhere. £100,000 is on the point of being spent at Balmain in connection with the Lever Brothers great works. There is a big coal-mine over there which causes thousands of pounds to be spent at Balmain. There is a general rise in the price of land in the suburbs; things are, without the shadow of a doubt, on the upward grade. Another thing I should like to refer to, though I am not going to attribute this to the Ministry, but the fact remains, that during their regime, the railways have shown themselves in a better position than in any of the other colonies. Our railways are paying interest on the capital invested. We know that whilst the population is increasing rapidly in this colony, in the other colonies the population is stationary. Perhaps some hon. members are not aware of the fact, that our railways cost £40,000,000, but there is no loss on the capital. The interest is paid out of revenue. They have spent a similar amount on railways in Victoria, but there they have a loss of £450,000 a year. In South Australia they have invested £12,000,000 on railways, on which they have a loss of £150,000 a year. It is the same with regard to Tasmania. That indicates that New South Wales is in the van of Australian progress. It has been greater during the office of the present Ministry than it was during the previous five or ten years. I think, at any rate, that ministers can claim that things have not gone back. You cannot call the Prime Minister a socialist, or any thing extreme. I think he is what you may call an excellent judge of differences.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is an opportunist!

MR. LAW: There are plenty of others who have tried a thundering lot of times, but the opportune moment never arrives. I was saying that the Premier is not an extremist; that is where his wisdom comes in. There are a lot of men who cannot conceive a proper distinction between possibilities and probabilities, but I think the Premier can. Some people charge the Prime Minister with the crime, as they think it, of actually desiring to obtain the position of Prime Minister of federated Australia. I say this is a grand and noble ambition for any man to have. While other men may have the ambition, they have not the ability to fill the

*Fifth night.*

position; and, however matters may stand at the present moment, it is my sincere wish that the Premier will be the first Premier of federated Australia. The lines of demarcation between the masses and the classes are not so great now as they were before the advent of this Ministry to office, and, if they have done nothing more than pass legislation of that character, they have done a great deal of good. While the Premier has taxed those who hold enormous areas of land and possess large capital, he has done so without offending them, and he has shown that what he has done has been only fair in the interests of the whole community. At the same time I should not like to sit down without acknowledging that the hon. member for The Hume fought a straight and an honorable fight during the federal campaign, and that he took the democratic side of the question in the contest in regard to the Federation Bill. I intend to vote against the Government on the amendment and also on the motion.

Mr. MOORE (Bingara) [9:37]: I do not intend to detain the House for more than a very short space of time, because the question which is being debated is practically settled; but as one who has never been a thick and thin supporter of the Government, and who has never had any favours from them, but who has endeavoured to given them a fair and independent support, I wish, before the vote is taken, to say a very few words, because I intend to stand by them to-night in the hour of their defeat. I pass over the various matters which have been referred to during the course of the debate. The few remarks which I shall make will have reference to the one subject to which the discussion has really been narrowed down. The real question upon which we shall have to vote is not, do we approve or do we disapprove of the payment to the hon. member for Paddington, but do the Government deserve the death penalty. The Opposition as a whole have exonerated the Premier from any corruption in connection with this matter. If the House thought that he had been guilty of anything dishonorable or corrupt, there could be but one verdict and one sentence, no matter what the legislative and administrative record of the Government might have been, or what its power of usefulness, no matter what the

[*Mr. Law.*

consequence, and without consideration of who was to replace the Government. We have heard from a number of hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House that, although they intend to vote against the Government, they acquit the Premier of anything in the shape of personal dishonor, though I scorn the distinction which has been drawn during the debate by no less an hon. member than the late leader of the Opposition between private honesty and public honesty. So far as the Opposition are concerned, they were elected to oppose the Government, and they have a right to oppose them in every legitimate way; but I take the liberty of saying that those who have in the past given the Government their support, and have by their acts in this House shown their confidence in the Government, if they vote for the motion before the House, will, whether they do it consciously or unconsciously, brand the Premier with dishonor.

Mr. STOREY: And themselves with discredit!

Mr. MOORE: In my humble way I am as jealous of the honesty and purity of public life as I think any man is; and I should be very sorry to give a vote upon any question which would have the effect of lending approval to any act of a minister or a government which I thought was in any way dishonorable or corrupt. It is for that reason that—believing, as I do, that the Premier, whatever his mistakes may have been, stands before us absolutely honest, and innocent of corruption—I should have an unutterable contempt for myself if I gave a vote which would either directly or indirectly brand the Premier before the country as corrupt.

Mr. HAYNES: Suppose we all received what the hon. member for Paddington received!

Mr. MOORE: I do not wish to speak about the potentialities of this subject. The members of the labour party and of all parties in the House have for years past, allowed certain practices to go on for which we are all responsible and all blamable.

Mr. EDDEN: I think that is hardly a fair way to put it!

Mr. MOORE: Then the hon. member can later on show the House that I have said what is not fair. But when Parlia-

ment moves in this matter, what does it do? Parliament is itself responsible for the continuance of the practice of paying fees and expenses to lawyers and laymen, and instead of moving in the direction of curtailing it, it has extended the practice. Consequently, we have in existence the Public Works Committee, which I say, advisedly, is the most demoralising influence in our public life. Why is it that members of Parliament should not receive payment from a government? Because such a practice tends to demoralise our public life. But the object of every man should be to make our public life as pure and as honorable as possible, and if it is advisable and necessary that, in the interests of political morality, we should make it impossible for both lawyers and laymen who are members of Parliament to obtain anything from the Crown in the shape of fees or expenses or payments of any kind, the argument should apply to the Public Works Committee. We know the influence which is at work before hon. gentlemen are appointed to that committee. But during this debate I have noticed that men who have been receiving fat fees from the Public Works Committee have been the loudest in condemnation of the payment to the hon. member for Paddington. There is a great deal in connection with this matter upon which one would like to speak, but I do not intend to do so. As the Colonial Treasurer pointed out, the Government to-night occupies a unique position. Never before in the history of responsible government has been witnessed the spectacle of a ministry which possesses the confidence of Parliament being hurled from office, but that is the position to-night. Hon. members cannot get away from that position. A government which possesses the confidence of Parliament is to be hurled from office because the Premier has made a mistake. The right hon. gentleman has admitted that he has made a mistake, and there is no question about it. Call it a mistake, a blunder, or whatever you like, but no hon. member during the course of this debate has said that the right hon. gentleman acted corruptly or dishonorably. That being the case, I ask hon. members who are prepared to hurl the Government from office, do they think they are meting out a punishment which is proportionate to the offence?

Mr. NORTON: If we are wrong, our constituents will punish us!

Mr. MOORE: The hon. member can have his own views on the matter; I am expressing mine now, very briefly, and, I hope, fairly. I have never been a thick and thin supporter of the Government; I have never been in their councils; I have never had any favours from them; and what position am I taking up to-night? I am standing by them in the hour of defeat. I am not running away from them at a time when they are going down, and when it might be a little more popular to run away from them. I trust that I shall never descend so low that I will allow my public acts to be influenced in a matter of this sort—where I should be doing the right hon. gentleman a gross injustice by recording my vote against him—by any such consideration as what people may think of me. If ever I descend so low as that, I hope that I shall die. This House is going to give a vote, and it thinks that by that vote it is going to show its righteous indignation and put a stop to a practice which has been allowed to exist for the last forty-five years—ever since we have had responsible government. We are going to have a vote recorded to-night which will not be a direct vote on that or any other particular question, because various elements will go to make up the vote. I do not say that hon. members' vote will be anything but legitimate, but I say that no one can tell what motive prompts any hon. member in the vote he will give to-night. No one will be able to ascertain from the division who votes against the Government because of the Neild episode, or because of something else. It is impossible to deny the fact that the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government—whatever his attitude may have been on the first federal referendum—and I, for one, did not admire it—did magnificent service in the cause of federation on the second occasion, without which federation would not have been accomplished. It is also impossible to deny that the right hon. gentleman has now to pay the penalty for the action that he took in helping to bring about federal union. I do not say that those hon. members who are voting against the Premier, because of that, are doing anything wrong. I do not know a higher stand than anybody

*Fifth night.*

could take than that taken in regard to the federal question by some hon. members who voted against the bill on the second occasion.

Mr. WILLIS: Does the hon. member mean to say that every hon. member on this side of the House is voting against the Premier on that account?

Mr. MOORE: Certainly not. I do not say anything of the sort, and I appeal to the House whether the words I used could reasonably bear that construction. The hon. member, at any rate, will accept my assurance that I did not mean that. I referred to some hon. members who have been warm supporters of the Government, and have helped them to carry the liberal and progressive democratic measures which have characterised their tenure of office, and who are now going to vote against the Government, not because of the Neild episode, but because they want to punish the Premier for his action in regard to federation. They have a perfect right to do that. They placed above federation certain principles which they thought ought to be incorporated in the federal bill. I do not blame them. But they themselves will admit that the real cause of their hostility to the Government is the fact that the Premier was the means of getting that bill accepted by the people on the 20th June last—a bill of which those hon. members themselves did not approve. If the Premier goes down now, he can go down with a thought which, if I were in his position, I would cherish and be proud of—that the magnificent service he has rendered to the cause of Australian union has brought upon him the hostility of a number of his old supporters which materially helps in hurling him from office. I repeat that whilst, in common, I suppose, with all hon. members, I do not approve under any circumstances of hon. gentlemen receiving, either behind the back of Parliament or in the face of Parliament, fees or expenses, or whatever you like to call it, I am not prepared, by my vote to-night, to do what in my heart I believe would be a gross injustice to the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. COTTON (Newtown—Camperdown) [9-58]: A good deal has been said in the course of this debate in regard to the connection of some hon. members, of whom I am one, with what has been called the

[Mr. Moore.

“party of revenge.” That phrase, I think, originated with the Premier, and I can quite pardon his using it, although, I think, that before I have finished my remarks he will acknowledge that it was an unjust one. The Premier and the House know perfectly well upon what grounds, in a constitutional sense, I lost confidence in the Government. I went to the country as a follower of the Premier, as I have been for many years. I have spent the best years of my life in giving him my support, and I do not regret one hour of it, because I think he has done excellent work for the country. I went before my constituents at the last election as a follower of the Premier on certain clearly-defined lines with regard to federation. The Premier and the other members of the Ministry, in the most unmistakable manner, have departed from those lines. If they had put forward this argument, and this only, that in their judgment the limit of concession had been reached—I know the Premier made use of that phrase, and I wish to do him every justice—it would have been a fair argument. But there was no occasion for the Premier and the other members of the Ministry publicly, within the space of a few weeks, to deny principles they had affirmed for years, and to affirm certain ideas of political government which they had denied and condemned for years. It was absolutely at that point that the Premier lost heart in fighting, not merely the democratic fight for New South Wales—that was only part of the fight—but the democratic fight for all Australia in connection with the federal constitution; and at the point where the Premier lost heart I lost confidence in him, and I should stultify myself to-night if I were to give a vote of confidence in the Ministry when I have lost it distinctly on those grounds. I do not wish to shelter myself behind the Neild episode. Had that never occurred I would have recorded my vote to-night against the Government on the one ground, that the Ministry went to the country on certain well-defined principles which they afterwards deserted. The fact that they won has nothing to do with the case. What would you think of a ministry who went to the country as a free-trade ministry, and because they thought that protection was coming turned round and said they were protectionists? The principles on

which I went to my electors are the principles for which I must vote in this House, even though ministers change their political principles with the ease and rapidity with which a lightning-change artist changes his coat. This is an occasion much more for sorrow than for sarcasm, for I have to give a vote against men in whose support I have given the best years of my life. I would infinitely have preferred to stay with them in this vote, and to go down with them, than to record the vote I shall give against them. Surely in saying that, and giving the Ministry credit for the substantial and splendid work they have done during their five years of office, there is no element of injustice. Certainly there is no element of revenge in a man in Parliament giving a vote in accordance with the principles to which he pledged himself when before his constituents. It is idle to talk about revenge. It is idle to attribute to a man like me anything like petty malice. I have as many faults as the average man has, but every one who knows me knows that nothing like petty malice enters into my composition. It is simply because I believe I am bound in duty to the men who sent me into Parliament that I shall record the vote I shall give to-night. I do not shelter myself behind the Neild episode, and I should have recorded a vote of no confidence in the Ministry had that episode never occurred. I wish that to be distinctly understood. In the second place, regarding the particular business of the hon. member for Paddington, it has been said over and over again with perfect truth that this sort of thing has been going on for years. It has also been said by one hon. member to another, "You never did anything to prevent it." I stand in a different position. In 1892 I moved a motion of censure condemning the then government for doing this very thing—appropriating funds without the authority of Parliament—and it is rather remarkable that the present Colonial Treasurer—who can plead in defence of his own Government, practice, custom, and everything else—did not so plead for Sir George Dibbs when I tried to hurl him out of office for it. It is on the records of the House that I moved a motion of censure against Sir George Dibbs because he used certain moneys without the authority of

Parliament. Does wrong become right because you substitute the name of G. H. Reid for George Richard Dibbs? It does not. There is an additional element in this Neild episode, for this money was paid in spite of a distinct promise to Parliament that no expenses would be allowed to the hon. member. That is the beginning and the end of my indictment. I have not the faintest sympathy with the unwarranted talk, fortunately by only one member of this House, the hon. member for Hastings-Macleay, of corruption in connection with this matter. I say that it is an unwarranted exercise of public power, just as happened in Sir George Dibbs's case. I did not accuse Sir George Dibbs of corruption, although the money was appropriated for his own expenses. I never made use of the word "corruption." I described it as an unwarranted executive act. No one, I think, but the hon. member for Hastings-Macleay would have introduced the word "corruption," and looking over the past record of that gentleman's life, he is the last man in this colony who should mention anything about public corruption. He is the very last man who has a right to do so. But I put that aside altogether. There is no element of corruption in the matter. There has been an unwarranted executive act, without any question of corruption at all. Because the scene has changed, because the last act is committed by one man instead of by another, that does not alter my position; but there is one aspect of the case put forcibly by the hon. member for Warringah, when he said that this was one wrong act in a brilliant record. I quite agree with that view of the case. But the hon. member pleaded on that ground for generosity towards the Premier. The Premier has made it impossible for a member to vote upon this question from any generous standpoint. He has—I do not mince words in this matter, used his position here to threaten hon. members with the penalty of a dissolution if they vote for this motion of censure. It is of no use for hon. members to say that that has not been the case. I have sat here night after night, and have heard the threat again and again. If a man threatens me that because I punish him for a certain act I am to be penalised, then there can be no talk of generosity. When it becomes a question of personal

loss or gain to me and to other hon. members, then, however deeply one may feel upon the subject, the question is relegated from any sphere of generosity. It must be dealt with outside all considerations of private friendship, and there is no other standard upon which we can give a vote than the cold, clear standard of public duty. That is the only answer to threats of that description; and I think this threat is one of the saddest mistakes the Premier has ever made in his political career—a mistake which I very much regretted hearing him make. Now, of course, we have the usual talk about incongruous elements. That is inevitable. It has been known for some time—there is not a member among my 124 fellow-members who did not know it—that it was my intention to record a vote against the Government upon distinct constitutional grounds; and if a man like the hon. member for Hastings—Macleay chooses to drag his manhood into the dirt, and to turn his back upon all his protestations of federal fealty and loyalty to the Premier, and to earn the contempt of every honest man in this community by coming to vote with me, is it my fault or his? That is my answer to this allegation. It is with the greatest regret that I am here to give my vote against the Government, and I give it in the clearest sense of public duty. At the same time, I am voting against a man for whom I have the warmest personal regard, and, apart from purely constitutional matters, I have no fault to find with him. I shall always, whatever the future may hold, in whatever light he may view my action, have for him the remembrance of a leader who was most liberal and most democratic, and at the same time one of the brightest men we have ever had in political fights. He is a man I have been proud to follow, and a man I shall always rank high in my personal esteem; nevertheless, on absolutely clear constitutional grounds, I have to give my vote against him.

Mr. ASHTON (Goulburn) [10·8]: I do not mind confessing that the reason I have not attempted to catch your eye, Mr. Speaker, in this debate until so late an hour has been due to the repugnance that I feel in dealing with the task which now falls into my hands, and that is to give the reasons why I am going to cast a vote which will have the effect of displacing from power a

[Mr. Cotton.

government I have supported for the last five years. Unlike the hon. member who has just resumed his seat, I have no reason for voting against the Premier at this juncture except that which is embodied in the amendment of the hon. member for Wickham. I regard the act of the Premier in paying this sum of money to the hon. member for Paddington as a censurable act. I do not place it on the ground on which some hon. members have seen reason to place it, namely, that the gravamen of the offence or mistake, whatever it may be called, lies in the fact that money has been taken out of the Treasury without parliamentary authority. That is not the ground upon which I place this question. I draw a great distinction between this case and those cases which have been cited as precedents, because I believe that any extension of the practice which was adopted in this case might lead to a serious interference with the smooth working of the political machine. I approach the question not from the standpoint of a moral purist. I regard it simply from the political standpoint, and much as I shall regret to cut myself adrift from the Government and the party with whom I have been acting, for the last five years, my position is simply this: that I regard the advantage of carrying the amendment which stands in the name of the hon. member for Wickham as outweighing the disadvantages attaching to a change of government. That is to say, I feel that the effects of saying that the Prime Minister was not censurable for this act would be of such great duration and of such extreme importance that I cannot see my way, strongly as I sympathise with the position in which the members of my party are placed, to give a vote of that character. The position that I take to-night is a position that carries with it a very great amount of regret, but it is a position from which I see no escape, and for that reason I shall vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Wickham. If a vote be taken on the general resolution I shall not vote for it.

Mr. COHEN (Petersham) [10·15]: I should not have risen at this very late hour and at this stage of the debate to make any comment, were it not that my name has been dragged into this question in connection with what is stated to be one of the corrupt practices of the Government.



It has been sufficiently clearly stated by the Colonial Treasurer to-night that in my case, at any rate, I did nothing more than any member of the House might have done. I do not desire to shield myself behind the plea of privilege, which I may have as a member of the bar. I had no communication from first to last with any Government department, or with any officer or with any member of the Government itself, and my fees have all been paid to me. I have not any claim, nor could I have any claim whatever against the Government. If I had not been paid my fees I could not have recovered one penny from the Government. I was the nominee of the other side. It is not necessary, I take it, to go into the details of this thing. But if there be anything against me, if there be anything in this charge, made at a time like this, it was the duty of the House to have my conduct properly inquired into. I court every inquiry, and I promise not to shield myself behind the privileges of a member of the bar. I indorse every word uttered by the hon. member for Redfern, and I will assist in the passing of any measure which will place all members of this House upon an equal footing. The position I was in was one which any member of the House might have occupied without any loss of dignity or character. While I am upon my feet, I should like to refer to another corrupt practice charged against this Government in connection with a gentleman whom I am proud to claim as a friend. I refer to Dr. Cullen. I have had the pleasure of that gentleman's acquaintance for a great number of years, and for the last five years I have been upon terms of the closest intimacy with him. I occupy chambers adjoining his, and I think I may say, without flattering myself, that I am in a great measure in his confidence. I know that in this transaction which has been referred to the hon. member was not the private secretary of the Premier. The vouchers in the department will show that that was not the case, that the hon. gentleman did not go to Melbourne in that capacity. He had a professional retainer. I do not say that that alters the case put by the hon. member for Redfern; but Dr. Cullen did no more than has been done in years past by every member of the Upper House. If the late Attorney-General were in this

House, he could say that Dr. Cullen has saved this country hundreds of guineas—a very large amount of money—by the services he has rendered to the Government gratis in local affairs. It will be found that he drafted important bills, and was offered large fees, which any other member of the bar would have taken, but that he refused them on the ground that he did not consider he was entitled to take them. If there be anything wrong at all in what the Government have done, I deny that there is any wrong in the transaction as far as Dr. Cullen and myself are concerned, and it is playing it down very low in this crisis to charge these matters as instances of corruption by the Government. I received a confidential communication from a certain gentleman of a certain conversation with Mr. Lyne as to this wonderful find he had made of corruption. As to my receiving a fee of 50 guineas a day, it is needless to say that I wish I had received it. If the Opposition wished to take notice of the matter, it would have been preferable for them to find out the truth concerning the statement made. A reporter from an evening newspaper, which represents the views of the Opposition, called upon me last Monday, and asked me if I had received fees in connection with any law cases of the Government. I said, "No." I was asked whether I acted for the Government, and I said that I acted as umpire in a case; that I had received no communication from the Government; that I had been paid my fees, and that I had received no money from the Government. The paper had not the common decency, when it mentioned the matter the following day to state those facts, but gave a garbled version. I came into this House, as most people are aware, as one of the few free-traders—I may say one of the two—who were not troubled by what the hon. member for The Tweed describes as "Reid-phobia." I came here in opposition to the Premier, and in support of Mr. Barton, as a federalist. I have acted truly to my pledges ever since I have been in the House. Now that I have just finished the first year of my political life no one can accuse me of being untrue to any of my pledges, and especially to my federal pledges. The question of federation is past. We have done with it—at any rate

*Fifth night.*

for a certain time. The people of five colonies have accepted it, the parliaments of four have accepted it. I expect the parliament of the fifth will shortly do so, and we may hope that the parliament of the sixth will do likewise. Therefore, federation is out of the arena of local politics. We have arrived at a stage when the public may rightly expect that we should proceed with domestic legislation—legislation which has been blocked by the progress of this great and all-absorbing question. But when we have arrived at this stage we are met by a motion of censure from the Opposition. I am not going to dispute their right to bring forward such a motion. The hon. member for Hastings-Macleay, who was the leader of the Opposition, resigned that post, stating publicly in the House that his reason for doing so was that he had given a pledge not to raise the fiscal question, that certain members of his party did not consider themselves bound by such a pledge, and, as he could not lead such a party, he would resign. The hon. member for The Hume was unanimously re-elected to the position. Now, it is only natural that we should inquire as to the cause of the change. Is not the cause patent from the speeches made by hon. members in this House who were formerly supporters of the Government—hon. members who were so incensed at the Premier for accepting federation and not sacrificing it, and not acting according to the way they wished, that they declared on the floor of the House that they would take the first opportunity to unseat him? These hon. gentlemen, and I refer particularly to the hon. member for Wellington, declared that they would not follow Mr. Barton, but they would take the first opportunity to overthrow the Government.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why did the hon. gentleman leave Mr. Barton?

MR. COHEN: I never left Mr. Barton. I have been true to Mr. Barton and to every federal pledge I gave.

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. gentleman is not going to vote the same way!

MR. COHEN: I am not bound to Mr. Barton's vote.

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. gentleman came in as a federalist!

MR. COHEN: I came in as a federalist, under Mr. Barton, and I gave the allegiance which every true man should give.

[Mr. Cohen.

MR. CRICK: And deserted him on the first motion he moved!

MR. COHEN: I will explain all that. The hon. member for Hastings-Macleay expressed on the public platform, at my side, that I had acted true to my pledges, and if he were here now he would say so again. As I was saying, these hon. gentlemen wished to take revenge upon the Government. Now, there is no man in the House who has reminded us of our speeches in *Hansard* so much as the hon. member for Wellington has done. I am going to quote one of the many things which that hon. gentleman said of the hon. member for Ashfield, and I will show how applicable they are at the present time to the hon. gentleman himself. The hon. member said:

The hon. and learned member has a burning and longing desire to bring down the Premier, whether by straight or crooked means. That is the real burden of his song. It does not matter whether the hon. and learned member uses covert, adroit, or circumspect language. One thing is transparent all the time, and that is his unprincipled desire to get at this man's position.

Does the hon. member not see how applicable those remarks are to himself? The hon. member could find no words sufficiently glowing to paint the Premier and his party then. He could find no words sufficiently damatory to describe hon. members on the Opposition side. According to the hon. member then, the Premier was the one man to brave the hostility of his friends for the public good. But then they were not the friends affected; when they are affected they exert all the powers of which they are capable to hurl the right hon. gentleman and his party from office. And for what? To join a party whom, if they are consistent, they cannot possibly follow. I am reminded of a celebrity in history, who once could not get his own way and wished to be avenged, and of whom Milton said:

Satan was the first  
Who practised falsehood under saintly show,  
Deep malice to conceal, couched with revenge.

The hon. member for Wickham has suddenly discovered that the Government has not proceeded with sufficient dispatch with certain measures. No one knows better than that hon. member that the question of federation blocked the progress of all legislation; and if that is to be hurled against the Government as a reason for

putting them out of office it was equally applicable some time ago. In a great burst of indignation the hon. member for Wickham pointed out the ungenerous act of the Premier in not accepting the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Hastings-Macleay on the address to the Queen. I agree with him. Apart from the consideration as to generosity, I think the hon. member might well have included the amendment in the address, and I think every true federalist should have voted for it. It would have been a gracious concession to a generous opponent. But the hon. member gives this as another reason for voting against the Premier, forgetful that at the time amongst the men who voted against that amendment was the man from whom the hon. member for Hastings-Macleay had a right to expect some generous consideration—the very man whom the hon. gentleman now proposes to accept as leader ; and if he looks at the division list on that occasion he will find the name of W. J. Lyne. The hon. gentleman should be careful how he seeks to inflict punishment, lest it recoil upon himself. I would say to him :

Heat not the furnace for your foe so hot  
That it do singe yourself.

One can understand the consistent opposition of some hon. members. The hon. member for Queanbeyan, for instance, has consistently opposed this Government from the start. He has always maintained that they had no right to be in power, and he has taken every opportunity he could to endeavour to hurl them from office. The hon. member has been a consistent protectionist, and one can admire his attitude and the attitude of those like him. But, although we may look with admiration upon his attitude, the hon. member must not think he can gain anything by threatening vengeance on those who do not take the same view as himself. The hon. gentleman need not bother about other people's constituents. Each of us can look after his own. We all know without the hon. member reminding us that each vote we give in this House is eagerly scanned by our constituents. Each of us knows the time will come when his constituents will ask him why he recorded that vote. And if the time comes that I am to be put out for any vote I give I would much rather be defeated by reason of a vote given honestly

and fearlessly, than by a vote which I did not believe in, but which I gave at the solicitation or request of my friends, or any body of members, or simply out of pure revenge. I think it was Sir Thomas Erskine May who said that every member when elected had a right to vote according to his convictions and conscience, and I believe he used other words which I do not remember, but the purport of which was that a man of honor should violate no pledge and no engagement that he enters into. I say the same thing, and I owe it to my own respect and to the dignity of the office I hold, not to yield to a petty meddling or dictation of any member or body of members who may assume to sway my judgment. On the question of federation, I wish to refer to a remark made by the hon. member for West Macquarie. I am told that I ought to oppose the Premier at the present crisis. I came in opposed to the Premier on the federal question, believing he was not sincere in regard to it. When we came into the House, and when the Premier produced his notice of the resolution in regard to the procedure, a vote of censure was moved, and the feeling of the House was tested. I voted on that occasion, and the House decided that the procedure was the proper one. After that, we all agreed to abide by the decision of the House. The next motion of censure was moved because the Premier opposed the federal leader at the Hastings-Macleay election, and because of the way he opposed him, and I voted on that also. The third motion of censure was on the fiscal question. When it was proposed I took the first opportunity of going to the hon. and learned member for Hastings-Macleay and telling him that I could not support him on that motion ; and, although I knew the pressure that was brought to bear on the hon. and learned member at that time to denounce me, I refused to go back on what I had said. Am I, a federalist, after having achieved the goal I have been aiming at, with the assistance of the Premier, to go back on him now ? Notwithstanding the fact that hon. members may attribute certain motives to him for going for federation, still we have achieved it ; and is that any reason now for voting against him ? It would be a sorry state of affairs indeed if, when we are all working for an end—

*Fifth night.*

and we achieve that end—for the public good, we are to condemn the man who helped us to it, because some twelve months before he was opposed to it, especially when that condemnation only comes from the very men who approved of his actions twelve months ago. I have a few words to say about the amendment of the hon. member for Wickham; and I may say that I intend to vote for the Government. I do so because I think it is a very shallow motive for tacking the amendment about the hon. member for Paddington on to the censure motion. This is only a small pretext. It cannot be said that the Premier has been guilty of corruption. It is considered that he made a mistake only; and I say that I think the punishment proposed is a great deal too severe for such a mistake. I am only too glad to support the Premier in the present crisis. I know very well he is going down; but I would sooner go down voting against the amendment than go up voting for it. I am going to vote against the amendment, and against the motion of censure.

Mr. GARLAND (Woollahra) [10.40]: I desire to claim the indulgence of the House whilst I say a few words in justification of the vote which I intend to give on this occasion. It is not often that I trouble the House with the reasons that I give for my vote; but as this is a matter of vital importance, I consider that it is only right that I should lay before the House the reasons for the vote I intend to give, more particularly so from the fact that my name has been more or less dragged into the question. Imputations have been made, not only against the Government, but also, to a certain extent, against myself, because I, in common with others, have accepted Government money whilst I was a member of the House. This matter was brought before the House in a way which was unfortunate for me to this extent, that I had no opportunity of defending myself in the way in which I should desire to have defended myself. I had no opportunity of placing all the facts of the case fully and fairly before the House, because of the means by which the matter was brought before the House. Not only did I not receive that notice, which any member, who is attacked either directly or indirectly, in common fairness has a right to demand, but because by the

rules of the House from the way in which the matter was brought forward I was limited to the short space of fifteen minutes in which to speak in justification of my conduct. I do not mean at this late hour to take up the time of the House at any length, but I desire to say that the Prime Minister, I believe, had absolutely no knowledge whatsoever that I held a brief from the Crown whilst I held a seat in this House. The Prime Minister, as head of the Government, is undoubtedly responsible; but I may say that when that brief was delivered to me, the Prime Minister was not head of the legal department. Mr. Want was head of the department at the time when that brief was originally delivered to me. I sent the brief back, and I believe that at the time when it was returned to me, Mr. Want was still head of that department. Whether he knew, or did not know that that brief had been re-transferred to me, I am unaware; but this I know: that Mr. Want stated to me that as long as the law is as it is, he sees nothing wrong in my conduct in this case. I claim this for myself, that I have some regard for my personal honor, and if I regarded this as an illegal or improper thing to do, I should have been the last man to do it. I consulted those men whom a young man, or a comparatively young man, may best consult on such matters. I consulted the leaders of my profession, and the hon. and learned member for Ashfield will bear me out in this, that I had his advice on the matter, and he informed me that the leaders of the bar saw absolutely no objection to my taking a brief from the Crown. Under these circumstances I took that brief. I say now that if a bill is introduced into this House which will prevent members of both houses of Parliament from accepting briefs from the Crown, I will give my support to that bill; but I say this: that the legitimate mode in which this House should express its belief, its conviction as to the practice of members of Parliament is by passing a law to that effect. It is not individual opinion in the House that any member of the House is bound to bow to, but it is to the will of the House expressed in the way in which the Constitution demands that it shall be expressed. I wish to say no more on that except this: that hon. members on both sides of the House, when

[*Mr. Cohen.*]

this matter was brought up, expressed their firm belief that I was actuated by no corrupt motive in accepting a brief, and that my vote would not be influenced by accepting it. I desire to say a very few words in regard to the matter of the hon. member for Paddington. I may, perhaps, speak with some little degree of confidence as to what took place between the parties, because I had the unpleasant duty cast upon me of being a member of the select committee which inquired into the matter. I heard the evidence, and I can only say that no legal man on that committee could, on the face of the evidence, in my opinion, have held that the hon. member had accepted an office of profit under the Crown. On that point the voting members of the committee were unanimous. The chairman of the committee dissented from that finding. We based our finding on this fact, that the £350 which was given to the hon. member for Paddington was no more than the reimbursement of out of pocket expenses incurred by him in connection with his trip to England in the compilation of the report.

Mr. NORRIS: He gave you no vouchers!

Mr. GARLAND: He gave us no vouchers, for what to me seemed the best of reasons. That reason seems to me to absolutely stamp as a false suggestion that when the hon. member first accepted this commission there was a tacit understanding between him and the Prime Minister that he was ultimately to receive remuneration for it. The hon. member had learnt a bitter lesson in regard to vouchers. He went as commissioner to the Adelaide Exhibition, and then the question of the payment of expenses cropped up. A select committee was appointed by the House to inquire into this expenditure, because he could not produce vouchers for all the moneys that had been given to him. Under the circumstances, I think, if the hon. member had expected that he was to be paid his expenses, he would have been very careful to keep vouchers. He did not keep vouchers; but we have his sworn statement that the money was so expended. We had the further corroborative evidence of the Principal Under-Secretary and the Under-Secretary for Finance and Trade, that, under the circumstances, the sum for expenses was a very moderate sum indeed.

AN HON. MEMBER: How did they know?

Mr. GARLAND: They have had experience of the payment of members' expenses in connection with a vast number of commissions.

Mr. EDDEN: There is another sum on the estimates!

Mr. GARLAND: Yes, a sum of £250.

Mr. EDDEN: £392!

Mr. GARLAND: £250 for the hon. member for Paddington, and the other is for the payment of a gentleman who translated a number of reports. What is the charge made against the Prime Minister? It is not a charge of personal corruption, and I take it that the majority of members of the House will not say that it is a charge of political corruption, because it is clear from the dates that at the time when the money was promised to the hon. member his vote was not worth a pin's head to the Government. The Government position was then secure. The truce of God had been struck between the contending parties, and it was agreed that all disputes were to be sunk until the federation question had been settled. It was not until some date between the 11th and the 29th November that the Premier made any promise to the hon. member for Paddington in connection with this matter.

Mr. EDDEN: How was it that no money was applied for or paid during the three years which elapsed between 1896 and 1899?

Mr. GARLAND: The Premier's justification of his action—and I believe it to be a true one, and I think that every other hon. member believes it to be true—is that it was not until he had seen the enormous work that had been compiled by the hon. member for Paddington that he made up his mind to pay him a single farthing.

Mr. CRICK: It is a great pity that the truth is not told about this matter!

Mr. GARLAND: I mean to tell the House the truth, and to give them the evidence which came out before the select committee. It does not appear in the printed report of questions and answers, but I mean to give it to the House. In November, the Premier received an advance copy of the report of the hon. member for Paddington, and he told us that when he received that report he was astounded at the amount of labour which had been expended upon it. The ordinary gentleman who gets a commission to go home to

*Fifth night.*

report upon public matters generally, only desires the parchment document with the seal of the colony upon it, because he thinks that it will be very useful to him as an introduction to the leading men at home; and, as a return for it, he generally compiles some thirty or forty pages of a report which is not of very much use to anyone. Such a report, I presume, is what the Premier expected from the hon. member for Paddington.

Mr. SAWERS: It is a very improper thing to give such commissions!

Mr. GARLAND: Well, as that matter has not been imported into the debate, I shall not discuss it. When the Premier saw what a great amount of labour had been expended upon the report of the hon. member for Paddington, he said, "I am not going to accept, on behalf of the state, the result of the labours of the hon. member for Paddington, without providing for some recompense to him for his out-of-pocket expenses, and his trouble, by putting an amount upon the estimates. As the head of the state, I do not think I should be doing right in accepting the work unless I made some such arrangement."

Mr. NORTON: What the hon. and learned member is now saying has already been said fifty times.

Mr. GARLAND: Perhaps that is so. The hon. member for Paddington then said that he did not think it would be right to accept this money. I have not read the whole of the report myself, but I have the statement of a respected member of the House, who has probably devoted as much time to the question of old-age pensions, and understands as much of the literature of the subject as any man—the hon. and learned member for Belmore Division—that this work is the most valuable compilation upon the question that he has ever met with.

Mr. SLEATH: Then he knows nothing about it.

Mr. GARLAND: Those who know the hon. and learned member, know that he does not speak at random upon these matters, and he having expressed that opinion, I am prepared to accept it. The promise that the Premier made to the hon. member for Paddington was that he would place a sum upon the additional estimates for the year; but there were no additional estimates that year, and nothing

[*Mr. Garland.*

more was done until January, when an interview took place between the Premier and the hon. member, and the hon. member asked the Premier to give him a certain sum of money in anticipation of the vote of the House. The reason that the hon. member for Paddington gave to the Premier was that it was absolutely essential to him that the money should be paid, because the policy upon his life, which was the sole means of support for his wife and family, in the event of anything happening to him, was about to be forfeited, and he was in absolute pecuniary distress. The Premier believed that statement, and I doubt if there was an hon. member in the House who would not believe it.

Mr. NORTON: The bailiff was in the house, and the Premier had to pay to get him out!

Mr. GARLAND: The Premier tells us that he honestly believed that the hon. member for Paddington had done work which was worth many hundreds of pounds to the state, and under those circumstances he would have been less than the man he is if he had not answered the hon. member's appeal. He made the payment, taking all risks. No man knew better, the intense unpopularity of the hon. member for Paddington in this House.

Mr. NORTON: This is the first time that the truth has come out!

Mr. GARLAND: No one knows the feeling of this House better than the Premier does, and I say more honor to him for what he did. He knew full well the risk that he was taking.

Mr. CRICK: Upon what page of the evidence will I find these facts stated?

Mr. GARLAND: The hon. member will not find them in the evidence.

Mr. CRICK: Why not?

Mr. GARLAND: I will tell the hon. member, and this again redounds to the Premier's credit. The hon. member for Sturt will no doubt corroborate what I am about to say. The Premier made the statement to the committee which I have just given to the House, and he also said, "Out of respect to Mr. Neild's feelings, I do not wish that statement to be taken down."

Mr. CRICK: He took an oath to tell the truth, and the whole truth!

An HON. MEMBER: If the Premier said that, why is the hon. and learned member divulging the statement to-night?

Mr. GARLAND: I do not know if I am exceeding my duty in divulging these facts, but I believe that I am right in doing so. I think that it would have been much better if the whole of the facts had been put before the House at an earlier stage. I honor the Premier for the risk that he took, and I say that if that noble action means the hounding from power of the Premier and his Government, I shall be proud to fall behind such a man.

Mr. CRICK: How is it that this evidence, which was given on oath, does not appear in the report?

Mr. GARLAND: The hon. member for Sturt will bear me out when I say that the Premier stated that he did not wish it to be taken down. It was suggested that it should not be taken down, and the committee, rightly or wrongly, assented to that suggestion. At the time, we did not think of the importance of the matter. I shall vote against the amendment of the hon. member for Wickham, and if it were the last political act of my life I should feel that in so doing I was doing my duty. I believe that though the Premier may have made a blunder in paying this money without the consent of Parliament, he would have been absolutely right in paying it if it were not for the fact that it was stated in the commission issued to the hon. member for Paddington that no money would be paid. Whether he was technically wrong or technically right matters little to me. What he did he did with his eyes open, and he admits it. He paid the money out of the Treasurer's advance account—an account which is given to the Treasurer for the very purpose of enabling him to make payments which, of necessity, cannot first be submitted to Parliament. It may seem a hard thing to say; if so, I apologise to the House for saying it, but if the man to whom the money was paid had been any one else but the hon. member for Paddington, we should have heard nothing about it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN: The hon. member for Paddington is not so unpopular as the hon. and learned member seems to think!

Mr. GARLAND: I am a new member of the House, but I hear and see a little of what goes on, and I believe that the hon. member for Paddington is exceedingly unpopular. I do not say that his unpopularity has consciously acted upon hon. members

—I should be the last to make such a charge—but one knows that there is such a thing as unconscious bias, and one knows how much it affects one's actions in a case of this kind. In conclusion, I have only to say that I shall vote against the amendment of the hon. member for Wickham, and if it were the last act of my political life I should feel that it was, perhaps, the best.

Mr. H. CHAPMAN (Sydney-Fitzroy) [11.2]: Like the hon. member for Goulburn, I feel myself to be in a very painful position. Ever since my return to this House in 1894 I have followed the Reid Government; and though I may, perhaps, be termed one of the party of revenge—I have heard those words used for the first time to-night—I am not one of that party, although at one time I felt annoyed at the Premier because of the famous somersault which he turned. But I forgave him that as I forgave him a great many other things, and the vote which I shall give to-night will be accompanied with feelings of regret. It is in no spirit of revenge that I shall give my vote. I have listened to the right hon. gentleman's defence of his action, but I do not feel that he has cleared himself of the charge which has been made in connection with the payment of this £350 to one faithful follower. I was one of those who tried to induce the hon. member for Paddington to come here and vote for the Government when a motion of censure had been moved, but he would not come. Yet it is a singular thing that upon the next occasion when a motion of censure was moved he toed the mark.

Mr. REID: He paired!

Mr. H. CHAPMAN: He as good as voted. I followed the right hon. gentleman only so long as he adhered to the free-trade principles upon which I was elected. I was very much surprised to hear him ask the leader of the Opposition if he intended to interfere with the fiscal policy, seeing that he himself tried to do so, although his proposals were defeated by the House. I am no follower of the leader of the Opposition. I am going to vote to-night in accordance with my conscience. If I do wrong I shall have to answer to my constituents for it, and I am quite prepared to do so.

Mr. NORTON: I am sure that the hon. member would not do it willingly!

*Fifth night.*

Mr. H. CHAPMAN : I do not suppose that any hon. member wishes to go for election every twelve months ; but whatever the consequences of my vote may be to myself, I am quite prepared to take them. I have the greatest possible respect for certain gentlemen on the Ministerial side. I heard one hon. gentleman who sits on the other side of the House say that he is going to vote for the Government on this occasion because the same thing had been done by other governments. It is very queer if we are to perpetuate wrongdoing. I have never known the same thing to be done before. If it had been, and a vote of censure had been moved against the then government, I should have voted as I shall vote to-night. Two wrongs do not make a right ; and if anything wrong has been done in former times, we ought not to wink at it and say there was no harm in it.

Mr. ARCHER : The hon. member has winked at it a good many times before !

Mr. H. CHAPMAN : For an hon. member who has been sitting in opposition to the Ministry to get up here and defend them by saying that previous governments have done the same thing, is a very paltry excuse for his vote. I came into the House as a supporter of a free-trade government. The right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government has given up free-trade. By his action in the secret conference he committed this colony to a larger protectionist policy than we ever had.

Mr. NORTON : Than we had even under Dibbs !

Mr. H. CHAPMAN : Yes, and hon. members will find that out very soon. I am not an anti-federalist, but I was against the bill. In giving my vote to-night I do so without any feeling of revenge. I represent a city electorate which requires very little from the Government, and I always obtained from the present Government whatever was required for my constituency. I have never gone to the Secretary for Public Works without getting everything I wanted.

Mr. YOUNG : What did the hon. member get ?

Mr. H. CHAPMAN : Everything I wanted for my electorate.

Mr. YOUNG : Did the hon. member get a medal ?

Mr. H. CHAPMAN : No ; a bag of potatoes. If the hon. member interrupts

[*Mr. H. Chapman.*]

me I will give him a Roland for his Oliver. I shall not say any more. The hour is late, and hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side are anxious to go to a division. I shall vote in the first instance for the amendment moved by the hon. member for Wickham, and afterwards for the original motion.

Mr. FERRIS (Parramatta) [11-12] : In rumour, my name has been pretty freely mentioned, and it is, therefore, incumbent on me, I think, to explain how I shall vote. For my advent in this House, I was under no compliment, either to the Ministry or to the Opposition. I came here as one of the most independent men in Parliament. My greatest opponent was the Prime Minister, who made it his business to go to Parramatta and speak in favour of the return of my opponent, who was one of his supporters. Later on, both the Reid party and the Barton party were opposed to me on the federation question. Under these circumstances, I claim I have a perfect right to act, according to the best of my judgment, up to the pledges I gave to my constituents ; and if I err in my judgment, I am responsible only to them. I was an out-and-out protectionist, and fought publicly for protection for twenty-five years. But the district I represent is a free-trade one. When the question of federation was brought before the people, I saw my opportunity of starting in public life the same as other men unhandicapped by the fiscal question. I fought a fair battle, and was returned to Parliament not only once, but twice. I was not selected by the Sydney committee as a Bartonite ; but on entering the House I had a natural antipathy to a free-trade ministry ; and I went into the Opposition room at once. However, in going into that room, I did so as a federalist, and not as a protectionist. I went there to follow the lines laid down by the hon. and learned member for Hastings-Macleay. There was no reason why I should follow the lead of that hon. gentleman beyond this : I candidly admit that I never thought the Prime Minister intended to go in really for federation, and under those circumstances I followed the lead of the hon. and learned member for Hastings-Macleay, believing more in him than in the Prime Minister ; but since my appearance in Parliament the Prime Minister has shown the sincerity of his action on the federal question. The



hon. and learned member for Hastings—Macleay himself stated on the floor of the House that he would be no party to ousting the Prime Minister from office, as he had carried out the principles of federation as far as he could. I do not think it is fair for any hon. member to blame me for the vote I intend to give on this particular occasion. What does this vote mean? I have watched the Prime Minister, and have voted against him on every motion of censure that has been brought forward since I have been in Parliament. I did so because I belonged to a party; but this is not a House of parties now. I admit that there must be an opposition to watch the Government; but this is a federal House, and not a House where two parties should be found fighting against each other in order to obtain possession of the Treasury benches, and I have seen nothing in the action of the Prime Minister and the Government to justify my turning round to-night and voting to put them out of office, because a certain small matter has been charged against them in connection with the action of the Prime Minister in the case of the hon. member for Paddington. I should prefer not to refer to that, for, after all, what is it? It is a matter of internal arrangement on the part of the Ministry. It is not essentially necessary that the Ministry should bring every small detail before the House. Every hon. gentleman who has been in a ministry knows—no one better—that thousands of things of greater moment than that now charged against the Prime Minister, have been effected, and never saw the light of day. This is a matter of £350, not spent on the Prime Minister himself, but upon one who happened to be one of his supporters. If the Prime Minister himself had “collared” this £350 for himself, I could understand the indignation that has been displayed in reference to the payment of this money to the hon. member for Paddington. It is all very well for hon. members to say that they cannot, as public purists, allow this question to go unchallenged; but did it not strike the House to-night that the hon. member for Rylstone and the hon. member for Fitzroy Division could not forget the action of the Prime Minister during the past year? I do not say that of all who have seceded from the other side; but a majority of them, under the

guise of objection to this payment of £300, are actuated by an impulse of revenge for the action taken by the Premier upon the question of federation. That aspect of the case must present itself to every right-thinking man. I came here with no prejudices against the Prime Minister or his colleagues. I have my own private feelings in the matter, and I feel that I cannot view their action in the light in which it is viewed by hon. members on the Opposition benches. These gentlemen, I am sure, will give me credit for having the courage of my convictions in recording my vote with the Government on this occasion, instead of with the party to which I am supposed to belong. The amendment of the hon. member for Wickham brands the Premier as guilty of corruption; but if he be guilty of corruption, why should he be removed from that side to this side? Why should he be allowed to sit on this side of the House with the brand of corruption upon him? The proper course for hon. members to pursue would be to impeach the Premier if they think they have a case against him. I am perfectly justified, I think, in my vote. There has no doubt been an error of judgment in this payment to the hon. member for Paddington, but no attempt was made to cloak the payment, it was placed upon the estimates in the ordinary way for the approval or disapproval of Parliament. I am aware that the Government must be defeated to-night, and I know, therefore, that I have everything to lose, and nothing to gain, by voting with them and by leaving the party on this side. I should have everything to gain by sticking to that party. As far as my constituency is concerned, I will put the matter before them at the proper time, and if my course of action in Parliament is held to be wrong, well and good; I have acted according to my own judgment and conscience, and I shall feel sure that if I am returned to Parliament again, I shall come back here with a career which, if short, at all events has been an honorable one.

Mr. DICK (Newcastle East) [11.23]: It is with some reluctance that I rise to detain the House for a few moments; but I feel bound to say a few words. It will be generally admitted, I think, that I have been, from the first moment I entered this House, a loyal and often an enthusiastic supporter of the Reid Administration;

*Fifth night.*

but their recent ministerial act, as set forth in the amendment of the hon. member for Wickham, has placed so severe a strain upon my party loyalty that I feel I must, in justice to myself, forego my party allegiance, in order to fulfil my duty as a representative of the people. The hon. member for Bingara, and several other hon. members who spoke to-night, stated that this offence on the part of the Government was not of so serious a complexion that they should be visited with the last penalty. In reply to that contention I should like to point out that the penal code of politics contains no such thing as a first offence, and that if a man is not prepared to censure a wrong act he must condone it. It is because I do not desire to condone this act that I intend, on this occasion, to vote for the first time, I think, against the Reid Administration.

Mr. LYNE (The Hume) [11.26] : In replying to the lengthy debate on the motion I submitted the other day, and the amendments, I think it would, perhaps, be out of place —

Mr. YOUNG : I should like to understand the position of matters before the hon. member proceeds any further. Is he to be taken now as replying to the debate or speaking to the amendments ?

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I do not think the hon. member's speech will close the debate, there being amendments before the House.

Mr. LYNE : I was about to say that I did not propose at present to enter minutely into the speeches delivered in this lengthy debate especially at this late hour. I do not propose to deal with many matters which have been dealt with by hon. members. But the Premier in reply to the motion of censure which I submitted practically admitted the whole of the charge which I levelled against him as to the payment of a sum of money to the hon. member for Paddington. I notice that he acknowledged that he made a mistake and he wished to be let off under the First Offenders Act, according to an hon. member who spoke to-night. I was rather surprised to hear of the speech of the hon. member for Parramatta, because the gravamen of the charge does not lie in the amount of money but in the manner in which the amount was paid to the hon. member for Paddington, and the manner in which it was kept from the House after

[Mr. Dick.

the promise of the Premier that no such amount should be paid. The hon. member for Woollahra, in speaking a few moments ago, made a statement which was in absolute contradiction of the facts ; he referred to a report of the select committee in reference to this matter, and he stated that the money was paid and the arrangement was made at a time when all party questions were at rest, when there was no party fighting—no motion of censure—and that, therefore, there could have been no understanding between the Prime Minister and the hon. member. But what do I find ? The Prime Minister stated in his reply that this amount of money was to have been put upon the supplementary estimates last year ; that it had been promised at that time that the amount should be put upon them. I find from the Premier's evidence before the select committee that, in answer to a question by Mr. Sawers, he stated that the conversation he had with the hon. member for Paddington in reference to the payment of this money took place about the end of October or about the 2nd of November. What do we find in reference to *Hansard* ? That the vote of censure on the Government took place on the 16th November, and we found the hon. member voting with the Government on that particular occasion.

Mr. NEILD : I voted with the Government before, and the hon. member knows it !

Mr. LYNE : The hon. member did not come to the House to vote.

Mr. NEILD : That is not the fact. I voted with the Government on the 28th September, and the hon. member knows it !

Mr. LYNE : I refer to the matter to show that the hon. member for Woollahra, without having looked up the matter, made a statement, leaving the House to believe that this matter was not arranged to be put upon the estimates at a time when there was a motion of censure pending. I will say one or two words only as to the paper from which the hon. member quoted, referring to the expenses of a commission relating to the conservation of water, of which I was president, and on which I worked hard for two years. The hon. member wished this House and the country to infer that I had taken between £600 and £700 as expenses in connection with that commission. Here are the whole of the expenses set forth in the

paper from which the hon. member quoted, and I find that the only amount of money paid to me was £3. That amount was paid to me for sundry disbursements upon a trip to Victoria, and it was paid for this reason: I had to put my hand in my pocket to pay expenses on that occasion, because the officer who usually looked after the expenses of the commission, was not present. I sent in a voucher for £3, but the Auditor-General would not pay the amount until I gave the certificate published here. It is a most unusual certificate, but I gave it at once: "I hereby certify that I did actually expend this amount or money on behalf of the public service." To show the unfairness of the hon. member, there is a column which shows that these vouchers have to be certified to by the president of the commission. The amounts to which the hon. member referred are vouchers for payments to other people, to which, as president, I had to certify. The hon. member wished to make it appear that I had received money from this commission, which lasted, as I say, for two years. I do not wish to deal further with that particular phase of the question. The speech delivered by the Colonial Treasurer to-night was delivered in an endeavour to show that this payment to the hon. member for Paddington was no unusual thing. There never has been proved a payment made in the same way as in the case of the hon. member for Paddington. There never has been, in any one of the cases the hon. member referred to, a single instance where the House has been deceived in the matter of a payment such as this, and where a promise has been given that the payment would not be made without consulting the House—in this particular case that it would not be made at all. The Colonial Treasurer referred to payments made to Dr. MacLaurin and Mr. F. B. Suttor. There was no promise made to the House, in answer to a question, that Mr. F. B. Suttor, who went to a conference in Ottawa, should not be reimbursed for his expenses. If the Government had been asked whether his expenses were going to be paid, and if they had said they were not, and if the expenses were afterwards paid, then that Government should have been censured in the way this Government is being censured at the present time. I could to-night rake up a number of cases,

but I do not think it is worth while, under the circumstances. I have by me a list of the commissions, the names of the gentlemen, and in some cases the fees paid, since the hon. member and his colleagues have been in office. I could rake up a very funny case. I wonder if the hon. gentleman remembers the commission and the payments he brought before this House when there were two sittings a day—the first time such a thing was done in the history of the colony. The Government very nearly went out of office over it, but someone came to their assistance. There are a number of other commissions of which I have the particulars—a great many more than the hon. member quoted as against previous governments. The Prime Minister and the Colonial Treasurer said that the matter of Mr. Goldstein's payments was of no consequence. Let me repeat what took place. The Prime Minister employed this gentleman as private secretary.

Mr. REID: Not true!

Mr. LYNE: As paid secretary.

Mr. REID: Not as mine, but as secretary of the party!

Mr. LYNE: And the hon. member promised him a position in the Government service.

Mr. REID: That is absolutely untrue!

Mr. LYNE: All I can say is, the gentleman makes that statement.

Mr. REID: He states what is wrong!

Mr. LYNE: He proceeded so far as to threaten to take proceedings for breach of contract; and he was promised a position, and practically appointed, but the hon. member for Queanbeyan came down to the House and asked a question before Mr. Goldstein took possession of his office; and then he was not appointed, but was informed at once that he could not get the position. The Premier goes to London, and there employs this gentleman on similar work to that which he said he would not be employed upon here. And when the amount appears on the estimates it is impossible, unless you know where to put your finger on it, to find the item.

Mr. REID: The Minister does not put the items in the estimates! Does the hon. member think the Minister has anything to do with that?

Mr. LYNE: The case is parallel with that of the hon. member for Paddington. In reference to one or two speeches made,

I cannot allow the speech of the hon. member for Lismore to go without challenge. The hon. member made most extraordinary statements. He said that a previous government had paid money under similar conditions to those under which this Government had paid the money in this case. I challenged the hon. member to mention a case, but he was unable to do so. The hon. member has had a most extraordinary career in this House. This is not the first time he has done what he is doing now.

Mr. EWING: I let the hon. gentleman off very easily!

Mr. LYNE: I do not want any consideration from the hon. member. The last occasion was one in which a railway was concerned. I remember it well. How is it that this hon. member gets concessions for his district that other members can not get? I hold in my hand a list of the money expended in his district last year. I could not obtain, and I know a number of other members could not obtain money for roads equal to more than about two-thirds of the amount voted, and that was very small; but here is a list showing that the amount of money voted in the hon. member's district was £8,000, and the amount spent was £13,000, and the items are given. Where was that money paid from? It was taken from some other districts where other members lost their money. It is a most extraordinary thing that this hon. gentleman should take the course he has done on this and previous occasions.

Mr. REID: And yet he was voting against us all the time!

Mr. LYNE: When there was no danger. I wish to make it abundantly clear to hon. members, like the hon. member for Parramatta, and one or two others who are going to vote with the Government, because they say they are afraid federation is in danger, that the party which I am leading intend in no way to jeopardise that movement. I say, and I have said before, that much as I have objected to some of the provisions in the Constitution Bill—and I have had the courage to state my objections—since the result of the referendum I have said that I would be as loyal to that vote as the strongest federalist in the House. I will not advocate one question one year on the 3rd June, and turn round and advocate the other side on the 20th June in the following year. I will be true to the

[*Mr. Lyne.*

principles I have advocated right through, and I will be true to myself and true to my words in carrying out what I say now. So that as far as the federal question is concerned, the Prime Minister attempts to raise it up to scare hon. members, and to scare the voters of this country, and I say that is a very poor subterfuge after what has taken place. As far as my feelings about federation are concerned, I think I am as true a federalist as a great many of those who talk so much about it. Amongst those with whom I was fighting on the last occasion, were some of the truest democratic federalists that were to be found in the colony. But they could not accept one or two provisions in the bill, and they had a perfect right to take the course they did on that occasion. In regard to the finances, the Prime Minister in his reply tried to make out that he had decreased the deficiency account in consequence of the two trust accounts—Martin-place and Centennial Park. I refer to the main deficiency on the 30th June, 1898. The hon. member would not answer my question when I asked if those two amounts were not included in the deficiency of the 30th June, 1895, and whether, therefore, it was not a fact that the difference in calculating those amounts would not affect the deficiency account to the extent of one sixpence. On every occasion the hon. member has tried to blind hon. members and to induce them to think that these two particular amounts caused the deficiency which took place between June, 1895, and June, 1898. I do not wish to refer to this matter any more. I think I have made my attack upon the Government in language that no one could take exception to. I have made no thrust below the belt. I have attempted to fight fairly, as I have done on previous occasions, and if the result of this division is a defeat for the Government, all I can say is, having fought the Prime Minister for so many years, that in removing the present Government from the Treasury benches the cause of the removal is simply that the hon. member has administered his department in connection with one or two of these expenses which have come to light lately in a way that the country must put a stop to. It is not of much avail to say that it has been done before. I have been

against the practice of paying members of Parliament under any conditions. I am against the practice now. But if we do not put our foot firmly down and compel any government that may be in power afterwards to pass a law—they will not do it voluntarily—to prevent a repetition of cases which, to say the least, are under the gravest suspicion—unless it does that, this House will be recreant to its duty, and future ministries will repeat, or attempt to repeat, what has been done on the present occasion. I shall say no more, as the hour is late. I hope what I have said will not cause the Prime Minister, or any of the ministers to say I have done an ill-natured act of any kind, but that I have simply done my duty as the leader of a large party in this House.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted from the amendment (Mr. Fegan's) stand part of the amendment—put. The House divided :

Ayes, 78 ; noes, 40 ; majority, 38.

## AYES.

Ashton, J.	McGowen, J. S. T.
Barnes, J. F.	McLaughlin, J.
Barton, E.	Miller, G. T. C.
Bennett, W.	Nelson, A. D.
Brown, T.	Nicholson, J. B.
Campbell, Alexander	Norton, J.
Cann, J. H.	O'Connor, B. B.
Carroll, J. G.	O'Sullivan, E. W.
Chapman, H.	Perry, J.
Clark, E. M.	Piddington, W. H. B.
Clarke, H.	Price, R. A.
Copeland, H.	Pyers, R.
Cotton, F.	Quinn, P. E.
Crick, W. P.	Reynold, J. B.
Cruickshank, G. A.	Richards, E.
Dacey, J. R.	Rose, T.
Davis, D.	Ross, Dr. A.
Dick, W. T.	Ross, H.
Dight, C. H.	Sawers, W.
Edden, A.	See, J.
Fegan, J. L.	Sleath, R.
Ferguson, W. J.	Smith, Samuel
Fitzgerald, R. G. D.	Spence, W. G.
Fitzpatrick, J. C. L.	Spruson, W. J.
Fitzpatrick, T.	Suttor, F. B.
Gillies, J.	Terry, E.
Goodwin, T. H. H.	Thomas, J.
Gormly, J.	Thomson, J.
Griffith, Arthur	Waddell, T.
Hassall, T. H.	Watkins, D.
Haynes, J.	Watson, J. C.
Hughes, W. M.	Willis, W. N.
Hurley, W. F.	Wilson, C. G.
Kidd, J.	Wise, B. R.
Law, S. J.	Wood, W. H.
Levien, R. H.	Wright, F. A.
Lyne, W. J.	
Macdonald, H.	
Mackay, J. A. K.	
McFarlane, J.	

## Tellers,

Chapman, A.  
Holman, W. A.

## NOES.

Affleck, W.	Lees, S. E.
Anderson, G.	Mahony, W. H.
Archer, W.	McCourt, W.
Brunker, J. N.	McLean, F. E.
Byrne, F. A.	Meagher, R. D.
Campbell, Archibald	Millard, W.
Carruthers, J. H.	Molesworth, E. W.
Clarke, T.	Morgan, W.
Cohen, J. J.	Nobbs, J.
Cook, J.	Parkes, V.
Ewing, T. T.	Phillips, S.
Ferris, W. J.	Reid, G. H.
Garland, J.	Rigg, W.
Graham, Dr. J.	Storey, D.
Griffith, T. H.	Thomson, D.
Harris, Sir Matthew	Whiddon, S. T.
Hawthorne, J. S.	Young, J. H.
Hogue, J. A.	
Howarth, G.	
Jesse, T.	
Lee, C. A.	

## Tellers,

Moore, S. W.  
Wilks, W. H.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted (Mr. Fegan's amendment) in the original question be so inserted—put. The House divided :

Ayes, 78 ; noes, 40 ; majority, 38.

## AYES.

Ashton, J.	McFarlane, J.
Barnes, J. F.	McGowen, J. S. T.
Barton, E.	McLaughlin, J.
Bennett, W.	Miller, G. T. C.
Brown, T.	Nelson, A. D.
Campbell, Alexander	Nicholson, J. B.
Cann, J. H.	Norton, J.
Carroll, J. G.	O'Connor, B. B.
Chapman, A.	O'Sullivan, E. W.
Chapman, H.	Perry, J.
Clark, E. M.	Piddington, W. H. B.
Clarke, H.	Pyers, R.
Copeland, H.	Quinn, P. E.
Cotton, F.	Reynold, J. B.
Crick, W. P.	Richards, E.
Cruickshank, G. A.	Rose, T.
Dacey, J. R.	Ross, Dr. A.
Davis, D.	Ross, H.
Dick, W. T.	Sawers, W.
Dight, C. H.	See, J.
Edden, A.	Sleath, R.
Fegan, J. L.	Smith, Samuel
Ferguson, W. J.	Spence, W. G.
Fitzgerald, R. G. D.	Spruson, W. J.
Fitzpatrick, J. C. L.	Suttor, F. B.
Fitzpatrick, T.	Terry, E.
Gillies, J.	Thomas, J.
Goodwin, T. H. H.	Thomson, J.
Gormly, J.	Waddell, T.
Hassall, T. H.	Watkins, D.
Haynes, J.	Watson, J. C.
Holman, W. A.	Willis, W. N.
Hughes, W. M.	Wilson, C. G.
Hurley, W. F.	Wise, B. R.
Kidd, J.	Wood, W. H.
Law, S. J.	Wright, F. A.
Levien, R. H.	
Lyne, W. J.	
Macdonald, H.	
Mackay, J. A. K.	

## Tellers,

Griffith, Arthur  
Price, R. A.

*Fifth night.*

## NOES.

Affleck, W.	Mahony, W. H.
Anderson, G.	McCourt, W.
Archer, W.	McLean, F. E.
Brunker, J. N.	Meagher, R. D.
Byrne, F. A.	Millard, W.
Campbell, Archibald	Molesworth, E. W.
Carruthers, J. H.	Moore, S. W.
Clarke, T.	Morgan, W.
Cohen, J. J.	Nobbs, J.
Cook, J.	Parkes, V.
Ewing, T. T.	Phillips, S.
Ferris, W. J.	Reid, G. H.
Garland, J.	Rigg, W.
Graham, Dr. J.	Storey, D.
Griffith, T. H.	Thomson, D.
Harris, Sir Matthew	Whiddon, S. T.
Hawthorne, J. S.	Young, J. H.
Hogue, J. A.	
Howarth, G.	
Lee, C. A.	
Lees, S. E.	

## Tellers,

Jessep, T.  
Wilks, W. H.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Question, as amended, put. The House divided:

Ayes, 75; noes, 41; majority, 34.

## AYES.

Barnes, J. F.	McGowen, J. S. T.
Barton, E.	McLaughlin, J.
Bennett, W.	Miller, G. T. C.
Brown, T.	Nelson, A. D.
Campbell, Alexander	Nicholson, J. B.
Cann, J. H.	Norton, J.
Carroll, J. G.	O'Connor, B. B.
Chapman, A.	O'Sullivan, E. W.
Chapman, H.	Perry, J.
Clark, E. M.	Piddington, W. H. B.
Clarke, H.	Price, R. A.
Cotton, F.	Pyers, R.
Crick, W. P.	Quinn, P. E.
Cruikshank, G. A.	Reymond, J. B.
Dacey, J. R.	Richards, E.
Davis, D.	Rose, T.
Dight, C. H.	Ross, Dr. A.
Edden, A.	Ross, H.
Fegan, J. L.	Sawers, W.
Ferguson, W. J.	See, J.
Fitzgerald, R. G. D.	Sleath, R.
Fitzpatrick, J. C. L.	Smith, Samuel
Fitzpatrick, T.	Spence, W. G.
Gillies, J.	Spruson, W. J.
Goodwin, T. H. H.	Suttor, F. B.
Gormly, J.	Terry, E.
Griffith, Arthur	Thomas, J.
Hassall, T. H.	Thomson, J.
Haynes, J.	Watkins, D.
Hughes, W. M.	Watson, J. C.
Hurley, W. F.	Willis, W. N.
Kidd, J.	Wilson, C. G.
Law, S. J.	Wise, B. R.
Levien, R. H.	Wood, W. H.
Lyne, W. J.	Wright, F. A.
Macdonald, H.	
Mackay, J. A. K.	
McFarlane, J.	

## Tellers,

Holman, W. A.  
Waddell, T.

## NOES.

Affleck, W.	Lees, S. E.
Anderson, G.	Mahony, W. H.
Archer, W.	McCourt, W.
Brunker, J. N.	McLean, F. E.
Byrne, F. A.	Meagher, R. D.
Campbell, Archibald	Millard, W.
Carruthers, J. H.	Molesworth, E. W.
Clarke, T.	Moore, S. W.
Cohen, J. J.	Neild, J. C.
Cook, J.	Nobbs, J.
Ewing, T. T.	Parkes, V.
Ferris, W. J.	Reid, G. H.
Garland, J.	Rigg, W.
Graham, Dr. J.	Storey, D.
Griffith, T. H.	Thomson, D.
Harris, Sir Matthew	Whiddon, S. T.
Hawthorne, J. S.	Wilks, W. H.
Hogue, J. A.	Young, J. H.
Howarth, G.	
Jessep, T.	
Lee, C. A.	

## Tellers,

Morgan, W.  
Phillips, S.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

## Resolved:

(1.) That the present Government does not possess the confidence of this House, and deserves censure for having made payments of public money to Mr. J. C. Neild, member for Paddington, without asking Parliament, and contrary to the assurance given by the right hon. the Premier.

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

## In division:

MR. CRICK: I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that an hon. member who is personally under censure is voting to whitewash himself. I ask if that is in accordance with parliamentary usage?

MR. REID: I am under censure, and I am voting!

MR. SPEAKER: There is no rule against the hon. member voting.

## ADJOURNMENT.

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

MR. CRICK: Will the right hon. gentleman say until when?

MR. SPEAKER: Until Tuesday.

MR. CRICK: Shall we meet on Tuesday?

MR. REID: That is an interesting subject which may engage my attention.

House adjourned at 12:19 a.m. (Friday).