

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL. Thursday, 26th September, 1901. Third Readings - Defence

Department-Proclamation of Maori Districts in Middle Island - Charitable Gifts Bill-Trustee Bill-Ad, ourn.

mie.it. The Hon. the SPEAKER took the chair at half- past two o'clock. be proclaimed, and every

opportunity given to PRAYERS. ## THIRD READINGS. Exportation of Arms Bill, Promissory Oaths Bill.

DEFENCE DEPARTMENT. The Hon. Colonel PITT asked the Hon. the Minister of Education when the

return or- dered by the Council on the 9th July last in reference to the staffs of the Commandant and of

the officers commanding districts would be laid before the Council. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER said he

would make inquiries and obtain it as soon as possible. ### PROCLAMATION OF MAORI DISTRICTS IN

MIDDLE ISLAND. The Hon. Mr. TAIAROA moved, That, in the opinion of this Council. it is advisable that

the Governor should proclaim certain districts in the Middle Island to be Maori districts for the purposes of "

The Maori Councils Act. 1900." He had seen in the Native Gazette that certain districts in the North Island

had been set apart under " The Maori Councils Act, 1900,' and he did not know why districts had not been

pro- claimed in the same manner in the Middle Island. He agreed with the Native people of the Middle

Island that it would be a good thing for them if they had districts proclaimed, so that they might work

under the provisions of that Act. It was not necessary for him to say much on this subject. He would

content him- self to the citizens of Auckland of 230 acres by self with moving this motion, in the hope that

VOL. CXIX .- 1. either one or more districts would be gazetted under the provisions of the Act of last year.

The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER begged to acknowledge the good service the honourable gentleman was

doing to the colony and to his own people by bringing this question forward. No doubt matters had not

been so necessarily urgent that the districts should be proclaimed and the Councils elected ; but,

nevertheless, under the Act of last year these districts should the Natives to manage their own concerns,

espe- cially in the matter of sanitation and other conditions of life. He assured the honourable gentleman

that his colleague the Native Minis- ter would take the matter into immediate con- sideration and

endeavour to deal with it, not only to show his appreciation of the good services the Natives were giving in this direction wherever they had been called upon to act, but also to assure his honourable friend that the Native Minister appreciated his anxiety to promote the good of his own people. The Hon. Mr.

TAIAROA thanked the Minister for the kind way in which he had received his motion. Motion agreed to.

CHARITABLE GIFTS BILL. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER .- Sir, the object of this Bill is one which, I think, every honourable member in the Council will be glad to see given effect to, namely, that where by deed or will any property is voluntarily conveyed, devised, bequeathed, or transferred to trustees in trust for the benefit of the public, such conveyance, devise, bequest, or transfer shall be exempt from all duties which, but for this Act, would be payable thereon. I think it goes without saying that the Council will be unanimous in passing this clause. The only question which has arisen in connection with it, it is only fair to mention, is that the question has been raised in connection with the exceedingly handsome Dr. Logan Campbell. It is found that that

<page>38</page>

to the existing state of the law. It was not, however, thought desirable that this Bill should be retrospective, and it is proposed to deal with Dr. Campbell's case by a vote on the estimates. Such a course, while recognising Dr. Campbell's munificence, will show good reason for an alteration in the law in this respect. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill. The Hon. Mr. LOUISSON .- I shall be very happy to support this Bill, but I think it hardly goes quite far enough. It simply deals, as I understand it, with property-which, I presume, means landed property-which is left by deed for charitable purposes. Well, Sir, I should like to see the Bill made very much fuller and to go further, because I think that the present state of the law prevents charitably disposed people from bequeathing money grants for charitable purposes. The duty on these bequests is very high. A case in point I have, Sir, in my mind. I happen to be a trustee where a very large sum of money was left for general charity - for charitable purposes in every direction-and we had to pay a very large amount for legacy duty-somewhere between \$2,000 and \$3,000. We had to pay that sum as duty to the Government upon this charitable bequest. That, I think, ought not to be. I think the law ought to be altered in the direction of encouraging charitably disposed people to make bequests to charitable institutions, and it should not be tied up and hedged around by technical conditions of all sorts. I believe the present law is to the effect that, under certain circumstances, these bequests are free of legacy duty ; but the remission is so hedged round by technicalities of one sort or another that it is very seldom that any charitable bequest comes within the four corners of the present Act. and I should like if the Minister in charge of the Bill could see his way to enlarge the purposes of the Bill in that direction, so as to embrace all charitable bequests of every description. I believe now that, if money is left for charitable purposes, if there is the slightest description of particulars as to the direction of the charities, then immediately you get outside the Act and you have to pay very heavy duties. It seems

to me that if a charitably disposed person leaves money or property of any sort to charitable purposes of any description we should not inquire too curiously as to in what particular direction the charity is to go : so long as it is to charities pure and simple, the gift should be encouraged by being free from legacy duty, which is not the case at present. The greater portion of charitable bequests at the present time have to pay very heavy legacy duties! something like 10 per cent .- which, I think, is wrong in principle; and I think the present law very frequently is the cause of very large charitable bequests not being made to the public. I should be glad if my honourable friend the Minister could see his way to somewhat enlarge the scope of the present Bill. The Hon. Mr. BOLT .- It is quite evident | again, by the munificence of an old man who Hon. Mr. W. C. Walker poses. Clearly the domain that Dr. Campbell has given to the Auckland people cannot be said to be a charity. I have not any objection to every such bequest being exempt from taxation. I may say, further, that the Auckland people are exceedingly fortunate in getting gifts of this sort. They have had given to them & large addition to their public library ; they have also received the Costley Home ; and now they are getting a park. I am sorry to say that, though we have a considerable number of wealthy men in the South, they do not seem to be imbued with the same patriotic feeling with regard to their public duties as are the wealthy people of Auckland. I think this is to be regretted, and I think this is a proper opportunity for drawing attention to it. In Dunedin we have been in want of a public library for There have been many many many years. efforts made to establish a public library, but. so far I am not aware of one single wealthy man in the South who has ever offered to contribute the necessary funds. There are some wealthy men in the South who could put their hands in their pockets and give \$10,000 towards a public library in Dunedin without injuring themselves in the slightest ; but they do not seem to have any inclination that way, and that is surely a thing to be regretted. I should not like to say that this is a result of their Scotch extraction, and that nationality will account for their undue cautiousness in money matters ; but, whatever may be the cause, it is a melancholy fact that we have not amongst the wealthy people of the South a single man who is public spirited enough to put his hand in his pocket for the establishment of an institution such as I have referred to. So far as this Bill is concerned, it will be of no earthly effect in the South. The Hon. Mr. JENNINGS. -- Sir, I only wish briefly to refer to what has given occasion to this Bill being placed before us. I may say it has been already referred to by the Minister -it is the princely gift, by Dr. J. Logan Campbell, of Cornwall Park to the City of Auckland, and therefore to the citizens of New Zealand. Sir, when I remember that Dr. Campbell arrived in Auckland in the very early ... days-in 1840-I feel that in those pioneer 1 days, when he viewed the ground he has now i so handsomely presented to the people, he never could have realised that in his lifetime i so beautiful, populous, and flourishing a city would have arisen there. It is given to some to be accumulators of wealth, of property, works of art, literary curiosities, and various things that tend to make life worth living for when rightly used. I think no brighter instances of the right use of wealth can be found than what has been done in the Province of Auckland by some of the men who have been accumulators of wealth. There was Sir George Grey's magnificent gift of art and literature and other collections, a gift, I believe, that is almost unexampled in any part of the world. Then,

<page>39</page>

for building a home for the aged poor, the neglected children, sailor's home, et cetera-all Costley's gifts to the people. There were also Mckelvie's rare and artistic presents to the Art Gallery of Auckland. Then, there is this last gift of Dr. Campbell's. I say that we should in every way encourage and hold up as bright examples those persons who by their own efforts have been accumulators, and who return those accumulations to the people. The only regret I feel with regard to Cornwall Park is that the name the Maoris gave the district in the early days has not been perpetuated - the name of "Tamaki"-especially on account of its romantic meaning : "Tamaki," of a hundred lovers. Any measure which the Government may propose for the purpose of encouraging such bequests deserves the favourable consideration of

every one in Parliament. The Hon. Mr. T. KELLY. - I do not think that Scotchmen should be pointed out as being singularly deficient in generosity. Generosity is not a matter which depends on nationality ; it depends more on individual instincts and a yearning to benefit suffering or ignorant humanity so as to benefit the race. Mr. Carnegie, the millionaire, who was in many respects a typical Scotchman, though he earned his wealth in America, did not forget the old country to which he belonged, and devoted large sums to promoting education in Scotland. I think these gifts for public purposes are commendable when people can afford it. Sometimes it is found that people who cannot afford it give more in proportion to others with much greater means ; but, if we consider the vast sums given in the past by bequest for useful public purposes which have been simply wasted or misapplied, I am not surprised that the wealthy who are willing to give are in doubt whether it is wise to give at all. It makes people shrink from giving money when they see how much has been devoted to purposes for which it was never intended. The best uses which I think money can be devoted is by utilising your spare capital during your lifetime ; you can then see that the money is well spent in the true interests of the people. However, I think climate has something to do with a generous instinct, and Auckland men have set a good example to the rest of the colony in this respect ; private endowment for public purposes has been frequently made there, and so long as such a generous instinct exists we ought to encourage it. With respect to the Hon. Mr. Louisson's statement that a legacy for public purposes made in Christchurch had to pay some thousands in legacy duty, I cannot understand it, as the Act of 1883 seems to specially provide for remission of such duty in such a case. The present Bill only enlarges the scope of the principal Act .. The Hon. Mr. LOUISSON .- I wish to make a personal explanation in regard to what the Hon. Mr. Kelly has said. I understand the reason why so large a legacy duty was imposed was because there were some very slight restrictions of Christchurch. This alone, because the poor of Christchurch were mentioned instead of the poor of New Zealand, rendered it liable to legacy duty. If there is the slightest restriction in regard to the direction of a bequest it immediately becomes liable to a duty, because it is not for the general benefit of the whole colony. Another sum was left for a wing to the Christchurch Hospital, which cost some £6,000 or £7,000, all of which had to pay legacy duty. This, I consider, is very wrong, and it is likely to deter other people from making similar bequests. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER .- I only wish to say, in reply, that apparently this Bill does not propose to go so far as some honourable gentlemen think it should. I do not think it is competent for the Council to enlarge the scope of the Bill, because it would be interfering with taxation. I am not prepared at this moment to argue whether all charitable gifts should be absolved from every condition of paying legacy or succession duty. I was not aware of the circumstances to which the Hon. Mr. Louisson referred, that succession duties are payable in case of the bequests to which he referred, but I would only point out that the Bill does not deal with those questions, which should be dealt with in another way. I have every sympathy with giving every encouragement to persons who die wealthy to devote by will their substance to doing good after they are gone; but, on the other hand, I have a certain amount of regard for the axiom that every property, once in a generation, should pay its dues to the State as a sort of insurance premium for the maintenance of good law and order. For that reason I should not like off-hand to state how far (Government is prepared to go in the remission of all dues whatever. I am quite sure we cannot in any way add to this Bill so as to make it include charitable bequests in the wider sense. Bill read the second time. TRUSTEE BILL. The Hon Mr. W. C. WALKER, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said it was rendered necessary by the present state of the law in New Zealand ; it was an endeavour to bring the law relating to trustees up to the English standard. It had been brought before the Minister in a memorandum which showed the necessity for it, and pointed out that it was advisable to bring our law up to the point of view of the English law. The difficulty nowadays was that trustees could hardly, without a considerable amount of trouble, get free of the duties placed on them, and were obliged to act through an attorney if absent from the colony. Clause 2 specified that -

"Where a trustee is dead, or remains out of the colony for the space of twelve months, or desires to be discharged from all or any of the trusts or powers reposed in or conferred on him, or refuses or is unfit to act therein, or is incapable of so acting, then the persons nomi

<page>40</page>

if there is no such person or no such person able and willing to act, then the surviving or continuing trustees for the time being, or the personal representatives of the last surviving or continuing trustee, may, by writing, appoint another person to be a trustee in the place of such first-mentioned trustee. The second part of that clause provided that a trustee might act for the whole or any part of the trust property. The number of trustees could be increased, or the trust property divided into different branches with different trustees, and trusts might be created for the purpose of dealing with the different branches of the property according to their requirements. He thought the Council would find that the Bill pretty well covered the whole ground, and not only brought the law up to the English standard, but made it apply generally to the circumstances of the case as recognised here. He moved the second reading of the Bill. Bill read the second time. ## ADJOURNMENT. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER moved, That the Council do now adjourn. The Hon. Mr. SHRIMSKI wished to say a few words on this motion. On the previous Friday they had adjourned at a quarter past three, the same on Tuesday, and now an adjournment was moved at the same hour, though they had plenty of work on the Order Paper to go on with. He could not see why business should be left over to the last moment, and wished to call the attention of the Council to the position. He did not for a moment mean to say that the honourable leader of the Council was playing with them, but he would remark that members did not come to Wellington to idle their time away. Motion agreed to. The Council adjourned at a quarter past three o'clock p.m. ## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. Thursday, 26th September, 1901. First Reading - New Business after Midnight - Officers of Parliament - Royal Visit Expenses Bill-Supply. Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER took the chair at half-past two o'clock. PRAYERS. FIRST READING. Canterbury College Empowering Bill. NEW BUSINESS AFTER MIDNIGHT. Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER .- As I promised the Right Hon. the Premier last night, I have to announce that, as the House has now approached within measurable distance of the end of the session, it is my intention to make the customary announcement that facilities will be given Hon. Mr. W. C. Walker . when they are reported to the House after twelve o'clock at night. I think I am justified in making this announcement. I find that last year it was on the 7th September that the Hon. Sir Maurice O'Rorke, Speaker of the House, made a similar announcement. It is now the 26th September, and I think I am justified in concluding that not many weeks will elapse before the session concludes. Captain RUSSELL (Hawke's Bay) .- I think that before a decision on the point is given it is customary for the Right Hon. the Premier to give the House some idea of the business he intends to proceed with. It has not been a customary thing, without notice to members, that Bills should be taken in all their stages at all hours of the night without our having an idea of what is to be put before the House. Mr. SEDDON (Premier) .- I called attention to the matter during the honourable member's absence. An Hon. MEMBER .- Not to the business to come on. Mr. SEDDON .- No, not in respect to the business, but in respect to taking new business after twelve o'clock at night. Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER .- Looking at the Hansard, I do not see that any such announcement was made by the Right Hon. the Premier before Mr. Speaker made that intimation. The very first order of business appearing on the 7th September is the intimation that I have just referred to. I therefore think that I am justified, after waiting for three weeks after the date on which the intimation was made last year, in making it now. Mr. HERRIES -Do I understand that that only refers to Bills that have been through Committee-that these may have their third reading after twelve o'clock ? Mr. DEPUTY - SPEAKER. - Agreeing to amendments and third reading. Mr. HERRIES .- Not second readings. Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER .- No. OFFICERS OF PARLIAMENT. Mr. PIRANI (Palmerston) .- I notice by May that during the absence of Mr. Speaker the Deputy-Speaker has all the powers and privi-

leges of Mr. Speaker. In connection with that, two vacancies, I understand, have arisen in connection with the permanent officers of the House. I would like to ask, if you have no objection to state, whether you have made any recommendation to the Government in accordance with the rule for the filling of those two vacancies. Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER. - I may state that only one vacancy has arisen, through the non-acceptance by Mr. Crow of the appointment to the Hansard staff. Another temporary vacancy has been caused by the illness of one of the Hansard staff, Mr. Russell. After consultation with the Chief of the Hansard staff and the Premier, it has been decided that during the present session no permanent appointment should be made to fill the vacancy created by

<page>41</page>

the non-acceptance of the position by Mr. Crow, but that a temporary appointment should be made. Accordingly, one gentleman has been recommended by me, and, I believe, has been appointed by the Right Hon. the Premier temporarily, for the session only. Mr. J. ALLEN (Bruce). - Have you made any recommendation about the Serjeant-at-Arms ? Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER. - I have not made any recommendation yet. Several gentlemen have sent in applications for the position ; some have been addressed to Mr. Speaker, some to me, and some, I think, to the Premier, who has forwarded them on to me. All these have been recorded by the Clerk of the House. I am not quite sure whether it will be my duty to make the recommendation, or whether it would not be better to wait for a week or two to see whether Mr. Speaker resumes his place, in order that he can make the recommendation, in accordance with the resolution of the House. Mr. SEDDON (Premier) .-- I may state, in respect to this matter, that Mr. Speaker (Sir Maurice) has made a recommendation. As there are a number of applications coming in, and of which Sir Maurice could not be aware at the time he made the recommendation, I have asked the matter to stand over. In the meantime the applications are being filed, and, when they are completed, will be dealt with as provided by our regulations. ROYAL VISIT EXPENSES BILL. A message was received from His Excellency the Governor forwarding copy of a Bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain expenses incurred by the Governor in connection with the Royal visit, and recommending the House to make provision accordingly. On the question, That the message be referred to the Committee of the Whole, Mr. SEDDON (Premier) said, It is necessary, Sir, I think, that I should explain to the House why the Government advise the course which is proposed to be taken under the Bill before us. Exception has been taken, I believe, to the item appearing on the estimates, and I may say in reference to that that the course which we took was strictly in accordance with the law ; and I wish at once, if any impression has been formed on members' minds, to say that His Excellency the Governor is not an interested party at all. He was the host for the colony, and, in respect to the liabilities incurred, his name was only nominal. The liabilities are actual liabilities of the colony. It is simply to reimburse or refund to him moneys which he has expended on behalf of the colony, and to meet other accounts in his name; he pays the accounts and we pay him back, and I do not think that that has been well understood. To remove, again, any impression on that point I may say that, from a communication received, which was communicated to Ministers, the Imperial Government desired to know whether the Colony of New Zealand were going to defray all costs in connection with the Royal visit. The reply was that the Govern- VOL. CXIX .- 2. \- ment itself would entertain wholly the Royal visitors. His Excellency, in entertaining, was simply entertaining on behalf of the colony, and the cost of the same was to be borne by the colony. Most of the invitations were from : the Government of New Zealand. Mr. MASSEY .- Revised by the Premier. Mr. SEDDON. - No; I at once say, emphatically, No. An Hon. MEMBER. - We will have something to say about it when the Bill comes on. i Mr. SEDDON. - Very well ; I say the honour- able member who makes that statement is doing me an injustice, and he is doing His Excellency an injustice. At all events, I take it that so far we have done well, and it is my desire-and I am sure it must be the desire of every member of the House -that, in respect to the King's representative, he should not be brought on the floor of the House, and should not be the

subject of debate. So far, this country has been singularly free of that, and, I think, wisely so; and it is to prevent what might have been an acrimonious discussion on the estimates that I have decided upon the course now taken. Not only that, but the point would have been raised later on that His Excellency would have been approving of an Appropriation Act, and in the appropriations would be a sum voted which, although for reimbursement of moneys paid on our behalf, he himself would receive. Mr. ATKINSON .- He would have 3.0. had to reserve the Bill. Mr. SEDDON .- He would not have had to reserve the Bill at all. As I have said, I have made inquiries, and such inquiries as to make it very clear there would be no necessity what- ever for reservation, because the Royal Instruc- tions are themselves clear. The wording of subsection (2) of section 6, page 184, is as fol- lows : " Any Bill whereby any grant of land or money, or other donation or gratuity, may be made to himself." I say it is clear you must read "donation " or " grant " in connection with the context, "any grant of land," and it means that it is where it is for his personal benefit, and certainly he has no personal benefit in having expended sums of money and paid moneys away on behalf of the colony. Mr. PIRANI .- What right has he got to do that ? Mr. SEDDON .- Well, he had a perfect right to do it when the colony was committed to defray all costs of the Royal visit, and His Excellency was asked by Ministers to act for the colony. An Hon. MEMBER .- He was not authorised. Mr. SEDDON. - Yes, he was authorised. This House authorised the Ministry, and the Ministry asked His Excellency to act. An Hon. MEMBER. - No. Mr. SEDDON .- Well, you took a vote last year ; and on the question of administration it is left to the Ministry to say how that money is to be expended, and by whom. And His Excellency the Governor, at the request of Ministers, took up the position of host on our behalf, because there was no one else who,

<page>42</page>

Ministers, was the host for the colony for the time being. Now, I wish that to be clearly understood, and if members will tell me how it could possibly have been done in any other way I shall be much obliged to them. Mr. TANNER. -- It ought not to have been done in that way. Mr. SEDDON .- Then, the Royal guests should not have been invited at all. Would the member for Avon say that ? Mr. TANNER .- No; I do not mean any- thing of the kind. Mr. SEDDON. - Well, I say they were the guests of the colony, and His Excellency the Governor was the host for the time being, and the course we are taking now is not that it is necessary according to law, because he was not an interested party, but, as the question might be raised in the House, we have decided that the items on the estimates shall be with- drawn, and that a separate Bill should be passed, and that it should be sent Home- reserved by His Excellency and sent Home for the Royal assent, thus removing all grounds that might be urged to the effect that there had been an infringement of the Royal Instructions. That will meet the difficulty. It will not lead to argument, because mem- bers of the legal profession will differ on this point, and to avoid that I say we are taking this course. Now, I would ask, Has not this colony received very great credit indeed for the manner in which their Royal Highnessess were entertained, and has not their visit to our colony been of great advantage to us ? I hope, therefore, nothing will be done that will detract therefrom ; and with the view of avoiding any- thing that may be said to detract therefrom, and to avoid having an acrimonious debate when we are in Committee of Supply on this question, we have taken this course. There- fore when we come to this vote on the esti- mates I shall move to strike it off, and by pass- ing this Bill and sending it Home in the usual way we can get the Royal assent to it. I there- fore move to go into Committee of the Whole. Mr. PIRANI (Palmerston) .- I do not wish to go into the merits of this Bill, and I regret that the Premier has gone so far as he has. But, Sir, when the Premier did speak I thought the least he could do would be to be fair. Now, the Premier might have stated that this Bill had been introduced in consequence of a com- munication that I made to him, as coming from the member for Wellington City (Mr. Atkinson), who had discovered -it was not the Premier's legal advisers at all - that if the Premier proceeded in the course he was taking in regard to the estimates the Appropriation Bill would have to be hung up for the Royal assent. Mr.

SEDDON .- No. Mr. PIRANI .- Well, I am going to prove it. The Premier, in combating my argument, told me when I brought the matter before him yesterday that the idea was ridiculous. Mr. SEDDON .-- Hear, hear. Mr. PIRANI-And that he had no intention of having a separate measure for this purpose. ! in a proper manner. I do not think it would Mr. Seddon come round to the point of seeing that it is not ridiculous, but that it is the proper thing to do. Now, the Colonial Secretary did mention about a separate Bill, and the Colonial Secretary thought it was a perfectly proper course to take, but the Premier did not. The Premier based his opinion on the question that it is not a grant of money to the Governor. What else is it ? The clause in the Royal Instructions is very clear, and it is all very well for the Premier to say that one reason for his change of front is that lawyers will differ. It will not come before the lawyers ; it will be a question between the King's advisers and the King's representatives in this colony. It is not a question for the Solicitor- General, who can very easily give an opinion to suit when it is wanted. Now, the clause in the Royal Instructions bearing on this point is very clear. It says, " The Governor shall not assent to any Bill whereby any grant of land, or money, or other donation or gratuity, may be made to himself." Mr. HORNSBY .- " A gratuity." Mr. PIRANI. - This is a gratuity. Mr. SEDDON .- " Made to himself." This is not for himself. Mr. PIRANI .- Well, he will have to sign a voucher for it, even if it is in recoupment of expenses he has incurred. I do not enter into that point at all. It is very clear that he could not possibly assent to the appropriation. with one exception, and I am surprised that the Premier did not see it is possible for the assent to be given. But the Premier has not studied his point very closely. He simply listened to \--- what I said, and did not pursue his study further. If he had looked a little further into the Royal Instructions, he would have seen that, - " Unless the Governor shall have satisfied himself that an urgent necessity exists requiring that such Bill be brought into immediate operation, in which case he is authorised to assent in our name to such Bill, unless the same shall be repugnant to the law of England, or inconsistent with any obligations imposed upon us by treaty. But he is to transmit to us by the earliest opportunity the Bill as assented to, together with his reasons for assenting thereto." The Premier did not see that point at all. i He sees it now. 1 An Hon. MEMBER .- You take the skin off. : Mr. PIRANI .- Yes, I often do take the skin off the Premier's eyes. He will see that his argument about the impossibility of getting the Royal assent falls to the ground. I do not think it is a proper thing that a vote for the ! Governor should be brought into conflict with ■ our own Appropriation Act, and therefore I \- - think the Premier is doing the proper thing in placing it in a separate measure. But I do claim that it is only another instance among many where the Opposition show their desire not to harass and worry and discredit the Premier, and that where there is a point that should be considered apart from party politics they do not deter him from dealing with it

<page>43</page>

of his party to make the simple acknowledgment that I think the member for Wellington City (Mr. Atkinson) deserves in this matter. Mr. HORNSBY (Wairarapa) .- I think it only right at this juncture that those who desire to speak on this matter should say now what was intended to be said when we came to the portion of the estimates dealing with this item. I was rather surprised to hear the Premier say that he deprecates bringing the Governor on the floor of the House, and then straightway proceeding to do it himself. Surely we, as the people's representatives, have a right to criticize any payment that may be made to the Governor out of the coffers of this colony. Now, we were told by the right honourable gentleman that the Governor was the host for the colony of their Royal Highnesses, when here on their visit. Sir, he constituted himself not only their host, but he went round the colony and took the whole thing out of the hands of everybody else; he created a feeling which, I dare venture to say, has never been created in this colony before by any Governor who has had the honour to represent royalty in this colony. He interfered in every way and shape with the arrangements of the people and the local bodies, and created a feeling throughout the colony that was very very difficult to overcome indeed. More especially did he do so here in the City of Wellington, and I say this, that if in the course of these

peregrinations of the Governor he expended certain sums of money, he did so without any warrant whatsoever from the people of this colony. We have no right to be asked to pay that money, and I for one say distinctly and decidedly that I shall oppose every effort on the part of the Government to reimburse His Excellency the Governor for that expenditure. He expended the money himself, with his eyes wide open, and without the authority of this House in any way or shape. Sir, this is only bearing out what was said by myself last year when the question of the Governor's Salary and Allowances Bill was before this House. I say distinctly that we are paying too much money for the glitter and the show. I do not object to a fair and reasonable amount being paid to the representative of royalty in this country ; but I said, when I divided the House last year on the question, that the sum of \$6,000 a year was sufficient for His Excellency the Governor. And what is the result now? Why, in about twelve months, we are called upon to pay something like \$11,000 to His Excellency. His salary has been raised, and we were told when we did it that he was to get no allowances after the raising of his salary ; yet here are the expenses and extras being piled up hand over fist, and this colony has to pay them. I say the time has come when the members of this House ought to cry " halt " in this matter and put a stop to it. Sir J. G. WARD (Colonial Secretary) .- Sir, I think it is a pity upon an occasion such as this for the question of the general salary of His Excellency the Governor to be discussed. gentleman a fact which he may not be aware of. He says that His Excellency went round the colony and interfered in connection with the visit of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York. Mr. HORNSBY .- He did so. Sir J. G. WARD .- Very well ; His Excellency was fully justified in doing so, for this reason : that upon him was cast the sole responsibility by the responsible authorities in England for the tour of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York in this colony, and he was therefore bound to personally see to and control all the arrangements in all parts of the colony. Sir, I think it would have been better if the discussion had taken place upon the second reading of the Bill ; but, as the honourable member has made a reference to it, it is only fair and right to the representative of the King in this country, whose name usually is not discussed on the floor of the House, that the position should be put before honourable members. Now, I say that the Executive-that is, the Ministers-had a full knowledge of the position which His Excellency occupied in relation to the visit of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York, and which honourable members could not be expected to have. In all the colonies and all the countries visited by the Royal pair the sole responsibility-Ministers, of course, as His Excellency's Advisers, co-operated, as everybody with responsibility in the colony, I am happy to say, did also-but the safety of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York during their visit devolved upon His Excellency the Governor, as the representative of the King in these colonies. His Excellency was so advised by the British Government. That being so, would His Excellency the Governor not have been wanting in his duty if he had not gone round the colony and superintended the arrangements ? Would His Excellency not have been wanting in his duty if he had not refused to do that which he believed to be inimical to the safety or the comfort of the Royal pair when in this country? I say that undeniably he would have failed in his duty if he had not carried out the instructions he had received, and which all the Governors of the respective countries covered by the Royal visit received. Now, the honourable member laid stress on the fact that His Excellency the Governor went round the colony and interfered. Mr. HORNSBY .- He did. Sir J. G. WARD .- He was only doing his duty. An Hon. MEMBER .- It was not done in any other colony. Sir J. G. WARD .- It was done in every other colony ; it was done in Victoria and New South Wales. I was in Victoria, and I know that the whole arrangements in connection with the visit of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York there were personally superintended by Lord Hopetoun, and the whole of the detailed arrangements were referred to him ; and he was fully cognisant of everything that was intended to be done, and nothing was done without his

<page>44</page>

knowledge, refused to do many things the people asked for, because the responsibility was upon his

shoulders, as it was upon the shoulders of His Excellency the Governor here in connection with the visit of the Royal pair to this country. Now, Sir, I think it is only right that should be said. Had the honourable member known it he would probably not have made the speech he did. The honourable member stated that His Excellency the Governor incurred expenditure without the authority of this House. Sir, His Excellency the Governor has done nothing of the kind. I would ask honourable members to realise what the difficulties were. When the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York came to New Zealand who was to be the headpiece of the colony? No other person than His Excellency could have acted in that capacity. It was the colony who extended the invitation to the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York to come here, and it did that upon a resolution passed by this House. The Government could not have invited the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York to go to the various functions. An Hon. MEMBER. - The people of the colony invited them. Sir J. G. WARD. - Yes; but who was the headpiece, to enable the will of the colony to be carried out? No other person but His Excellency the Governor. An Hon. MEMBER. - The colony paid. Sir J. G. WARD. - That is so; but how could the colony have acted? It is all very well for honourable members to say, and rightly so, that the people of the colony invited the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York to come here, and that the people of the colony paid for it; but I ask the honourable member, in carrying out the arrangements of that visit, how was the colony to act? It could only act through the constitutional channel, and who, I ask, was to represent the colony? The Government could not do it, the members of the Ministry could not do it. Mr. MEREDITH. - Why not? Sir J. G. WARD. - Could the Government have invited the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York to go to a hotel to dine, or to meet people there? I am only endeavouring to show honourable members what the difficulties of detail were, and what the position was in connection with this visit, and it is only right they should grasp that at this juncture, in consequence of the impression that appears to be in the minds of some honourable members. Now, I say that neither the head of the Government, nor the members of the Administration, nor members of Parliament could have done that which was required to be done in connection with the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York, and no other person but His Excellency the Governor-even if he had not been called upon by the responsible authorities in England to act in that capacity - could have acted in this country. There was no other authority in New Zealand who could have taken the place of host, to enable the public to see the Duke and Duchess, than His Excellency the Governor. The colony having extended an invitation to the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York to come here, it is clearly the duty of the colony to pay for it. In Auckland and Wellington and Christchurch and Dunedin it was His Excellency the Governor who sent out the invitations, and, as the Premier mentioned, that was done on behalf of the Government as representing the people of the country. An Hon. MEMBER. - No. Sir J. G. WARD. - That is so. I had some invitations that way myself. There might have been some special functions that the honourable gentleman was at where it may not have been the case. Mr. SEDDON. - Other than Government House. Sir J. G. WARD. - It is all very well for the honourable member to say "No," but the fact remains that it was the colony who invited their Royal Highnesses to come here, it was the colony who carried out through the constitutional head, His Excellency the Governor, all the functions, and it is the colony who has to pay. An Hon. MEMBER. - That is it. Sir J. G. WARD. - Very well, Sir; if we invited their Royal Highnesses to come here, do honourable members mean to say that the colony ought to repudiate any portion of the payment? I am only endeavouring to point out to the House what the position is, so far as the visit of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York is concerned, in relation to His Excellency the Governor and the Government. Honourable members say, and say rightly, that the people have entertained the visitors; and if honourable members can say in what way the Government, as representing the people of the colony, could have carried out arrangements in a way that would have been more satisfactory and acceptable to their Royal Highnesses I would be glad to hear the suggestion, because I am sure that no one, if they think the matter out, can suggest any way in which it

might have been done other than the way in which it was done. It is only right that members should understand that the responsibility of the visit of their Royal Highnesses was not put by the British Government on the shoulders of the Administration, or on the shoulders of the members, or of the people of the colony, but it was put directly on the shoulders of His Excellency the Governor, as the representative of the King. Of course, Ministers acted with His Excellency to make the visit safe and agreeable in every way to our distinguished visitors. It is only right that the method of providing the ways and means should be one to conform strictly to the law, and that all doubts should be removed. I am exceedingly sorry that on an occasion such as this any attempt should be made, even by the member for Wairarapa, to introduce the question of the salary and allowances of His Excellency the Governor. The Government know that, quite outside the expenses incurred by the

<page>45</page>

In this case the Governor appears to have acted outside the amount named on the estimates, a very large personal expenditure has been made throughout on his own initiative as the host of by His Excellency, and for which no contribution is asked or will be given. If the and has incurred liabilities that he was an honourable member had to go through the risk to incur by the Ministry of the day. The experience as we had to do he would have found Ministry now ask that he should be refunded the state of affairs was altogether abnormal, the amount of money he has spent. The Colonial Secretary, in speaking, emphasized the fact that the Governor was authorised to take impossible to get even the most ordinary at all steps necessary to protect His Royal Highness at the usual prices. Mr. ATKINSON .- Why have the Governor's Highness the Duke of Cornwall and York. ment not included everything ? The Colonial Secretary emphasized particularly Sir J. G. WARD .- Everything, as soon as early the matter of safety. Well, my impression is that the question of the safety Government requires to do now, as far as expenditure made directly by His Excellency the party generally fell on the New Zealand police, Governor on behalf of the colony is concerned, assisted by those who came from another colony, is to provide for that payment to go through him, and therefore the question of pay would not as it could not be made in any other way. The necessarily enter into this matter, so far as the expenditure made direct by the Government will safety of His Royal Highness was concerned. be dealt with in the usual way ; but, where we Now, I want to say that I think there may be had to throw responsibility on His Excellency, an explanation of this item, and I will ask the and where he was bound to fulfil the duty as Government if what I suggest is the correct host on behalf of the colony, the only way to explanation, because, if so, it will alter the incur the expense and to carry out the functions position I take up in the matter. I do not was to authorise the money and to get the think His Excellency the Governor, as the House to ratify it later on. That is what the highest personage in New Zealand, should be House is now being asked to do. I hope that expected to pay out of his own pocket the whole on the second reading of the Bill, when honour- cost of the maintenance and entertainment of able members have been posted up on the whole the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York position, there will be no attempt made to stop and party I am speaking now of the food, and payments to His Excellency that, under the so on - during the time they were in New Zealand circumstances, are being made to him only land. I understand this \$2,250 represents the because of his position. He was the only cost that His Excellency was put to throughout person who could act as host on behalf of the the whole of the colony. Now, if the (Governor- colony. All we ask is that the colony ment say that this \$2,250 represents the cost, should reimburse His Excellency for necessary not of furnishing, which is apparently provided expenses incurred by him in that capacity on for separately, but the cost of the entertainment, t half of the colony. from a food point of view, and so on, of the Mr. BOLLARD (Eden) .- Sir, I am very Royal party at the different centres throughout sorry to hear the Premier and the Colonial New Zealand, I have not

another word to say in Secretary say that the Governor was respon- connection with the whole matter. sible for the entertainment of the Royal Mr. SEDDON. - That is just what it is. Mr. G. W. RUSSELL .- Then, that is just visitors. Sir J. G. WARD .- I never said that. the point I wish to bring out ; and I do not Mr. BOLLARD .- I was under the im- think there is a man in the House who would say that the responsibility of entertaining in pre-sion that all the arrangements were made by the Government, because whoever was re- that way the whole of the Royal party during the time they were in New Zealand should be sponsible for them I must say that, as far as Auckland was concerned, they were done for cast on His Excellency the Governor, and taken out of his private pocket. I feel that myself ; party purposes. An Hon. MEMBER .- It is absurd. and, however desirous I may be of seeing an Mr. BOLLARD .- I say it is a fact. How- economical policy carried out, I would not say ever. I will not discuss the question now, but I that the whole cost of providing for the enter- will have something to say on it on the second tainment of the Royal party should be thrown reading of the Bill. on Lord Ranfurly because he happened at the Mr G. W. RUSSELL (Riccanton) .- Sir, I do time to be Governor of New Zealand. An Hon. MEMBER .- Nobody meant that. not wish to approach this subject with any heat, because I think it is one that, above all others, should be calmly and dispassionately discussed ; others meant. I have listened carefully to the toit there in an important principle underlying speeches and, if that is the explanation of the the matter, and that is the feeling that is Bill, I shall support it. urgermost in the minds of the House -- namely, that a gentleman occupying a very high but scarcely understand the attitude now assumed by the Government. First there was submitted irresponsible position has been permitted to to us in the estimates a grant of \$2,250 to His itour habilities, which apparently were un. limited, to the extent of \$2,250. The idea we Excellency the Governor to reimburse expenses have in this colony is that the Governor acts incurred by him in connection with the visit of Mr. G. W. RUSSELL .- I do not know what Mr. FISHER (Wellington City). -- Sir, 1

<page>46</page>

And that item, with studious forethought, was inserted in the estimates in such a manner that the House was prevented from dealing with it separately. But the Government, notwith- standing their great care, have found it neces- sary to change their position, and have taken the £2,250 out of the £50,000 asked for to cover in part the general expenses incurred in connec- tion with the visit of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York, and now propose to put it before us in the form of a Bill - a separate and special Bill. Of course, instantly upon 3.30. looking at the Royal Instructions, one sees that the Government have placed them. selves in a dilemma. Mr SEDDON .- Oh, no. Mr. FISHER .- We are accustomed to the honourable gentleman's ingenious manner of wriggling out of a difficulty. If the Govern- ment did not find themselves involved in diffi- culty, why change the whole position of the vote ? Why place it before us as an item of the estimates one day, and in the form of a separate Bill on another day? The reason is clear. Primarily, the honourable gentleman acted in ignorance of the provisions of the Constitution Act. Subsequently, the Royal In- structions were evidently brought under his notice by some person, it does not matter by whom. The Royal Instructions (1892) sav,- "VI. The Governor shall not, except in the cases hereunder mentioned, assent in our name to any Bill of any of the following clases :- "(2.) Any Bill whereby any grant of land or money, or other donation or gratuity, may be made to himself." Mr. SEDDON .- " To himself." Mr. FISHER .- I will devote some little #cc-zero attention to those words "made to himself." In the estimates we were asked to vote a sum of \$2,250 as a "Grant to His Excellency the Governor in reimbursement of expenses in- curred by him. ' Who authorised the Governor to disburse ? Where is the authority ? There is no authority. He disbursed, if he disbursed, of his own free will. He asks to be "re- imbursed." Then, if he is " reimbursed," the " reimbursement " distinctly is a "donation . made to himself." The or gratuity colony entertained the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall. and right royally were they enter- tained. The Parliament of the country gave authority to the Government to meet all ex-

penditure connected with that entertainment, and the Parliament now has before it a bill for expenses amounting to \$70,060. This item, then, of \$2,250, for which there is no vestige of authority, cannot otherwise be regarded than as a "donation or gratuity" to his Excellency the Governor. These are the words of the Royal Instructions. If the honourable gentleman succeeds in inducing the House to believe that this is not a "donation or gratuity" to His Excellency the Governor, then language has lost its use and meaning. First, why are we asked to vote \$2,250 as a grant to His Excellency the Governor, in reimbursement of expenses incurred by him in connection with Mr. Fisher and York? Why are we asked to pass & grant for such a purpose? Mr. A. L. D. FRASER. - A grant for reimbursement. Mr. SEDDON. - On our account. Mr. FISHER. - The honourable gentleman says it is reimbursement of money spent on our account. My answer to that statement is this: The House has before it items of expenditure amounting to \$70,000, which are intended to cover all expenditure connected with the Royal reception. The Governor is not, and was not, invested with any authority to spend money "on our account." Where is there such authority? Produce it. And if as is the fact, the people of the colony are asked to pay a sum of \$70,000 for expenses connected with the visit of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York, why should they be asked in addition to make a special grant to His Excellency the Governor? And I ask, with added force, Why should there be a special grant to the Governor now in the face of the Act we passed last year, to which I willingly assented, in accordance with which the salary of the Governor was increased by the sum of \$2,000. This is the clause of the Act:-- "It is hereby enacted that from and after the coming into operation of this Act there shall be payable to the Governor every year out of the Consolidated Fund the sum of one thousand five hundred pounds as an allowance for the salaries and expenses of his establishment; and also the sum of five hundred pounds as an allowance for the travelling-expenses of himself, his family, officers, and servants." Clearly this Act was intended to cover all expenses connected with the travelling of His Excellency the Governor. There, it will be seen, is a special allowance of \$500 "for the travelling - expenses of himself, his family, officers, and servants." And that extra allowance was granted only last year. So he is receiving two travelling-allowances for travelling over the same ground. But, to be Irish, he cannot travel twice at once, yet he is to receive two. In discussing special travelling - allowances. such a subject we are limited in the expressions we use in speaking of His Excellency the Governor, because it is expected of us that we shall all speak with the very greatest respect of the representative of the King. But while we speak with the greatest respect of the King and of his representative, it must be remembered that we are sent here by the electors of the country to narrowly guard the public expenditure. If that is not our function, then we have no function. It is, of course, the duty of His Excellency's Ministers to explain and defend on the floor of this House every act of His Excellency: they are his responsible advisers. We readily understand the position of Ministers as the constitutional representatives of His Excellency in this House. On the other hand we are here to advocate and safeguard the interests of the taxpayers of the country; and I say that the Parliament of the country, having provided for all expenditure connected with the

<page>47</page>

Royal visit, it exceeds all principles of reason or extraordinary statement of the honourable member for Eden, that the reception of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York, so that the Governor was responsible for the far as Auckland was concerned, was carried out purely for party purposes. I have no hesitations of the Duke and Duchess during their travels through this country. In the figurative expression in giving to that statement an unqualified sense he may have been responsible for their contradiction. The Government, so far as the safety; but he, personally, was no more responsible for the reception of the Duke and Duchess at Auckland than I. The police and the special detectives do. The function was carried out by the Government of the colony and the special detectives do. The function was carried out by the Government of the colony and the special detectives do.

colo- Harbour Board on the Queen Street Wharf, and by Dr. Logan Campbell, the Mayor of New Zealand. Sir J. G. WARD. - The member for Wairarapa, Auckland, and the Reception Committee, as he said that His Excellency the Governor far as the city was concerned, went round the colony interfering; and I said in reply to that that the responsibility for the Commissioners' control of the visit of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York was thrown upon His House that the Commissioners had nothing to do with the Governor, and in personally whatever to do with the reception of the Duke seeing to matters he had only done his duty. and Duchess at Auckland. There were three Mr. FISHER. -- The safety of the persons of gentlemen appointed as Commissioners, and the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York Mr. Holmes, the Travelling Commissioner, also would no doubt be entrusted to His Excellency visited that city; but, as far as any initial - the Governor, but the arrangements for the giving of any portion of the ceremonies, or any active assistance in carrying them out protection of their persons and the expenses connected with all those arrangements have to be concerned, none whatever was given by or borne by the people of this colony, and those Mr. Holmes or the other three Commissioners. expenses are included in the sum of \$70,000 They made certain suggestions, but the suggestions which we are about to be asked to vote. suggestions were received from them in their 1 wish, in all my references, to speak with the capacity as members of the Auckland Citizens utmost respect of His Excellency the Governor - Reception Committee. There was a meeting nor. It would ill become me, or any other of citizens, and a large representative committee member of this House, to speak in other was elected, and among the members of that language, but still, I say, in the plainest, committee were the three gentlemen who were simplest possible manner. that this is an appointment by the Government, and who were unfair charge to cast upon the people of this termed "Royal Commissioners." The Government - country; and I give that not as an individual member did not directly intervene in any shape or expression of belief, but as being founded on form, nor do anything except erect an arch, at the strongest basis of constitutional law as laid a cost of, it was said, \$1,000, in Queen Street. down in the Royal Instructions. It is useless to play with words. The Royal Instructions, Government platform? placed in the hands of His Excellency the Governor by the King and by his Ministers the Government and by the committee. At in England, are clear, distinct, imperative, the Government platform all the front seats and ought to be inviolable. However, the were, practically, filled by Government opposition, if passed, must be reserved for the nents, and I and other members for the city solicitation of His Majesty's pleasure, and and Government supporters had to take back will receive the gravest consideration at the seats. That is the way the Government in - hands of His Majesty's Ministers. I introduced the question of political colour as free I am greatly surprised that the Government regards the reception. With regard to the principle - ment should ask us to pass a Bill granting principle of this Bill, I contend that the Governor the Governor \$2,500 additional to the \$2,000 was the proper functionary to entertain the Duke which we voted last year. I ask again, Who and Duchess of Cornwall and York. He was the entertained the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall - official agent of the colony. The honourable member? The people of this colony entertained member for Wellington City stated that the them, and it is the people of this colony who Governor had done this without any authority. will pay for that entertainment. I express the Well, Sir, it was clearly explained by the common that there are persons who have been Colonial Secretary that the Governor had been given credit for expending money during the requested to perform the function as the official visit of the Duke and Duchess to New Zealand head of this State, that he did so in that who never spent a single copper of their own capacity, and that this sum of money is to money. But we know who will pay. It is reimburse him for what he expended as the from the public purse that this expenditure official and accredited agent of the people of will be drawn, and it is unfair, it is unwarranted - this colony in entertaining the Royal visitors. hinted, and, in the face of the language of the Surely, then, the cavilling at this expenditure is Royal Instructions which I hold in my hand, it unworthy of the dignity and self-respect of the is invalid and illegal. people of the colony. Where could the Royal Mr. NAPIER

(Auckland City) .- I would not pair have been entertained if not at the Govern- have intervened in this debate but for the ment House, both in Wellington and Auckland ? An Hon. MEMBER. - What about the Royal Mr. NAPIER .- I have already stated in this An Hon. MEMBER .- What about the Go- Mr. NAPIER. - A platform was erected by

<page>48</page>

the Premier could not have invited them to his house. He has not the accommodation nor the conveniences, and the Governor's residence is the proper and official and only suitable place where the Duke and Duchess could have been lodged and entertained. Now, the Duke came here with a large suite, and I think the sum of money asked for is extremely moderate, considering the extra- ordinary expenditure that had to be incurred and the abnormal circumstances. Such being the case, I trust the House will pass this vote, and I regret that there should have been any criticism whatever upon it. As far as the King's representative in this colony is con- cerned, in my judgment he acted with great discretion and great ability in supervising the general arrangements made throughout the colony for the safety of the visitors and the good order and proper carrying-out of the various functions and ceremonies. I may say that in Auckland we were deeply indebted to His Excellency the Governor for his suggestions and for information which he gave to the com- mittee and to the Harbour Board with regard to the proper manner of carrying out all the various details of those functions, and I believe that the same thing might be said as to the reception committees in the other centres. At any rate, I am sure that the people of Auck- land are indebted to His Excellency for the manner in which he did participate in the reception. There was friction, I believe, in Wellington, but I do not believe that the cause of that friction rested upon the shoulders of His Excellency the Governor. I believe it arose from a misunderstanding, and from the too keen anxiety of certain tradesmen in this city to de- rive certain benefits which might be obtained from the spectacular procession passing through their particular streets; but, as far as the Governor was concerned, he had special instruc- tions from the Imperial Government we know, and those who have followed the details of the tour of their Royal Highnesses will have observed that in every instance their Royal Highnesses were accompanied by the Governors of the various States and colonies throughout the whole of their tour, and whilst they were within the territorial jurisdiction of each particular colony. I hope the motion will be carried, and I think the second reading of the Bill ought to be passed without any debate. Mr. A. L. D. FRASER (Napier). - There are only two points upon which I wish to speak, but I will preface my remarks by saying that I do not think it is very creditable to this House that this discussion should have taken place on this item in the estimates. An Hon. MEMBER .- Why? Mr. A. L. D. F . ASER. -- That is my opinion. If the member for Wairarapa does not look at the matter through the same glasses as I do, that is either his or my misfortune ; but I say that it is not to the credit of this House that this discussion should have taken place this afternoon. The member for Palmerston claims credit for the member for Wellington City Mr. Napier point that I suggest does not exist. I quite believe that the member for Wellington City (Mr. Atkinson), with his keen legal training, located a point which he thought was disas- trous to the estimates as presented to Parlia- ment ; but I may tell honourable members that days before that point was discussed by myself and other honourable members, and I have that very point marked as a marginal note to be referred to. An Hon. MEMBER .- Why did not the Pre- mier give you credit for it ? Mr. A. L. D. FRASER .- I did not mention it to the Premier, but I and several other mem- bers have discussed it for some days, and the conclusion I came to was that a Bill was un- necessary. If honourable members will refer to the estimates they will find that the vote is to "reimburse." That word wants to be care- fully kept in mind. In the Instructions from Her Majesty the words used are " dona- \--- - tion or gratuity." So that I may not make any mistake in respect to the interpretation of these \----- words, [will give the meaning as set forth in a leading dictionary. "Reimburse" is to re- fund. That is the word used in the estimates : we are asked to refund to His Excellency ex- penses he has incurred on behalf of the colony. A "donation " is

something given, and a "gratuity" is something given without an equivalent. I simply dispose of that point by saying that the matter has been under discussion by honourable members for some time, and my own opinion is that the Premier would have done better, perhaps, if he had not introduced this Bill, for it is superfluous. But he has done so with a good object, and that was in order that there should be no lengthy discussion of the matter on the estimates, and in order to remove any doubt that might exist. Personally, I consider there is no doubt. Hon. MEMBERS .- Oh ! Mr. A. L. D. FRASER .- That is my opinion. I say that the £2,250 to provide for reimbursing His Excellency does not affect one jot or tittle the Constitution of this colony. Now, I have only a few words to say with reference to what was stated by the member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher). In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred I listen with pleasure to that honourable member, and to his deductions on questions which come before this House, but to-day his speech was transparently a gallery speech. Just imagine that honourable gentleman, with all his ability, experience, and education, saying that we were duplicating by reimbursement what we passed by statute last session. We passed by statute last session an increase of \$1,500 to the Governor's salary, and \$500 for expenses. Was that for His present Excellency ? No: it was for all Governors. It did not anticipate any visit of their Royal Highnesses to New Zealand; in fact, it was not known at the time that they were actually coming here. The increase was one for all time. An Hon. MEMBER .- It was one of the arguments in favour of the Bill.

<page>49</page>

The increase in the Governor's salary had nothing to do with the Royal visit, but the £2,000 for renovating Government House was voted separately in anticipation of the Royal visit. As I have said, the increase is there for all time for the Governor, whoever he may be, and yet the honourable member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher), with an illogical deduction that is foreign to him, says that, when the Governor was travelling throughout New Zealand and drawing this \$500, it was part of the £2,250 now on the estimates and under discussion. Now, how long was he travelling throughout New Zealand while the Royal party were here ? Under three weeks. What is the fraction of \$500, even if his deduction was right ? But the Governor was travelling on the colony's business, as the chief representative of His Majesty the King. I say the quibbling over what has been done in entertaining the Royal visitors, over what has raised New Zealand in the eyes of the civilised world-I am not speaking of it in the way of an advertisement-is discreditable to the House and country. Our chief representative, our chief host in New Zealand, surely must be the Governor, the representative of His Majesty the King, and he spoke, acted, and expended money on behalf of the colony. Are we now going to say that he should not have done so, and try to go behind it? My own opinion is this : that it is not creditable to us ; it is not pleasant. One thing I am pleased to see is that there is a certain section of this House who are silent on this question, and who by their silence indicate that they agree with me in recognising that it is not creditable or honourable to now question this expenditure. Mr. WILFORD (Wellington Suburbs) .- I propose to say a few words in reference to the position. First of all, I desire, before going into the matter, to say that the remarks of the honourable member for Napier surprised me greatly. He prefaced his speech by saying that the time of the House was being wasted in a discreditable manner by discussing the visit of the Duke and Duchess of York, and in discussing the expenditure by His Excellency in entertaining them : and yet four-fifths of the time the honourable member spoke was taken up in exactly the manner which he deprecated. I do not for a moment deny that the speeches on this particular motion are not the speeches one would understand should be delivered. And this is the first time since I have been in this House that I have had an opportunity of congratulating the member for Palmerston on the statesmanlike view he took on this question. I do not agree with his deductions, or the course which he suggested should be taken, but I agreed with the tone he introduced into the debate, because he said the whole thing that had to be discussed was whether this money vote should be covered by Bill or left to the estimates. Surely that is

the whole question now. I am not going to give honourable members any index of my feelings, nor shall I say at this stage whether I am going to vote for or against the amount on VOL. CXIX .- 3. I think we have to direct our attention at the present moment simply to the question as to whether or not this is the proper course to be adopted. I believe, myself, the proper course is that suggested by the Premier. I must really point out to the honourable member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher) that while speaking he was a little touchy at some interjections made by myself during his discursion on the Instructions passed under the Royal sign- manual, as detailed in the book he had before him. I asked him whether he was reading from clause 9 or clause 6 of the Instructions ; and he answered quite pettishly, evidently annoyed at my interruption. He said he was reading from the Royal Instructions of 1879. I was reading from the Instructions of 1892, and the Instructions of 1892 amend the Instructions of 1879, although the words are almost identically the same. I feel sure, therefore, the honourable member will at once admit that he was unjust, and that he behaved in a pettish manner in answer to my interjections, which were simply made for the purpose of getting information. Mr. FISHER .- Will the honourable gentleman allow me to apologize for my pettishness, and to accompany that apology with the request that he will inform the House that the words quoted by him and the words quoted by me are identically the same words-they do not vary in any respect whatever. Mr. WILFORD .- I accept the honourable gentleman's apology at once, and really the words are the same, and the honourable gentleman can understand my interjection when I asked him whether he was reading from clause 6 or clause 9. Now, surely the proper course to be taken is for a Bill to be introduced, and then the whole discussion as to whether or not this money should be passed can take place. Honourable members no doubt have made up their minds as to whether they are going to vote for the Bill or leave the sum on the estimates. Let us get to the vote. I intend to take no part in describing the Royal tour, or the entertainments at Government House and elsewhere in connection with the Royal visit, because I think that matter will properly be discussed when the Bill itself is being discussed, or during the discussion of the amount on the estimates. Mr. ATKINSON (Wellington City) .- Sir, I agree with the last speaker that we should not treat this stage of the Bill as the second reading, and I am surprised that the honourable member for Auckland City (Mr. Napier), a distinguished member of the legal profession, should not have been able to confine himself to what is the real issue before us. Professor Huxley made the remark that he found men to differ not so much in their liability to err as in their readiness to acknowledge error after they had erred. Now, the Right Hon. the Premier constantly affords an illustration of that text. He makes just about as many mistakes as other people, but you will never find him acknowledging in words, even though he may

<page>50</page>

a mistake. Mr. SEDDON .- I never do. Mr. ATKINSON .- Of course not ; yet if he did not make a mistake in placing that vote on the estimates, he has made a mistake now in asking us to take it off. There is no escape from that dilemma. I see the honourable member for the Suburbs is frank enough to admit that. There is really no great harm in the Premier making a mistake of this kind. He is not a Law Officer, and he cannot be expected to examine every legal detail of the work he is engaged upon, and therefore it could not be for a moment supposed that any reflection was cast upon him personally if this were acknowledged to be a mistake. On the contrary, I think it would have been to his credit if he had frankly said, " We have made this mistake, we ask the House to rectify it, and to proceed in another fashion." But, of course, he has not done that. He gave us as one reason for the step he is taking that we should avoid acrimonious debate upon the vote. But the debate upon this measure will give us much wider opportunities of debate than we should have had if the vote had remained on the estimates. He has given us this opportunity now, and we shall still have an opportunity of speaking on the estimates when they come along. We shall also have all the stages of the Bill now being introduced, instead of a single stage on the estimates. Then, the honourable gentleman said the lawyers would differ with regard to the effect

of these words in the Royal Instructions. The honourable member for the Suburbs was so guarded that I do not think he gave us an opinion upon the application of that clause of the Royal Instructions which he read to the matter now before us, and I do not think we had an expression of opinion from the honourable member for Auckland City (Mr. Napier) either ; and the silence on the part of two such loyal supporters of the Government may, I think, be taken as an indication that they " did not consider the point was quite free from doubt," to use a favourite phrase of the Solicitor-General's. Now, as to the opinion of the Solicitor-General, it was very unkindly said, in regard to a case before our Court of Appeal, in which five Judges sat and four of them decided one way and the minority of one the other way -I shall not mention the names, but it was remarked by a member of our profession that all the lawyers on the Bench had decided one way and, let me say, Mr. Justice Jones the other. It was very hard on Mr. Justice Jones ; and it would be equally hard on the Solicitor-General if I were to say, in regard to the alleged difference of legal opinion as to the effects of this clause, that all the lawyers of the colony would be on the one side and the Solicitor-General on the other. It would be rather hard, and I will not, therefore, commit myself to the remark. But the honourable member for Napier has made the best lawyer's speech on behalf of-I do not know that I ought to say on behalf of-not on behalf of the course the Right Hon. the Premier is taking, because Mr. Atkinson surdity of the course the Premier is taking. The points upon which the member for Napier laid stress were that the words of the Instructions were- "The Governor shall not, except in the cases hereunder mentioned, assent in our name to any Bill of any of the following clauses :- "(2.) Any Bill whereby any grant of land or money, or other donation or gratuity, may be made to himself"- and that in the estimates the words " reimbursement of expenses" were used in lieu of "grant" or " donation." He made the most of that, and cited a dictionary in support of his argument. I have no exception to take to his definition of the words, but I wish to ask the House this simple question : Who is liable, if we do not pass the Bill or if we do not pass this vote ? And the answer to that is, His Excellency the Governor. If we are liable, no Bill is needed ; if the Bill is needed it is only because His Excellency the Governor is liable. There is a dilemma again, from which I can see no escape. And therefore if in the absence of this Bill His Excellency the Governor is liable, though he may have a moral claim for reimbursement, that would be still in law a donation, and therefore comes within the clause of the Royal Instructions that has been referred to. Supposing I give £10 to the Royal Reception Fund, I am £10 out of pocket, and supposing & month later my constituents or some benevolent committee decide they will reimburse me the £10 which I have paid on behalf of the country to the Royal Reception Fund, well, that £10 will merely reimburse me for the money I have already spent; but, so far as the relation between the Committee and myself is concerned, it is nothing but a donation from them to me, and there is no escape from that unless I was their legally authorised agent. If I was their agent my action was their action, and therefore it was their gift and not mine, and no resolution of indemnity or anything else was required for my reimbursement. So it appears to me perfectly plain that this procedure that the Premier has asked us to take is the proper one. Otherwise the Appropriation Bill must have been reserved for His Majesty's 1 ----- assent, because the Instructions would have prohibited His Excellency from assenting to a 1 Bill from which he would have derived a personal advantage. Now, I agree with the member for the Suburbs in holding that the question of the merits of this grant, reimbursement, or donation is a question that is properly reserved for the second reading, and I shall not now express my opinion one way or the other. But I see the learned honourable member for Napier, Mr. Fraser, is now in his place, and as he has got his dictionary with him, it would not take him long to find out that there is a distinction between a moral and a legal obligation ; and generally in litigation and in common life one insists on the moral quality of a claim when there is no legal basis on which to rest it. I cannot meet his arguments on that subject further than by saying that His Excellency 1 1

reimbursed, but that does not affect the legal question involved. Morally this expenditure may be a debt, but legally it will be nothing but a donation; and therefore I support the course which the Premier is taking in proceeding by way of Bill instead of by way of vote on the estimates, not for, but in spite of, the reasons which he himself has given for the course he is about to take. Mr. SEDDON (Premier) .- I am sorry this matter has taken so much time, but probably it may save time later on. Now, I was accused of not being generous. Mr. PIRANI. - No ; not being fair. Mr. SEDDON. - Well, of not being fair. Now, I could not give credit where, so far as I was concerned, the credit was not due, and I will tell the member for Palmerston the reason why. This question was discussed weeks ago between myself and the Solicitor-General before the estimates were brought down at all. It was not a discovery at all when the honourable gentleman mentioned it to me; and, as he himself will admit, I told him very positively there was nothing in the point raised. Then, how could I give credit when the matter was definitely settled before the estimates were brought down? The question was raised not only as to the Royal Instructions, but also as to section 57 of the Constitution Act itself, and whether it was necessary to reserve it as a grant, or a clause of a Bill and hold that over. If I had been taken unawares, and if any member were to advise me of a mistake I made, I am the first to admit it. But I say I could not give credit where there was no credit due. And now I will give the honourable member, and I will give the House, an explanation of what was done. It is very seldom this is done ; it is an unusual course to adopt, but I will take it this time, although I may be laying down a precedent that probably it is not advisable to follow. Before I would agree to this Bill for the changing of the course that was decided upon, I asked the Solicitor-General was he still positive about the legal position. At all events, this is what he said- Mr. PIRANI .- He puts you in a big hole sometimes. Mr. SEDDON .- I do not admit that ; at any rate, when I get there, you will all admit there is never a hole that I am not able to get out of. Now, let us be serious : "I am asked to advise- Mr. ATKINSON .- Will the Premier say what is the date ? Mr. SEDDON .- Yes; the 26th September, 1901 : - "I am asked to advise whether the grant on the estimates of £2,250 to His Excellency, in reimbursement of expenses incurred by him in connection with the visit of their Royal Highnesses, is a grant within the meaning of sub- clause (2) of clause VI. of the Governor's Instructions of the 26th March, 1892, instructing him not to assent to ' any Bill whereby any grant of land or money or other donation or gratuity may be made to himself. relate only to such descriptions of grants as are in the nature of donation or gratuities. The words ' other donation or gratuity ' show this clearly. The grant on the estimates is not in the nature of a donation or gratuity. It is a mere reimbursement of expenses incurred by His Excellency whilst acting as host to their Royal Highnesses on behalf of the Government and the colony, the Government having fully recognised from the outset that the burden should not fall on him." Mr. PIRANI .- How does he know that ? Mr. SEDDON .- Because he is conversant from the inception with all that has taken place, and, of course, your Solicitor-General must be. If your Government is wise, then, to prevent it getting on to the shoals, it is necessary you should do so. Now, I say, in face of that opinion of the Solicitor-General, I ought to have said to the House, a vote can be taken. If taken on the Appropriation Bill there are two alternatives: the Governor can send an Appropriation Bill up if he is not personally interested, and it is only a reimbursement ; or he can reserve the particular clause of the Appropriation Bill and send it for His Majesty's consent, and the other sections of the Appropriation Bill otherwise would be approved of. Mr. PIRANI .- That clause would not be. Mr. SEDDON .- You would always put in a clause to cover a thing of this kind. At all events, I am giving you the legal position as the Government is advised. Now, you will naturally ask, Why, if so advised, do you bring down the Bill ? Mr. PIRANI .- That is the point. An Hon. MEMBER .- It is to save trouble. Mr. SEDDON .- No, it is not to save trouble, but to insure peace, so far as the legal position is concerned. But I do not wish to have His Excellency's name brought on the floor of the House for acrimonious discussion, and to reflect or detract from the credit which fell to the colony for the manner in which we entertained the Royal visitors. If I can avoid that, surely I am justified in doing so.

I was sure that if I took this course it would remove difficulties that were in the way, as there were a number of members in the House who would support the passing of the Bill, because then the question as to the constitutional aspect in regard to the passing of the Appropriation Bill would be removed. Therefore, this was my best course, and in the best interests of all concerned. In accordance with my legal advice, and in accordance with my own conviction, and with a view to obviating a difficulty I was told would be bound to arise in Committee when the estimates were under discussion, I have taken this course; and surely, having taken that course, members should not find fault with me. Mr. PIRANI .-- We are not finding fault. Mr. SEDDON .- Well, of course, as I said, I could not give credit where credit was not due. Mr. PIRANI .-- You have taken the advice and the credit. Mr. SEDDON .- The member for Napier has

<page>52</page>

self had discussed the point. Mr. PIRANI .- But they did not communicate it to you. Mr. SEDDON .- They did not communicate it to me, but it is quite evident to me that this matter has been discussed by very many members of the House, and I say it is to their credit that they have discussed it; and it is to my credit and to the credit of the Government that, seeing how a difficulty may be obviated, I should do it in a way that prevents an acrimonious discussion, and enables members to support the grant who would otherwise have objected to the reimbursement by vote on the estimates on the ground that such a vote would militate against His Excellency the Governor assenting to the Appropriation Bill. I say, by bringing in this Bill, which removes a difficulty from the path of many honourable members, the Government are doing a wise thing. Now, there is another point which would have been raised, and which it is my duty to avoid. When we came to the end of the session, and the Appropriation Act had to be passed and receive the assent of His Excellency the Governor, what would have been said ? There are some lawyers holding the opinion of the honourable member for Wellington City (Mr. Atkinson)-if he is still of that opinion-who would say that if the Governor gave his assent to the Appropriation Bill it would be a wrongful act, because he was personally interested. Well, by taking the course I am adopting now I remove that difficulty and contingency, and I prevent also, probably, adverse criticism in the Press. Very well, if I can do all this by this course-which, of course, is not in any way a reflection on the Government-surely I am not to be blamed for doing it. That is the reason why I have brought the Bill down. Now, I regret that there has been a misapprehension in respect to this question. The member for Riccarton asked a question very fairly in these words : " Does this include the extra cost entailed upon His Excellency during the visit of their Royal Highnesses ? " That is exactly what it is for, and nothing else. I may say at once that in these charges is the extra cost entailed at Government House, Auckland; Government House, Wellington; and the Fernhill Club, Dunedin. The tradesmen's bills that were sent in to His Excellency the Governor are all in this, and I may say His Excellency, out of his own pocket, has disbursed already, in the payment of these accounts, a sum of £1,100. Mr. MEREDITH .- Are you in possession of these bills ? Mr. SEDDON .- Yes. I say His Excellency sent a list showing the disbursements he had made, and the bills were sent to us in which considerably more was shown in excess of the disbursements than the amount we are asking for ; but some of these accounts which were in the name of the Governor we considered should be paid direct by the Government. An Hon. MEMBER .- What about the £2,500 we gave him last year ? Mr. Seddon salary last year has nothing whatever to do with this; this is the extraordinary cost entailed outside his ordinary salary and allowances. I will put the position in this way: If we take His Excellency's expenses at Auckland, Wellington, and elsewhere, and take from them his ordinary monthly expenditure, the colony is called upon to pay the balance, because it was caused solely on behalf of the colony in the entertainment of their Royal Highnesses. Sir, that is the actual position ; and, in respect to the exception that is apparently being taken by some honourable members, I have only this to say, and I say it with authority : that the visit, notwithstanding the promise to the contrary made to the Governor, is going to entail upon His Excellency an expenditure outside this altogether. Now, I will give another case in

point to illustrate my argument. An individual holding a public position gives up his house entirely to the Government and to the colony ; all the bills come in to him, because they are in the first instance his liabilities. He pays these accounts, and then sends them on to the Government. Now, what course do the Government take? We take a grant from Parliament to reimburse him for the amount he has paid on behalf of the colony, and I do not know that there is any other way in which we could do it. Mr. PIRANI .- We are going to knock that off too. Mr. SEDDON .- You should not do that, because it is the only way we can possibly meet the liability of the colony. Mr. FISHER .- Who gave him carte blanche to spend the money of the colony ? Mr. SEDDON .- There is no such thing as carte blanche at all, and, so far as the expenditure is concerned, the proof of that is shown in the small amount the Royal visit has cost this colony. The entertainment of their Royal Highnesses in the four centres of this colony was equal to the entertainment of their Royal Highnesses probably in four of the other colonies. For instance, Auckland may be said to be the same as Melbourne, Wellington the same as Sydney, Christchurch the same as Adelaide, and Dunedin the same as Western Australia. I say that, practically, we entertained in four centres, and when members take that into consideration, and the cost of removing our troops, and the cost of travelling, it will be seen that the expenditure submitted to Parliament is not at all excessive. In fact, we have been asked the question why the expenditure is only £50,000, and members say it must be more. But we only come to Parliament with the accounts that we have received. . - Mr. MASSEY .- Will two sums of £50,000 pay it ? Mr. SEDDON .- In my opinion £70,000 will pay for everything. There were really 4.30. five centres - there was Rotorua as well-and there was no squandering at all, for His Excellency the Governor and Ministers were all very careful to prevent extravagance of any kind. The Government are not in any

<page>53</page>

dilemma. When we come to the estimates we | Attorney-Generals, they fall on them in a most shall strike off the item. The Bill will be brought on for its second reading, and on that occasion members, having had time to reflect on the information that has been afforded them, will probably pass it without dissent. At any rate, the Bill will go Home for the Royal assent, and those who contend that otherwise there would have been an evasion of the Royal Instructions will be satisfied, because they will see that what has been done by the Government has been done constitutionally. Mr. ATKINSON .- That is rather rough on the Solicitor-General. Mr. SEDDON .- No, it is not at all rough on the Solicitor-General, because the Solicitor-General, while adhering to his opinions as to the legality of the matter, said the question of the personal element-the question of the House and the question of estimates versus Bill -must rest with the Government. It was a political matter, he said, and it was not his place to advise the Government on it. Mr. FISHER .- What would have happened if the Solicitor-General had decided in the other direction ? Mr. SEDDON .- If the Solicitor-General some weeks ago, before a grant was put on the estimates, had advised that the proper course was a Bill, and that the Governor could not give his assent to the Appropriation Bill on account of an appropriation being in that measure, we would not have put the item on the estimates at all, but would have brought down a Bill in the first instance. The course we are now taking will, I think, meet the objections that have been raised, and prevent, as I believe it will prevent, an acrimonious discussion on the estimates. Then the matter would not have ended there. We should have had it again when the Appropriation Bill was before the House, and in all probability it would come up next session as well. There will be a fair debate on the second reading of the Bill ; but I do not want it to be said that I was on the horns of a dilemma, and that by taking the course I am now taking I am admitting I had made a mistake. I have made no mistake. I say I could have passed the amount on the estimates, and His Excellency would have been justified in signing the Appropriation Bill. But the question of policy comes in, and, as a matter of policy, and with a view of preventing what might lead to unpleasantness, and to promote peace, I am taking the present course. Mr. ATKINSON .- There is something more about

policy at the end of the letter. Mr. SEDDON. - I have given you the legal opinion. Mr. PIRANI. - Give us the illegal opinion. Mr. SEDDON. - There is nothing illegal. I may say to members opposite that I quite appreciate the course they have taken. I cannot help appreciating it. The course they have taken has my greatest admiration. I only wish my friends on this side would do the same. On this side there are three or four coming Attorney - Generals, and, instead of members on this side supporting my coming outrageous manner sometimes. But there is one little pet lamb on the other side who is a budding Attorney-General, and on that side they all stick to him. Honourable members all know the legal duels there are at times between the coming Attorney-General on the other side and the member for Auckland City on my side, and if it had not been for the waste of time I would have appreciated those duels myself. I say again that I do not blame the Opposition for laying stress on anything that is brought before the Government by a member of their party. I was young and erratic once myself, just as the honourable member for Wellington City (Mr. Atkinson) is. An Hon. MEMBER. - He is sowing his legal wild oats. Mr. SEDDON. - Well, I do not like to endorse that opinion, or I might bring the two honourable gentlemen into conflict. However, I wish to say that the course I am now taking is in the best interests of the colony. It will save unpleasantness that might otherwise have arisen, and, that being so, I ask the House to pass the Bill. The course I am suggesting will facilitate the colony in meeting its liabilities, because a separate Bill as soon as passed may be sent Home at once, while if we had to wait for the Appropriation Bill we should have to wait until the end of the session. The matter has been well thought out. Mr. FISHER. - Why was it not foreseen? Mr. SEDDON. - It was foreseen. If you ask me if I could foresee that there were certain members who would block my estimates in respect to that point, I say I could not foresee that; and I take it that no man in the world could foresee what the member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher) himself is going to do. In fact, I do not think the honourable member himself can foresee it. Mr. FISHER. - I am like you: I want to see which way the cat is going to jump. Mr. SEDDON. - The honourable member is the cat in this case, and I want to take the proper course and avoid a catastrophe. Some honourable members have asked why the Premier did not bring in a Bill on the matter. Well, the Premier has decided in what way he thinks the cat is going to jump, and the Bill that has been brought in will, I believe, be unanimously passed by the House. The colony will not repudiate; the responsibility must constitutionally rest, in the first place, on the Government. When the Home authorities asked the question was the colony going to pay the cost, if we had said "No" they would probably have taken another course; but the Ministry of the day said the colony had invited their Royal Highnesses to be the guests of the colony, and the colony would pay the cost. I say this is a legitimate portion of the cost, and I say, further, that the colony will cheerfully bear it. Mr. PIRANI. - I would like to ask the Premier if he will lay the document on the table containing the legal opinion with regard to this matter.

<page>54</page>

read. Mr. PIRANI. - Should I be in order in moving that the document the Premier has quoted be laid on the table? Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER. - It is not usual to compel the production or laying on the table of confidential communications that have passed between the Crown Law Officers or departmental officers and the Government. Mr. PIRANI. - But it has been read by the Premier. Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER. - What has been read the Premier can please himself about, but it would not be in order to move that the document be laid on the table. Mr. PIRANI. - The point is that the Premier has kept back the best part. Mr. SEDDON. - I have left that for the second reading of the Bill. Motion agreed to. Bill referred to Committee of the Whole. Recommendation that provision be made accordingly agreed to and reported. Bill read a first time. ## SUPPLY. CLASS II. - COLONIAL SECRETARY. Miscellaneous services, £81,398. Sir J. G. WARD (Colonial Secretary) said that as a Bill was introduced dealing with the item, "Grant to His Excellency in reimbursement of expenses incurred by him, £2,250," he moved, That the item be struck out. Motion agreed to, and item struck out. Mr. MASSEY (Franklin) wished some explanation of the item

"Grant to Ministers and their Secretaries in reimbursement of expenses incurred by them, including £150 for ordinary travelling - allowance, £350." He understood this was in connection with the Royal visit. Ministers had an allowance of 30s. a day for every day they were absent from Wellington, and besides that they were paid ordinary travelling-expenses ; but evidently that was not sufficient. The Royal party was in the colony for three weeks, and for that time the Ministers and their Secretaries required an additional \$350 as travelling-expenses. Unless some good reasons could be given for the retention of this item it ought to be struck out. He would like to know how much of the expense related to the Secretaries and how much to the Ministers. Mr. PIRANI (Palmerston) wished the Minister to explain why the money put down for the reimbursement of expenses incurred by Mr. Rhodes, the Mayor of Christchurch, £247, should be voted. Mr. SEDDON (Premier) might say at once that Mr. Rhodes had incurred expenses in connection with the Royal visit which it was only fair and reasonable the colony should bear, though they had, in the first place, been charged against the Mayor of Christchurch. They were tradesmen's bills for alterations made to his premises, and so on. These expenses were incurred on behalf of the colony. Everything had been done in the most careful and business-like manner what Mr. Rhodes had done. That was the only way the liability could be met. It would be necessary to take another vote for accounts that had since come in. There had been strict economy, and no unnecessary expense incurred. The manner in which the colony had been treated by Mr. Rhodes in respect to the Royal visit was deserving of every credit. Mr. RHODES (Ellesmere) said it appeared there must be some misunderstanding in regard to this item. He understood it was the Government that incurred the liability, and not the Mayor of Christchurch. Mr. SEDDON -- No. Mr. RHODES said he had telegraphed to the Mayor about the item, and had received the following reply : "Government arranged all expenditure here. Do not understand the item." There was evidently some misunderstanding. He would like the Minister to explain the item. Mr. SEDDON said there was a letter from Mr. Rhodes which accompanied the accounts. Mr. J. ALLEN .- What are they for ? Mr. SEDDON .- The food, amongst other things, supplied to "Te Koraha " during the Royal visit. Mr. J. ALLEN .- He did not order it. Mr. SEDDON said, All the accounts were sent to Mr. Rhodes - ordinary tradesmen's accounts, and also accounts for furnishing, et cetera. Mr. Rhodes was liable in the first instance, although it was only nominal, for the colony was the host, and the accounts paid or hereafter to be paid would be reimbursed him. Sir J. G. WARD said he had in his hand a letter from Mr. Rhodes to the department, which the honourable member for Ellesmere could read. He would not read the details of the accounts, but the items which the honourable member for Bruce said should be read were as follows : - d. 55 19 Servants' wages 6 1. Groceries, provisions, &c. 178 14 11 .. 50 14 0 Gas and electric light fittings 5 0 Table-linen, &c. 53 20 0 0 Decorations and flowers .. Fuel and light 19 11 7 14 Band (music) 5 0 Sundries 30 13 10 . Mr. MASSEY (Franklin) said it would be as well that this matter should be cleared up, as there had been a great deal of criticism outside the House regarding it. He understood the position to be that Mr. Rhodes vacated his house-handed it over to the Royal party - and this £247 was in payment of expenses incurred by the Royal party while staying there, and that Mr. Rhodes had nothing to do with it. Mr. SEDDON said that was so. In regard to alterations, for instance, the Government had advised that gas should be installed as well as the electric light, in case of accidents. The accounts were sent to Mr. Rhodes, while the work was really done for the Government. Mr. and Mrs. Rhodes had given the Government

<page>55</page>

out, and he felt that the colony was greatly indebted to them. Contrasted with 5.0. the cost in other parts of the country, this charge was the most reasonable of all, and it was too bad that they should call this matter into question. Mr. Rhodes said he had gone carefully through the accounts, and he (Mr. Seddon) was sure that he had, for he had called attention to two or three places where he thought the tradesmen had been putting it on a bit too much. These were the colony's liabilities, and the only way to reimburse

Mr. Rhodes was by voting him the money in the way they were proposing. If the placing of this amount on the estimates had caused Mr. Rhodes any anxiety, or had subjected him to any adverse criticism, he could only say that he was very sorry for it. If the Government had paid the accounts in the ordinary way the Auditor would not pass them. That had been tested, and unless there was direct authority for the work from the Government the Auditor would not pass the payment. Mr. MONK (Waitemata) said it seemed to him that Mr. Rhodes, who had behaved most generously in connection with the visit of the Royal party to Christchurch, was being disparaged through the action of the Government. The cost of these alterations should have been a charge on the Government, and not be made to appear as if it were a charge made by Mr. Rhodes against the country for the entertainment of the Royal visitors, as it appeared by the estimates. The alterations and charges forming this amount should have been directed by an official with a proper warrant for doing so, also directing the accounts to be made out against and in the name of the colony. Sir J. G. WARD said the position was, that Mr. Rhodes, in a very praiseworthy spirit, placed his house at the disposal of the colony for the use of the Duke and Duchess of York during their stay in Christchurch. The necessary expense dependent on the stay of their Royal Highnesses was to be borne by the colony, and was being borne by the colony. The accounts which they were dealing with now were sent in to Mr. Rhodes himself, and Mr. Rhodes sent the accounts to the department; they had to be paid. The Government could not pay them. The result was, in order that they should do fairly by Mr. Rhodes, the amount had to be put down on the estimates in the name of Mr. Rhodes. Take one item, "Table-linen, £53 5s.": the colony got the whole of that back again, and it would be re-sold. There was an expenditure far beyond the total amount on the estimates incurred in Mr. Rhodes's house, but the balance had to be provided for out of the payment to His Excellency the Governor, and that was in the £2,250. What was on the estimates was only what Mr. Rhodes was billed for by those to whom the accounts were owing, and for which he ought to be reimbursed by the colony. The Government did not send the accounts to Mr. Rhodes, but, the accounts having been sent to Mr. Rhodes by the tradesmen, Mr. Rhodes mentioned, as had been done in other places. Mr. MEREDITH (Ashley) thought it would have been better if, in the first place, the Government had been candid and had made a clear statement in reference to this particular item, and he had no doubt that if that had been done the House would have passed it at once. The Premier had made one statement and the Colonial Secretary had made another statement. It appeared that the Mayor of Christchurch gave up his beautiful residence for the benefit of the Royal party. He did not entertain the Duke and Duchess of York; he was not the host on that occasion. It appeared to him (Mr. Meredith) that the Mayor of Christchurch (Mr. Rhodes) must have allowed himself to be employed as a sort of agent for the Government for the purpose of receiving tradesmen's bills respecting the catering for the Duke and Duchess at his private residence. It would have been better if the Government had made arrangements through Mr. Holmes, who was their Special Commissioner, and who arranged in the first place that Coker's Hotel should be secured on behalf of the Government. But, inasmuch as the Governor had taken the place of Mr. Rhodes, and taken his private residence and occupied the position of host on that occasion, these accounts had been sent in to the Governor, and should have been included in the £2,250. If they were not included in the £2,250, they were an additional claim on the part of the Government for £247. He did not see that Mr. Rhodes had anything to do with the Government, good, bad, or indifferent. Mr. SEDDON.- We are responsible to him as our agent, and he is responsible to the people who supplied the goods or performed the services. Mr. MEREDITH said he did not think the name of Mr. Rhodes should have appeared in the estimates at all. He might mention that he was informed there was another gentleman in Christchurch who offered to accommodate the Duke and Duchess, on this condition: He claimed that he should be the host, and that the Duke and Duchess should be his guests. That offer was declined. No blame in this matter was attachable to Mr. Rhodes. Mr. J. ALLEN (Bruce) said, If he had been able to move an

amendment he should have done so, but the Standing Orders would not permit him. He would suggest this: that the Government might consent to the item being struck out, and bring it down on the supplementary estimates in a different way. He thought the present wording was misleading to the members of the House and to persons outside, and he would suggest that the wording should be, " Expenses incurred in Christchurch on behalf of the Government." He understood that, with regard to this particular vote, some of the items which the Colonial Secretary had read out were already provided for under the grant to His Excellency. Sir J. G. WARD .- No; it is in excess of that. Mr. J. ALLEN said the amount he was particularly referring to was the amount for

<page>56</page>

ask, Would it not have been reasonable to have included that in the \$2,250 for His Excellency the Governor ? His Excellency was the host. In the item read out by the Colonial Secretary were certain articles of groceries and other things which were part of the actual food, and he thought they should have been included in the £2,250 granted to the Governor, because His Excellency was the host. Mr. SEDDON .- No ; he acted as host for the colony. Mr. J. ALLEN said, Surely he was, and His Excellency notified it ; he saw it in the news- papers that he invited Mr. Rhodes to dinner. Sir J. G. WARD said that was not included in it at all. Mr. J. ALLEN said they would want to know by-and-by what the \$2,250 was for. Sir J. G. WARD wanted to say that the amount in excess of what was in this item on the estimates had been charged to the Govern- ment. He might mention this, for instance : that there was \$20 expended in decorations and flowers in Mr. Rhodes's house ; it was in- curred by Mr. Rhodes, under authority, in de- corating. The trouble was that the accounts had not been sent in the names of the people to the Government direct, but to Mr. Rhodes, and the result was that the Government had to put the amount on the estimates in Mr. Rhodes's name. He was informed that there were some seventy- five people staying in Mr. Rhodes's house-a number of them being servants who went there before the arrival of the Duke and Duchess -- and they required to be provided for. It was not the Governor nor Mr. Rhodes who had to provide for that. It was the colony. Mr. J. ALLEN understood that everything _ that took place in Christchurch in Mr. Rhodes's house took place by the direct instructions of Captain Alexander. Then, later on they came to another item in the estimates, connected with renovation, furnishing, alterations, et cetera, of certain residences, and included in those residences were the expenses connected with renovating the residence of the Mayor of Christchurch. He wanted to know whether the charge for renovating the residence of the Mayor of Christchurch was part of the items which had been read out by the Colonial Secre- tary. Sir J. G. WARD .- No, it is not so; only in connection with electric lighting. Mr. J. ALLEN said, Then, there were items connected with the renovating of this residence in Christchurch which were included in the general heading : why should they not all be put under the general heading ? Sir J. G. WARD said he had tried to explain the position to the honourable member. The Government did not want to put in Mr. Rhodes's name more than that of anybody else. Mr. SEDDON .- Strike the item out. Mr. J. ALLEN thought the best thing to do would be to strike it out and bring it down in the proper way. He did not want Mr. Rhodes to lose anything by it, but he did not want him to be placed in a false position. Mr. J. Allen now that the mischief was done, it would only make matters worse to strike the amount off the estimates, as it would appear then that the Mayor of Christchurch had made a demand for a sum of money that had been refused. As a matter of fact, no sum that Parliament would be likely to pass would reimburse Mr. Rhodes for the great expense he had been put to in entertaining the Royal party. The misleading way in which this item appeared on the esti- mates was not only unfair to Mr. Rhodes, but to the City of Christchurch, of which he was Mayor. Mr. G. W. RUSSELL (Riccarton) asked why it was in the case of Christchurch only that accounts for provisions supplied to the Royal party had been sent to the Mayor. What had happened in regard to the accounts for goods supplied to the Northern Club at Auckland, and the Fernhill Club, Dunedin ? Were they sent to the secretary of the club ? Sir J. G. WARD

said, in those two cases a contract was made on the basis of a payment of so much per head for the victualling of the Royal party. In the case of the Mayor of Christchurch that was not done. Mr. G. W. RUSSELL said it was very remarkable that there should have been this one exception. Sir J. G. WARD said it was not the fault of the Government. Mr. G. W. RUSSELL said it could not be called Mr. Rhodes's fault, and why should it be made to appear on the estimates that he was receiving this sum of \$247? Sir J. G. WARD said these accounts were in the first place sent to Mr. Rhodes by the tradespeople who supplied the provisions, and Mr. Rhodes had sent the accounts on to the Government. Mr. G. W. RUSSELL (Riccarton) asked if Mr. Rhodes had actually paid this money. Sir J. G. WARD did not say that ; but the accounts had been sent on to the Government with a letter from Mr. Rhodes. There was no object in putting the item as it was on the estimates, excepting to comply in the ordinary way with the requirements of the Audit Department. Mr. G. W. RUSSELL said, Surely the accounts could have been sent back to the tradespeople with a request to alter the name of the debtor. Sir J. G. WARD said, If such a course had occurred to any one, Mr. Rhodes might have been written to and the accounts returned to him; but no one thought such a course necessary. It was the colony and not Mr. Rhodes who entertained the Royal couple during their stay in Mr. Rhodes's house. An Hon. MEMBER. - What was done in connection with Mr. Nathan's house, Auckland ? Sir J. G. WARD thought there was a contract there also. Mr. MASSEY (Franklin) said this item of £247 to reimburse Mr. Rhodes for the expenses incurred in connection with the Royal reception in Christchurch bore that interpretation, because later on provision was made in the estimates for the alteration of the residences used

<page>57</page>

by Royalty, and among them was that of Mr. [appeared on the estimates, it would be well to pass Rhodes. However, he was now informed that the liability was incurred by Mr. Rhodes, acting on instructions received from Captain Alexander, and the Committee had to pass the item. If they did not do so the tradesmen would not receive their money, unless Mr. Rhodes paid it out of his pocket ; and he thought Mr. Rhodes had done quite sufficient already. With regard to the next item, "Grant to Ministers and their Secretaries, in reimbursement of expenses incurred by them, including £150 for ordinary travelling-allowance, \$350," he certainly thought there ought to be a definite expression of opinion on the part of the Committee. He thought a great many members would agree with him that sufficient provision had already been made for the travelling-expenses of Ministers and their Secretaries ; and, as the Royal party were in the colony about twenty days, this would mean about \$17 per day in addition to the ordinary expenses already provided by law. He thought the Committee should know how much of this \$350 was intended for Ministers and how much for their Secretaries. He was surprised at Ministers putting such an item on the estimates, and, in order to give a definite expression of opinion, he would move that it be struck out. Mr. HORNSBY (Wairarapa) would move a prior amendment, to the effect that the item of \$247 granted to Mr. Rhodes be reduced by £1. as he wished to speak on that particular question. They had been informed by the Premier that another \$200 was to come forward to be debited against the colony, making something like \$470 or \$500, in round figures. He would like to point out that when a previous matter was being discussed members were told that included the whole caravansary of the Royal party throughout New Zealand, and he wanted to know why this thing was to be charged twice over. If there were contracts at Auckland and Dunedin, and this #447 in Christchurch, for supplying the Royal party, then where did the £2,257 which members were told was to pay the expenses of victualling the Royal party throughout New Zealand come in ? There was a discrepancy there, and he desired to enter his protest against what he conceived to be a double charge against the funds of the colony. In regard to some other charges later on, he had seen photographs in the illustrated papers of certain rooms where distinguished personages slept when in Auckland, and he wanted to know what had become of the furniture if the colony had paid for it. With regard to this item, it seemed to him it was placing Mr. Rhodes

in a very unfair position before the colony, because he (Mr. Hornsby) had heard it stated that it was a very mean thing on the part of Mr. Rhodes, who was supposed to be entertaining Royalty at his residence in Christchurch, to come and ask the Government of the colony to pay for it. Mr. G. J. SMITH (Christchurch City) thought, as the Minister had fully explained the circumstances under which Mr. Rhodes's name appeared on the vote. The item was a fair charge, and he thought the House would be consulting its dignity by proceeding with the estimates. He regretted exceedingly that Mr. Rhodes's name appeared on the estimates at all, because that gentleman had placed his house at the disposal of the Government, and had done everything in his power to worthily represent the City of Christchurch. He had done it well; and it seemed that the only reward he was to get was to have his name dragged across the floor about a paltry sum of £247. He thought this item ought to be passed. Mr. HUTCHESON (Wellington City) regretted very much that this item on the estimates rendered it possible for the casual man in the street to put a left-handed construction on Mr Rhodes's position in this affair. It was not a disbursement on the part of Mr. Rhodes. Mr. Rhodes had merely passed along to the Government the tradesmen's bills. Mr. SEDDON said there was a liability on Mr. Rhodes. Mr. HUTCHESON was given to understand that Mr. Rhodes merely transmitted the bills from the tradesmen in order to keep the Government out of conflict with the Auditor-General. The Government found they had no power to incur expenses in connection with a private house, and in order to get over the difficulty the expedient was adopted of making Mr. Rhodes nominally responsible for the expense. He was also given to understand that His Excellency's Private Secretary, Captain Alexander, personally supervised the alterations. Mr. Rhodes apparently gave the house to the Government for a specific purpose, and in the carrying out of the necessary alterations Captain Alexander was the party who gave the instructions. Why, then, should it be made out that Mr. Rhodes was being reimbursed for expenses he had incurred in connection with the Royal visit? No doubt Mr. Rhodes deserved the thanks of the House for the munificent way in which he had treated the Royal visitors. He would like the Government to be generous, and to make the matter quite clear. At present it was open to the construction by any biased-minded citizen to say that Mr. Rhodes was paid for everything he did; and such a conclusion would not be unnatural for the uninformed citizen to arrive at. One or two little words might be added to show that the expenses were incurred by the instructions of the Government. Mr. SEDDON said it was so stated in the estimates: "Grant to Mr. Rhodes, Mayor of Christchurch, in reimbursement of expenses incurred by him." Mr. HUTCHESON said the terms were altogether too general, and it was only fair that the Government should make it clear to the public that Mr. Rhodes was getting nothing out of the transaction. Mr. RHODES (Ellesmere) said it was only fair to the Mayor of Christchurch that it should be stated that no alterations or temporary additions to his house were made by him until the

<page>58</page>

and had the selection of the tradespeople. Sir J. G. WARD asked if the honourable gentleman was quite sure of that. Mr. RHODES said he was in the house himself with Captain Alexander when the latter went into the details as to the necessary alterations of the house and as to the selection of tradespeople. That was before Mr. Rhodes left the house. Mr. Rhodes may have recommended tradesmen, but it was only for the approval of Captain Alexander, who really made the selection. Captain Alexander went into the smallest details. There was no redecorating necessary, as the house was a new one. A small permanent addition was required, and was paid for by the Mayor, but all other additions were only of a temporary character, and were afterwards removed. If the discussion had done no other good, it bad, at any rate, removed an impression from the minds of members that the Mayor had acted as host to the Royal visitors and had been reimbursed for the expense he had been put to. But, as far as the people of the colony were concerned, the misapprehension still remained, and this item on the estimates was a record for all time that the Mayor had been repaid his expenses—a record that was not true. As for

these tradesmen, he had not paid a single penny of their accounts himself. They were still to be paid, and would be paid by the Government, so it could not be a matter of reimbursement. This was, of course, one of the things that would be trotted out against the Mayor at election times, and it was somewhat ungenerous, considering the trouble and expense the Mayor had been put to, that the Premier should have allowed the matter to appear in this way on the estimates. Mr. SEDDON said the matter had been carefully considered, and there was no other way possible of doing it. Mr. RHODES was not accusing the Government of malice prepense. It may have been an oversight, but it was a pity it was done. However, he realised that no further good could be done by prolonging the discussion, and he would have to be content to let the matter remain as it was. Sir J. G. WARD would not like any misapprehension to exist regarding the position of the matter. There seemed to be an impression on the mind of the honourable member for Ellesmere that the Government had put Mr. Rhodes's name on the estimates for ulterior purposes. That was absolutely without foundation. He would give the history of the whole matter, and members could then judge for themselves. A letter was sent by Mr. Rhodes to Mr. Donne on the 16th July, forwarding the whole of the accounts, some of which were made out in the name of Mr. Rhodes, and some in the name of the residence only. When the accounts arrived, Mr. Donne went through them, and sent them to the Minister, with a memorandum saying he considered the accounts were reasonable, and recommending them for payment. The accounts were marked, "30701. - For Cabinet consideration." He Mr. Rhodes wording of the item on the estimates, and it was somewhat unfortunate that the accounts were sent to the Government by Mr. Rhodes himself, as they were. The Government had not sent an account to Mr. Rhodes. All the accounts and the details had been sent by Mr. Rhodes himself to the department. That was the position. Mr. Rhodes was not the host in Christchurch & all. It was the Government on behalf of the colony. Mr. Rhodes placed his house at the disposal of the Royal party, and it was a very fine thing for him to do - an action that was much appreciated by the Government and, he was sure, by the whole of the colony. It appeared, however, that some honourable members were confounding two things. Mr. Rhodes gave a public entertainment in Christchurch - one of the finest ever given in the colony. It was given entirely at his own expense, and was much appreciated by every person who was privileged to be present. Mr. Rhodes also placed his private house at the disposal of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York, but he was not their host. It was the colony who was the host, and the colony and not Mr. Rhodes, therefore, had to pay the accounts. Mr. PIRANI said it was not put very clearly on the estimates. Sir J. G. WARD said, Well, at any rate, it was the colony who was the host, and it was the colony that would have to pay the accounts. The accounts were sent by Mr. Rhodes to the Government, and, as a matter of course, the item was put on the estimates in Mr. Rhodes's name. There was no other way of doing it. Some days before the Duke and Duchess went to Christchurch the preparatory arrangements had been made at Mr. Rhodes's house. He understood the family had to leave some days prior to the arrival of the Royal party to make room for a number of servants, which consisted of no less than about seventy-five people. Many things that were necessary were ordered by Mr. Rhodes under authority - indirectly or directly under the authority of the Government, perhaps - and Mr. Rhodes had properly sent every account to the Government. Well, what could the Government do but put the item on the estimates? Everybody recognised that Mr. Rhodes had placed his house freely at the disposal of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York; but, as he had said before, the colony itself was the host, and the colony had to provide the money for the cost of their entertainment in Mr. Rhodes's house. That was the whole position. Mr. MONK (Waitemata) said the Government did not act in the first place in a business-like manner: they should have had their agent to make the necessary arrangements, and he should have arranged for the accounts to have been sent in to the Government. That was the first blunder. Then, the item should have been worded something like this: "Amount of £247 charged to Mr. Rhodes by mistake, which should have been charged to Government." That was the second blunder, and

had led to all this discussion.

<page>59</page>

the word "him." cluded in another item altogether. i: Mr. LAURENSEN (Lyttelton) said he thought he would be consulting the dignity of Standing Orders will not allow it. the House and his own dignity by not speaking on this item. Canterbury members to sit here and allow this Mr. HORNSBY (Wairarapa) said, when he item to pass in its present form without going made a statement previously that certain things to a division, and therefore he suggested that had been done in various parts of the colony the name of Mr. Rhodes should be expunged ; that statement was contradicted, and he now otherwise there was danger of some slur being wished to say that the whole of this trouble cast on the Mayor of the City of Christchurch. might have been obviated if the first arrange- ment made by the Government in Christchurch they could to avoid bringing this and other items had been adhered to. For example, if the down in their present form. The Solicitor- arrangement in respect to Coker's Hotel had General was consulted, and they found that that been adhered to none of this trouble would was the only way that they could deal with the have arisen ; but a certain vice-regal gentleman matter. He could say this : that right through had poked his nose into the matter, and thus Mr. Rhodes had behaved admirably, and relieved the whole of this trouble had occurred. a situation which was most difficult. Per- Mr. TANNER (Avon) said that no gentle- sonally, he and Mr. Rhodes were excellent man in the colony had placed himself so unfriends, and he was very much pleased with the teservedly at the disposal of the Government way Mr. Rhodes had acted, and when this diffi- with respect to the Royal visit as Mr. Rhodes. culty arose he did his best to get over the He had turned out of his own home and had difficulty in respect to the payment of the given up his residence for the accommodation accounts. It had been suggested that the of the Royal visitors, and he had probably done name of Captain Alexander should be inserted. more than any other man in the colony to They could not do that, because the rules of make the visit of their Royal Highnesses a the Audit would not allow it ; and, secondly, Yet no other man's name appeared success. Captain Alexander had no authority from the on the estimates as receiving money by way Government, and if he incurred any liability it of reimbursement except Mr. Rhodes. He (Mr. would be on behalf of the Governor. Captain Tanner) did not think that was a fair thing to Alexander was not a Government officer. The do, and Mr. Rhodes's friends in the House had Audit Department would not have passed the fair cause of complaint. account unless on Ministerial authority preced- Mr. SEDDON .- What about Ministers, and ing the liability being incurred. what about the Governor? They are mentioned in the estimates the same as Mr. Rhodes. of Christchurch ? Mr. TANNER said, as to Ministers, they ex- Rhodes was the position of an agent. The pected them to do all that they had done ; but, in regard to the Governor, he thought he would Government were the principals. The agent had have something to say with respect to that incurred certain liabilities, and the Government were getting this item passed so as to reimburse matter later on. He felt that the statement of the member for Ellesmere was absolutely him, because they were the principals. If the Government were not the principals the vote for true, and could be reconciled with the explana- the item would not be there. He might remark tion now given by the Colonial Secretary, for, from his knowledge of Mr. Rhodes, Mayor of that there were some accounts which he would be Christchurch, both in that House and as a very sorry to see appear on the files of the Public Accounts of the colony. They had no right to political opponent, he was a gentleman whom go into the privacy of a house, and they would ary one in the colony might trust in matters of this kind. be doing so if that course were adopted. Then, Sir J. G. WARD .- How do you suggest that the Auditor-General might say that he wanted this matter should be dealt with ? the Governor's warrant; and he would report the matter to the House, and the question Mr. TANNER said that was a matter for the Law Draftsman, but it was a pity that it would be referred to the Public Accounts Com- mittee. Did members want that? It was a should appear in its present form. From the most difficult situation, and he might say that estimates of the year it would appear

to the future historian as if £247 had been claimed by it took the Government some time before they saw their way out of it at all. The only way Mr. Rhodes, and that he was reimbursed to get out of it was simply boldly to put it that extent. . Mr. MEREDITH (Ashley) regretted that so on the estimates. The Government could not much time had been taken up in discussing simply settle the matter by sending a cheque to Mr. Rhodes. He did not think Mr. Rhodes this question ; still, he thought it was impera- would take exception to the course which the uve, to maintain the dignity of the House and Government had taken, and he was surprised the respect due to the Mayor of Christchurch, that that gentleman's name should be expunged at the Canterbury members taking the matter up, and endeavouring, as it were, to make politi- from this item. He would suggest to the Pre- cal capital against the Government. mier two alternatives-that the name should be expunged and the name of Captain Alex- ander inserted, or that the words " on behalf Mr. SEDDON. - You cannot do that; the Mr. MEREDITH said it was not possible for Mr. SEDDON said the Government did all An Hon. MEMBER .- What about the Mayor Mr. SEDDON said the position of Mr. Hon. MEMBERS .- NO. Mr. SEDDON said the residence was given

<page>60</page>

the Government agreed to put the house in order, and that certain accounts were de- frayed by the Government. But there were these accounts which had been sent to Mr. Rhodes, and which probably were chargeable to Mr. Rhodes in the ordinary way, but which the Government accepted the responsibility of. He thought the colony was indebted to Mr. Rhodes because he had exercised supervision in re- spect to these accounts ; and he (Mr. Seddon) would have been very glad had the same care been taken in respect to some other accounts. Mr. Rhodes's friends had themselves brought on all this trouble when there was not the least necessity for it. His Excellency the Go- vernor was in exactly the same position in this respect, because the words "for and on behalf of the Government " did not appear opposite the item of expenditure incurred by His Excel- lency. Mr. J. ALLEN (Bruce) said, although in the estimates exactly the same wording was used in connection with the items for His Excellency the Governor and Mr. Rhodes, he would point out that in the Bill which had been before them that afternoon it was stated that there should be paid to His Excellency the Governor the sum of \$2,250, being the amount of expenditure incurred and disbursed by him "for and on behalf of the colony." Why should not the same words be put in the estimates in respect to Mr. Rhodes. The honourable gentleman could by Governor's message have the words " for and on behalf of the colony " inserted. Sir J. G. WARD asked if the honourable member wanted those words inserted opposite all the other items. Mr. J. ALLEN did not think there were any other items in the same position, but if there were they should be all treated fairly. The wording of this item might be used against Mr. . Rhodes later on, when this debate was forgotten-in the event of Mr. Rhodes contesting an election, for instance. Mr. SEDDON pointed out that at the head of all these items which were now being dis- cussed there appeared the following wording in the estimates : " Expenses connected with the visit of their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York, any Act to the contrary notwithstanding." Then, under that heading there appeared among the other items, "Grant to Mr. Rhodes, Mayor of Christchurch, in reimbursement of expenses incurred by him." Under the circumstances he did not see how people could think that the expense was in- curred otherwise than for and on behalf of the colony. And, even if they did think so, any one who turned up the estimates would naturally refer to the debate as published in Hansard as well. Mr. PIRANI (Palmerston) said the arrange- ments in connection with the Royal visit were a muddle from beginning to end, simply because there was no one person in charge. The Pre- mier had stated that there were other items of expenditure in this connection which would have to be placed upon the supplementary esti- Mr. Seddon tion to striking this item out and including it in the supplementary estimates ? He would point out that there was another item on the estimates for expenses connected with the resi- dence of the Mayor of Christchurch, and that might lend colour to the story that was going about that this first item was not an

expense which had been incurred in connection with the residence. Now, the Premier had quoted some words at the heading of these items in which the words "any Act to the contrary notwithstanding" were included. Those words could only apply to the vote to His Excellency, and to no other item. Mr. SEDDON said they applied to Ministers as well, because they received a certain stated salary. Mr. PIRANI said it was made to appear in the estimates as if they applied to a grant to Mr. Rhodes. It was ridiculous to state that such words were necessary to enable the payment to be made to Ministers, in face of the payment made to the Premier from the Cook Islands vote. Mr. A. L. D. FRASER (Napier) said the Government had been blamed, he thought by the member for Waitemata, for these invoices being made out in the name of the Mayor of Christchurch; but he would like to know how the Government could be blamed for that. After very generously lending his house for the entertainment of the Royal visitors, surely it was most natural that Mr. Rhodes should be present to supervise any alterations that the representatives of the Governor might suggest were necessary; and, as it had been admitted by the member for Ellesmere that the Mayor of Christchurch recommended the labour that should be employed, surely it was most natural that the accounts should be sent to Mr. Rhodes. He understood, with regard to all the houses engaged for the Royal visitors, that it was understood the Government were to pay the expenses; but it was only natural to assume that the owners should superintend and supervise any alterations that were necessary. He would like to know how could the Government prevent tradesmen from sending their accounts to Mr. Rhodes; and yet the whole debate on this question had been because these invoices were sent in Mr. Rhodes's name. The member for Ellesmere had exonerated the Government from any blame, and he asked why not let the matter drop now? The Mayor of Christchurch had received kudos all over the colony for his action, and a misapprehension that had existed in the minds of the people of the colony, that the Royal visitors were the guests of Mr. Rhodes, had been cleared up by this item. Mr. RHODES (Ellesmere) said the alterations to the residence of the Mayor of Christchurch were not extensive, and anything of a permanent nature was paid for by the Mayor himself. Mr. HUTCHESON (Wellington City) hoped the suggestion made by the honourable member for Bruce would be adopted, and that the Premier would allow this item to come off the

<page>61</page>

any estimates, making it clear, in as few words member for Franklin were somewhat ill content as possible. that Mr. Rhodes only permitted sidered. The honourable member said that the Government to incur this expenditure in Ministers and their Private Secretaries were his house. well-enough provided for, but it apparently did Mr. ALLEN said that, as the Government not strike him that these gentlemen might have had not accepted his first suggestion, he would wanted new frock coats and silk hats, or that like to ask the Minister if he would pass the it was necessary for them to get a new rig-out. item as it stood, and. when supply was reported, recommit the wording of the vote, and put coats or silk hats included in the items. For in the words that were in the Bill in connection the information of honourable members he tion with the Governor-namely, "for and on might say that the total extra expenditure in behalf of the colony." He would like to ask curred by Ministers and their Secretaries during the ruling of the Acting-Chairman if it were the Royal visit amounted to £231 16s. 5d., possible to recommit the wording of the vote independently of the usual travelling - allowance. The sum of £171 13s. 2d. was incurred The ACTING-CHAIRMAN said that the by Ministers. The total amount included whole item, both words and figures, must be some charges that really ought not to be recommitted for consideration. regarded as charges either by Ministers or Mr. J. ALLEN said he would like to ask the their Secretaries. They had, for instance, Premier if he would accept this suggestion. an item of some £14 for a reserved car over There was not a single item, except in regard the Manawatu line. One Minister had also to the Governor and Mr. Rhodes, worded in included travelling-expenses amounting to £13 this way, and in respect to the Governor the 10s., but all the other items were made up of wording had been altered in a Bill dealing with

extra charges which were made against Ministers. the question. He would undertake to say that Ministers and their Secretaries. Of course, in travel- members on the Opposition side would accept lying, throughout the colony, at that time the suggestion without debate, and if the expenses were exceptionally heavy. He might Minister would only accept the suggestion it say that at one place in the colony, where he would get the item out of the way. usually would have paid \$2 10s., his account Mr. SEDDON .could not accept the sugges- for the same service came to £17 10s. tion, and would not allow the Government to be put in a false position. If the suggestion was accepted it would be said that the Government members seemed to think that Ministers made had been forced at the last to alter the item by a profit out of the allowance given to them for Governor's message. He would not allow mem- travelling ; but, as a matter of fact, anybody bers opposite to put the Government in any who was willing could have the whole of his false position. The item was put on the esti- travelling-allowance if they would pay the ex- mates in proper manner, after careful considera- pense he was put to on occasions when he went tion, and in good faith. If a proposal was made about the colony. to recommit the estimates for the reconsidera- tion of the item it might mean that Supply "That the item, 'Grant to Ministers and their would be intercepted by a motion before the Secretaries, in reimbursement of expenses in- Committee-of-Supply stage was reached, and to curred by them, including £150 for ordinary travelling-allowance, £350,' be omitted." adopt such a proposal would be simply wasting time. The best course to take was to pass the item and say no more about it, and he would, Allen, J. if possible, avoid any further vote for Mr. Atkinson Rhodes on the supplementary estimates. If Mr. Ell Rhodes or any friend of his had said to him Gilfedder (Mr. Seddon) some days ago that there was an Hardy objection to the wording of the item, and Haselden that Mr. Rhodes might be placed in a false Hutcheson position, it was just possible that by a Go- vernor's message the words " for and on behalf Allen, E. G. of the Government " might have been added, and in that way anything such as had been Arnold suggested might have been avoided. At the Barclay sathe time, this was unnecessary, for every one Bennet knew the expenses were incurred for the colony. Collins However, he had heard no objection to it at all, Colvin and the first he had heard was when the item Field came on that afternoon. Flatman Amendment to reduce item, "Grant to Mr. Fowlds Rhodes, Mayor of Christchurch, in reimburse- Fraser, A. L. D. Millar ment of expenses incurred by him, \$247," by Fraser, W. El negatived, and item agreed to. Graham Mr. HUTCHESON could not help thinking Hall that, as far as the grant to Ministers and their Sir J. G. WARD said there were no frock Mr. MASSEY asked if that was at Rotorua. Sir J. G. WARD said, No; some honourable The Committee divided on the question, AYES, 19. Symes Lang Laurensen Tanner Thomson, J. W. Lethbridge Meredith Monk Tellers. Pirani Herries Rhodes Massey. NOES, 36. O'Meara Hall-Jones Parata Hogg Russell, G. W. Hornsby Houston Seddon Smith, G. J. Kaihau Stevens Lawry McGowan Thompson, R. Mckenzie, R. Ward Willis. McNab Tellers. Carncross Mills Napier Palmer. Majority against, 17.

<page>62</page>

Mr. PIRANI would like to know the amount paid as compensation in connection with Coker's Hotel. Sir J. G. WARD .- Nothing at all. Mr. PIRANI asked if there was not a dis- pute in reference to that. Sir J. G. WARD .-- Not now; there had been a dispute. He was informed the agreement had been broken, but not by the Government. Mr. PIRANI desired to draw attention to another item-namely, that in connection with the expense incurred in the review and massing of troops. A number of young fellows in Palmerston were deluded into going to the review at Wellington and Christchurch, under the idea that they were going to get 4s. a day. Sir J. G. WARD .- They got half-a-crown. Mr. PIRANI said they had got nothing. All that they had got was this: that the Govern- ment had incurred an expense of 2s. 4d. a day for food in connection with them. Food, the Go- vernment called it ! Raw meat - and they were given two matches each to cook it. The Feild- ing Volunteers certainly were paid 4s. a day, when they only travelled twelve miles further than the Palmerston Volunteers; and he wanted to know how this difference was made up

between the amount allowed to the Volunteers at Palmerston North and the amount allowed to the Volunteers at Feilding. In the majority of cases these young fellows left their work for a week, and were out of pocket the amount of their wages for that time as well as the amount they had to pay to keep themselves from starvation ; and, owing to mismanagement, they had had to undergo great privations : yet the Government were mean enough to deduct from their allowance 1s. 6d. a day because they did not travel exactly 100 miles. Every single penny of expense incurred by Ministers was paid out of the pockets of the country, as well as their allowance of 30s. a day; yet they acted in the way he had described towards these Volunteers, who received no benefit whatever. In connection with this mismanagement he did not think that anything so disgraceful had ever occurred in the annals of the colony. He could give the Premier one item in connection with the transport of troops from Wellington to Christchurch which would open the eyes of the public. The captain of one of these companies of Volunteers foraged round on his own account, and eventually the Wellington Harbour Board lent the men a shed on the wharf to sleep in. After considerable trouble arrangements were made for the transport of these men to Christchurch. During the whole of that week's trip the men had to incur considerable expense, because they often did not get a decent meal. He might mention, also, that while in Wellington the only way in which the men could go in a decent state to the parade was by taking off their boots and leggings, rolling up their trousers to the knees, and walking through the mud and slush, and then scraping off the mud, and thus make themselves fit to appear on parade. They had to stand in the rain several the only men in respect to whom the Government had attempted to exercise any economy with regard to their allowance. Yet £50,000 was put down on the estimates for expenses in connection with the Royal visit, as well as another £20,000 to come. Why, the liquor bill incurred would have paid these Volunteers 10s. a day each easily. He thought these men ought to have been treated differently. Mr. TANNER (Avon) said he had listened with considerable interest to the statements made by the last speaker, and, unfortunately, those statements agreed with a great many things which had come his way. He did not pretend for a moment to say that the Government were in any sense responsible for either the cold weather, or the mud in the streets of Wellington, or for the rain which fell at the time ; the men, of course, had to bear those things, which were inseparable to the position. But there were things for which the Government were responsible, and which, he thought, would discredit any Administration in this connection. One of the greatest blessings that could befall New Zealand at the present time, he believed, would be a Guy Fawkes conspiracy which would send the Defence Office sky-high. This sort of thing - indifference, neglect, and extravagance - had been going on for years; it had been prevalent for at least two years-since the departure of the First Contingent to South Africa in 1899. In his electorate there was a man who was engaged to pack hay, which was to be put on board the vessel which took away the First Contingent. That man had never been paid yet. And, what was worse, although the work was ordered to be done by a Government official, it had been repudiated by the Government ; and he might mention that the man had to do the work on a Sunday night. That man had claimed, and claimed in vain, and he (Mr. Tanner) had brought the matter under the notice of the Premier, yet he had never obtained any inquiry, and the man had never got any money. There were several pounds due to that man at the present time. As a last resource he had recommended the man to petition the House. There was a time when several contingents were being despatched in rapid succession, when he (Mr. Tanner) almost dreaded to go into Christchurch, owing to the way in which he was buttonholed by men who had claims on the Government for work actually performed for the Defence Department. He had brought these cases under the notice of the Premier. but had got no answer -the department was immovable. Some of these men had obtained payment, but others had not. With regard to the review in Christchurch, some of the North Island Volunteers had told him that they were distinctly promised 4s. a day if they went to Christchurch for that review. Some of the men who were in the Printing Office, remembering previous

experiences, exacted a promise that they should be paid their ordinary wages whilst absent ; but when they returned the promise was at first repudiated, but he un-

<page>63</page>

out of that 4s. a day, 2s. 4d. was stopped for food ; but as the men had been away for several days they expected that the remainder would be forthcoming. He had, however, been informed that the commanding officer of one company had since told his men that the rest of the money would be required to pay for the straw the men slept on in Christchurch. Such a plea deserved the widest publicity. Altogether he considered the administration of the department was a scandal from beginning to end. Mr. SEDDON said, in reply to the member for Palmerston, there had been a standing regulation for years past that unless the men travelled a hundred miles the larger amount was not paid. If that regulation was bad now draw attention to a statement appearing in it it had always been bad. On this occasion, as far as he knew, the officers commanding the accounts due to the local tradesmen for tracts let the various corps know what they were supplies had been paid. He thought it was to receive, and that they would have to come under the ordinary regulations; and if there item " Expenses connected with the renovation had been any promise given by an officer commanding that there would be something paid beyond what was allowed by regulation, he, as the following residences placed at disposal of the Government for use of guests, namely : Defence Minister, would have considered him- the Northern Club and Mr. Alfred Nathan's, self committed to it, but he should take steps to prevent any officer going beyond the regulation- Auckland ; at Christchurch, Mayor's residence and Mr. Beswick's ; at Dunedin, Messrs. Den- tions in future. Now, as to the complaints about the cooking of the food, there had been niston's, Stephenson's, Laing's, Sinclair's, and an inquiry into the matter, and he regretted Park's, £1,000," he would like to ask the Minis- to say that neglect had been proved. There ter in connection with which of these places was any rent paid or to be paid ? was no doubt that the cooking-apparatus should have been under cover, and the mistake had entered into an agreement in every case for been made in allowing the men to camp at taking over certain places, and that would be Newtown Park at all. Another mistake was that the cooking was let to one contractor. It called rent. would have been far better to have had several the Mayor's residence at Christchurch ? contracts for the work. But, as the report and the evidence taken during the inquiry had been sent to the officers implicated for their explana- Auckland ? tion, it would be better to say nothing further in the meantime. Later on he would know paid so much per head for the people entertained how to deal with those who were at fault. An Hon. MEMBER .- What about the con- paid for Mr. Nathan's house. tractor ? Mr. SEDDON said the contractor should not get his money if he had not carried out his con- tract properly. As to the conveyance of the troops by steamer, his attention had already been drawn to it, and the explanation was that places ? the steamer that was expected to convey the paid for certain alterations in private houses troops did not arrive, and the steamer that was there, as they did not want to put the Royal ready had not sufficient accommodation for the visitors or the colony under monetary obliga- number of passengers. This led to great in- tion to private people. convenience ; but, under the circumstances, the best that could be done had been done, and he in this item in connection with the Fernhill quite approved of the action taken by the Club, Dunedin. officer in charge. So far as the Christchurch arrangements were concerned, he believed there £253 for renovation, and the Government also was general satisfaction expressed on all sides. paid so much per head for the victualling of In reply to the member for Avon, he could say the people who went there. that there was no money stopped from the pay of the men for the straw they slept on. The Government had paid over £89 for straw for give the Committee an idea as to the various amounts paid in the different cities under this the men. And, as to the delay in payment to the item of £1,000. He thought it was only right men. he might say he had only that day re- that members should be furnished with these ceived a voucher for the sum of \$500 for pay- details. ment to some of the southern corps. Now, as June and the vouchers only

left Dunedin on the 16th of this month, he could not understand what the officers commanding the district had been doing all this time, keeping the men out of their money. And then there was further delay, because, the vouchers having left on the 16th of this month, allowing a couple of days from Dunedin, it took eight days before they reached him, and he had in consequence asked for an explanation. There was no intention on his part to delay the payment of this money, and unless the officers sharpened themselves up a little in connection with these matters he would have to look for fresh officers. Mr. BARCLAY (Dunedin City) wished to southern paper, that, although it was nearly three months since the Royal visit, none of quite time they were settled. In regard to the tion, furnishing, alterations, rent, &c., of Sir J. G. WARD said the Government Mr. BARCLAY asked, Did they pay rent for Sir J. G. WARD .- No. Mr. BARCLAY .- To the Northern Club, Sir J. G. WARD said, No; the Government Mr. BARCLAY asked if there was any rent Sir J. G. WARD .- No. Mr. BARCLAY .- For Mr. Beswick's place ? Sir J. G. WARD .- Yes. Mr. BARCLAY .- For any of the Dunedin Sir J. G. WARD said, No; the Government Mr. BARCLAY asked if there was anything Sir J. G. WARD said there was a sum of Mr. BARCLAY asked if the Minister could

<page>64</page>

ber wanted the details he could have them, but he really did not think he would find them interesting. They were very minute and numerous. Mr. WILLIS (Wanganui) did not think the Premier intended to reflect on the officer commanding at Newtown Park for the muddle that occurred there, but, as a matter of fact, he had done so. His opinion was that Lieut .- Colonel Sommerville had been very badly used. He was left alone when others were enjoying themselves at the Royal reception, and any recommendations he made in regard to cooking or other camp matters were not given effect to. An attempt had been made to throw the whole blame on his shoulders. He thought this was extremely unjust, and that in fairness they should let the matter rest until time had been given to that officer to reply. He (Mr. Willis) said the military heads of the department were the people mainly responsible, and they should bear the blame. Mr. MASSEY (Franklin) said, referring to the muddle at Newtown Park, and to a smaller extent at Christchurch, he once heard the Premier say that if he had control of affairs in South Africa he would make some of the generals sit up. The right honourable gentleman was also Defence Minister, and when we had a little show of our own in the neighbourhood of a large city both the men and horses were starved and the utmost discomfort prevailed. He did not know what would happen if a similar gathering was held two or three hundred miles from a large centre. He was in sympathy with Mr. Barclay in his endeavour to get details for these items. It was the duty of members to see that money was not improperly expended, and to know how it was expended, and, so far as this item was concerned, he would like to know whether the luncheons given to the veterans in the different centres were provided for in the vote of £20,000 ? Mr. SEDDON .- Yes. Mr. MASSEY said, Perhaps the easiest way would be for the Minister in charge to give the details of this .£20,000, and also of the succeeding item of £12,153. Mr. SYMES (Egmont) said he did not understand the Premier to blame Lieut .- Colonel Sommerville, because he would be putting the blame on the wrong shoulders had he done so. Lieut .- Colonel Sommerville made suggestions in regard to cooking and other matters in connection with the encampment at Newtown Park to the officer commanding the district, and repeated them, and they were ignored ; but he ventured to say that had the recommendations been given effect to the scandal would not have occurred. This was not the first muddle that had occurred here; there were muddles every time troops were brought to this city. They were absolutely incompetent and incapable of catering for anything over fifty men. It was a marvellous thing that Volunteers brought from the South Island were looked after and fed on the road ; but the Volunteers from the I obvious in that camp: First, that the men day, and were expected to stay there until ten o'clock the next morning without anything to eat ; or, if they did get anything, it was at their own expense, as was done on the occasion of the visit of the Imperial troops. He

thought the sooner the head of the department, or the Government, shifted whoever was in charge and got some one who knew how to look after the men, the better it would be for the men and for the colony. Mr. MONK (Waitemata) was one of those who considered that we had spent too much in military display by fully £20,000 or £30,000, and that the balance of the \$75,000 could have been spent on behalf of fifty other purposes with much more benefit to the colony. He thought the Premier would remember an instance where some northern troops had been brought down to Wellington, and no provision whatever was made for their accommodation, and they became indebted to the hospitality of the people of a small township north of here for the accommodation that ought to have been officially provided. It seemed to him the department was incapable of dealing with any number beyond fifty troops without some complaint arising, and he was sure there was no one more conscious of that than the Right Hon. the Premier. He would prove it, for as he passed by the Premier's residence the other day he saw him flying the Union Jack with a white border, which was the British signal all the world over that a pilot was wanted. He thought flying the Pilot Jack was very significant of our condition, though he should prefer to see him flying the blue ensign with the badge of the Southern Cross. As to the review of troops at the different centres, the Premier had admitted that the season was a bad one, and it was very unwise to risk the moving about of a large number of young people, and subject them to the inclemency of the weather in the depth of winter. If a few choice troops had been selected at each of the centres to form a bodyguard for the Royal visitors it would have been better than all the show that had been made. The fact of the matter was the country could not well afford the cost of such a show. The welfare of posterity had to be looked to, and there were many other matters that required urgent attention in the interests of the colony, and until they were provided for there was really no money to throw away in useless directions such as much of the displays that were made on the occasion of the Royal visit. For himself, he thought that, instead of £75,000) being expended, as the Premier had said would be the cost, not more than \$30,000 or £40,000 should have been spent. Such a sum would have done ample justice to the Royal visitors, and at the same time there would have been no feeling that the colony had gone so seriously beyond the amount that he thought should have been squandered. Mr. HUTCHESON (Wellington City) wished to say a word or two about the affair in the Newtown camp, more especially as the Minister was concerned in the matter. Two things were

<page>65</page>

were housed in bad, rotten tents; and, second, that there was no covering for the cooking-place. As far as the latter drawback was concerned, it appeared to be a case of inability to put the covering up when the weather was wet, and when the weather turned fine it was considered that no covering was required. Some of the officers who had charge of New Zealand's sons in the dangers of war actually proved on this occasion that they did not know how to feed the men in the Empire City of the colony, where they were actually right in the middle of plenty. He thought that if he had been a Volunteer he would have got something better than uncooked food to eat, and something better than foul water to drink, and he would have been justified in so doing, seeing that others were getting quite a different class of food. He would like to get an expression of opinion from the Minister in charge as to whether he did not think it would be fair to pay to the citizens of Wellington the money which it could be clearly shown would have to be expended before Newtown Park could be put into a proper state of repair again. He would also like to know how much money had been paid to the Commissioner in the vote of £12,153. Sir J. G. WARD said a sum of £467 had been paid as the salaries and expenses of the Commissioners. Mr. HUTCHESON would like to know the particular amounts paid to each Commissioner. Sir J. G. WARD said the salary was £100 & month for about three months and a half. As to the question referred to by the member for Waitemata, the honourable member had said the expenditure in connection with the Royal visit should have been kept down. Well, he #cc-zero did not believe that, judged by what had taken place

in other countries, the expenditure in New Zealand was heavy. In Capetown there was an expenditure of £100,000 on the occasion of the Royal visit. That information had reached New Zealand by letter only that day, and that colony, it had to be remembered, was at present in a disturbed state. In New Zealand, unlike anywhere else, the Royal party had been entertained at five different places, and, no matter how economical one might wish to be, when the expenditure had to be divided over five places it would be seen that by comparison with the expenditure of other colonies, and at Capetown, the expenditure in New Zealand had not been excessive. An Hon. MEMBER said, Look at what you got from the citizens. Sir J. G. WARD said, Yes, of course, something handsome was contributed by the citizens in connection with the respective towns, and in Australia it was the same. He was informed the Governor-General in Australia had received a contribution of £8,000 from the State. The details of the item of £20,000 he (Mr. Ward) could not give exactly, because in a matter of the sort there would necessarily be some fluctuations: some of the accounts were in dispute and others had yet to be gone into. However, approximately, the expenditure was: (1) VOL. OXIX. - 4. Cost of conveyance by sea and land, other than Government railways, \$7,000; (2) Rations, £5,900; (3) Pay, net, after the deduction of rations, \$7,900. Mr. G. J. SMITH (Christchurch City) said that the military display at Christchurch was in every way worthy of the colony and worthy of the occasion. The member for Waitemata made some remarks about the great cost of this display to the colony—namely, \$20,000. If the honourable member would only bear in mind that there were ten thousand troops there, he must recognise that the expense was not extraordinary, and that the display was worthy of the occasion. Visitors from England had expressed themselves highly delighted with it. He did not want to deal with the Newtown Park scandal—there would be another occasion for doing so—but a great deal of that trouble might have been avoided if the officers had known their duty and looked after their men. If the officers in command had looked after the thing properly, after the first meal they would have seen that satisfactory arrangements were made. The member for Egmont made some remarks about the men coming down in the train not being attended to in regard to meals as they should have been. He (Mr. G. J. Smith) thought, if that was so, it was the fault of the officers of the various companies, who ought to have ordered their men to parade with knapsacks containing a meal. As to the vote of £20,000, he thought the colony ought to congratulate itself that the amount was not £40,000. From what he saw at Christchurch he would have been quite prepared to hear that the cost was £40,000. He hoped that this item would be passed. Mr. PIRANI (Palmerston) said the honourable member for Egmont had referred to the treatment of Volunteers during the time they were travelling on the railway. He (Mr. Pirani) thought it nothing short of a scandal that men should be asked to travel between New Plymouth and Wellington by train without any arrangements being made for their obtaining refreshments on the journey. He would give honourable members an idea of what Ministers thought to be proper provision for gentlemen travelling between New Plymouth and Wellington. He referred to those people who had attended the functions at Rotorua—public men, Pressmen, and others. They had dinner at half-past six in the evening before they started from New Plymouth; at eleven pm. they reached Hawera, and there was dinner ready for them there; at half-past one they reached Aramoho, and there was dinner ready there; at four a.m. they reached Palmerston North, and there was a meal ready there. Let members compare that with the treatment of the Volunteers, who had to travel the whole of the distance without any provision being made for meals. He thought this was a matter which deserved some consideration at the hands of Ministers. He moved, That the item, £20,000, be reduced by £5, to indicate the disapproval of the House of the arrangements made by the Government and their officers in connection

<page>66</page>

with the neglect to pay Volunteers. Mr. COLLINS (Christchurch City) could not agree to the reduction of the amount by £5, although he recognised that the honourable gentleman wished to protest against the

arrangements of the department in connection with the sending of the troops to that review. He believed that this £20,000 was well spent on the review, and he would rather see the amount increased than reduced, if that increase carried with it the assurance that the men would be properly treated. Mr. WILFORD (Wellington Suburbs) was unable to support the amendment of the honourable member for Palmerston, but he only wished now to say a few words in reference to the Newtown Park scandal. He took part in the inquiry into that affair in the way of arranging the evidence for the Commissioners, and he asked, on behalf of the rank and file, that he should be allowed to be present at the inquiry, not professionally but as an ex-Volunteer, to conduct the inquiry before the Commission. He might say that if the Defence staff had listened to the representations made to them by Lieut. - Colonel Sommerville before the men went into camp at Newtown Park that disgraceful affair would not have taken place. Two letters were written by Lieut. - Colonel Sommerville. Sir J. G. WARD. - I think this is the wrong place to go into the question of who is responsible for the whole thing. Mr. WILFORD said the Minister in saying that showed he had not read the evidence taken before the Commission. He only now wished to ask honourable members to read the whole of the evidence before they condemned Lieut. - Colonel Sommerville, a man who had done so much in the past for New Zealand, in view of the fact that the Colonel was unable to reply on his own behalf. Sir J. G. WARD had no objection to the honourable member defending Lieut. - Colonel Sommerville at the right time—that was, when the Defence estimates were before them. The whole question and position of the Defence and Volunteer officers could then be fully discussed. The Committee divided on the question, "That the item, '£20,000' be reduced by £5." AYES, 18. Bollard Lang Symes Graham Lethbridge Tanner Hardy Massey Thomson, J. W. Haselden Meredith Tellers. Herries Monk Atkinson Hornsby Pirani. Parata Hutcheson NOES, 38. Allen, E. G. Hall Ell Arnold Field Hall-Jones Fisher Barclay Heke Bennet Fowlds Hogg Carncross Fraser, A. L. D. Kaihau Carroll Fraser, W. Laurenson Colvin Gilfedder Lawry Mr. Pirani Wilford Mackenzie, T. Palmer Russell, G. W. Willis. McKenzie, R. Seddon McNab Tellers. Millar Collins Stevens Thompson, R. Smith, G. J. Mills Majority against, 20. Amendment negatived. Mr. T. MACKENZIE (Waihemo) wished to know whether the item, "New Zealand Flora, \$300," was for Mr. Kirk's Flora of New Zealand. Sir J. G. WARD said this was the salary of Mr. T. F. Cheeseman, who was appointed last year to prepare a Students' Flora. Mr. T. MACKENZIE said a very valuable work had been brought out recently, and the Government had encouraged it, and rightly, he thought. He wished to refer to a most valuable work which had been prepared by Mr. Hamilton, and which, he thought, would be a most excellent work for this country to contribute towards. In regard to the item, "Expenses, Royal Commission on Federation, £3,800," he thought that the small farmers' interests had been most inadequately represented on that Commission. He found on that Commission that there were more lawyers than farmers, and more newspaper men than farmers, and more commercial men than farmers. There was only one gentleman farmer, Captain Russell, who was a runholder, on the Commission, and Mr. John Roberts, merchant and runholder. There was not one single small-farmer representative on the whole Commission. He took no exception to the ability of the Commissioners, who were an excellent lot of men; but it was a foregone conclusion what this Commission would report, because we knew that a majority of the Commissioners had expressed convictions against federation before appointment, and did not approach the question with an unbiassed mind. He wished to move a reduction of \$5 on this vote as an expression on the part of the House of the inadequacy of the representation of small farmers on this Commission. The whole Commission was a wasteful expenditure of the money of the taxpayer. Why, this very report cost £640 for printing alone, not including the cost of reporting, and it would never be read, because no possible result would ensue. Mr. COLLINS (Christchurch City) said he wished to move, That the item "Miscellaneous entertainments, including Commissioners' salaries and expenses, also expenses of invited guests from Australia and elsewhere, Press representatives, £12, 153," be reduced by £1,000. His object in doing so was to elicit, if

possible, some information from the Minister as to who were the Commissioners here referred to, and what their salaries were. He presumed these were the Commissioners who were supposed to have charge of the arrangements made for the celebrations during the Royal visit. Rumours - had gone abroad that very materially affected the public with regard to these Commissioners .. It had been said, with what amount of truth he

<page>67</page>

in receipt of \$100 per month. He did not know for how many months, but he could only describe this expenditure of money as a wicked extravagance. It was surely quite unnecessary that men should be appointed at such extravagant sums as these to travel up and down the country. He had had some little experience of what the Commissioner did in Christchurch, and all he did was to supply them with news they already had from the daily papers ; and, As for the other work the Commissioner did, he (Mr. Collins) said that, so far as the people of Christchurch were concerned, they did not want any skaking up at the instigation of any Commissioner. He could not understand this unwarrantable extravagance on the part of the Government. He would like to know if these men received travelling-allowances in addition to \$100 a month. He had nothing to say against legitimate expenses incurred in connection with guests invited to the colony from Australia or elsewhere. Of course it was only right that proper courtesy should have been extended to them. Mr. MASSEY (Franklin) asked, Were the Commissioners appointed in the large centres paid salaries? Sir J. G. WARD said there was only one paid Commissioner. Mr. MASSEY said that was what he wanted to know. The total of £12,153 covered a number of miscellaneous items, about which he thought the House should have some definite information. Would the Minister give the details ? Sir J. G. WARD said that included in the total of £12,153 were the following :- d. B. Railway fares and freights 3,700 0 0 Steamer fares and freights, &c ... 584 3 9 Food, camp utensils, &c. 2,571 9 5 611 Tents 2 3 .. 175 12 11 Travelling-expenses Rent. and nightwatchmen, Auckland 43 0 6 . Cartage, &c. .. 159 16 0 .. 47 0 0 Rent of paddock Labour, grand stand and race- 145 7 10 course Cutting raupo, firewood, cleaning. &c. Parliamentary reception (including luncheon and dinner) 1,848 0 0 .. Medais for school children 1,157 0 0 .. 1,050 0 Addresses, cards, &c. .. 0 .. 400 Kinematographs 0 0 686 Canoe and canoe 0 0 . Commissioners' salaries and expenses Laying foundation stone, Rail- 900 0 0 way offices, Wellington .. The figures, as he had said before, might be decreased or they might be increased, as some of the accounts had not yet been settled. Amendment. To reduce item " £12,153 " by £1,000, negatived. Mr. HERRIES (Bay of Plenty) moved to reduce the item " £12,153 " by £5. He did so for about the items included in the total sum. Were the souvenir cards included ? Sir J. G. WARD said, Yes : addresses and cards were included, at a cost of £1,050. Mr. HERRIES said a large number of the souvenir cards had been sent out ; but many of the invited guests to whom they had been promised had not yet received them. Mr. SEDDON said that a number of cards had yet to be sent out to those who were entitled to them. Mr. HERRIES was of the opinion that some of the cards were very good, and a credit to any establishment. The Rotorua card, for instance, was an excellent production ; it was prepared by Mr. A. D. Willis, the member for Wanganui. At any rate, it had that honourable gentleman's name at the foot. Mr. SEDDON said the card was done at Mr. Willis's office ; but he was not the contractor. Mr. HERRIES said it was a fine piece of work, and a credit to -- well, he could not say to Mr. Willis, or he was afraid it would bring that honourable gentleman under the Disqualification Act. Sir J. G. WARD said he would do his best to see that the invited guests received copies of the souvenir cards. Mr. MASSEY (Franklin) drew attention to the item for railway-fares and freights \$3,700, and he said he noticed that there was also an item of £10,000 for the carriage of troops, cadets, veterans, and Maoris. He would like the Minister to state who were the persons for whom these railway-fares were paid. Then, there was another item of \$724 for travelling expenses. Who incurred those expenses ? Then, there was the item £686 for presentations. To whom were the presentations made, and what did they consist of ?

Sir J. G. WARD said that was for the canoe and casket which was presented to the Duke and Duchess in Auckland. The amount set down for railway-fares included the fares of Maoris from Rotorua to Auckland, and also the fares of Natives from Wellington to New Plymouth. He might add that there was still a small amount to be charged for railage. The Government could not give the exact figures at present. Mr. MONK (Waitemata) said he quite approved of the presentation made by the colony to the Royal visitors. He might mention, however, that at Rotorua the Natives made presentations of greenstones which were heirlooms of great historic value, and he did not think the returned presents made to them were at all creditable. Mr. BARCLAY (Dunedin City) asked if the Press representatives were passed free all through the colony; and whether all their expenses had been paid. He might state that it was thought their presence would mean a good advertisement to the colony, but, so far as he had seen, that expectation had not been fulfilled.

<page>68</page>

the Government were entitled to credit for the admirable manner in which this item was worded - namely, "Miscellaneous entertainments, including Commissioners' salaries and expenses, also expenses invited guests from Australia and elsewhere, Press representatives, £12,153." Commissioners' salaries and expenses were part of the miscellaneous entertainments, just as corner men's salaries would be an item under the heading, "Christy Minstrel entertainments." So far as he could learn, this gentleman had not done any work at all in any part of the colony that entitled him to such remuneration. Now, in the item the words "Salaries to Commissioners" appear. Did he understand the honourable gentleman to say now that there was only one salary? Sir J. G. WARD.- There is only one Commissioner and one salary. Mr. ATKINSON thought the sum of £350 paid to Mr. Holmes for three months and a half's so-called work was out of all proportion. His chief work seemed to be to send florid and verbose telegrams in the Premier's own style all over the country; the amateur Commissioners drew no salary, and sent no telegrams. Then, there was the item "Food," but he wanted to know where the grog came in, in these estimates. What was the cost of the liquid refreshment as compared to the solid in connection with this Royal visit? Under the item "Present," he understood there was a book of ferns and other presents included in that item. Sir J. G. WARD said that represented a single present from the colony. Mr. ATKINSON wished to know, then, where all the other presents came in. Mr. T. MACKENZIE (Waihemo) believed Mr. Holmes had done some good work for the colony in connection with the Royal visit. Mr. A. L. D. FRASER (Napier) said, After the remarks of the honourable member for Dunedin City (Mr. Barclay), he thought it was only due to the visiting Press representatives to show what they had done in placing before the public the geographical features and the beauties of New Zealand. In Black and White, for instance, there was a reference to a lovely place in Tasmania, "Hobart Town, New Zealand, where their Royal Highnesses hoped to be next Tuesday"; and in another paper there was a reference to a charming townlet named Auckland in the Hauraki Gulf, Bay of Islands; and it went on to say that after staying there a day or two the Royal party would go on to the wonderland of Victoria, Rotorua. He was not joking; it was absolutely true that those statements were in print. Nevertheless, taking the matter seriously, the visit of the illustrious representatives of the English Press had been of inestimable benefit to the colony. Mr. FISHER (Wellington City) asked how many Press representatives were referred to in this item. Sir J. G. WARD.- There were, he thought, seven of them. Mr. HASELDEN (Patea) thought it was a colony, through the Government, had entertained the Royal visitors as they were entitled to be entertained, and it was not consistent with the dignity of the country to quibble over the items. Mr. PIRANI (Palmerston) said, From the remarks of the honourable member for Napier one would think that the illustrations he had mentioned were the only ones published, and that that was the way in which Press representatives were doing their work. Now, in the Sphere and the King there were some really splendid illustrations, which alone would do considerable good to the colony. Amendment, To reduce the item by £5, negatived. Mr. WILFORD

(Wellington Suburbs) would like to know what was the meaning of the item, "Expenses under 'The Fine Arts Copyright Act, 1887,' £10." He asked this for a particular purpose. Sir J. G. WARD said it represented fees under the Act in payment of the Registrar. Mr. WILFORD asked if the Minister would take an early opportunity of amending the copyright law. He would like him to carry forth his views mentioned at a meeting a short time ago in a Bill. He might point out that over in Australia the penalty for piracy—that had occurred in New Zealand once or twice—was imprisonment; and the Chief Justice had said that, as there was some uncertainty about the law, it required the attention of the Legislature. Sir J. G. WARD said he was of opinion that an amendment was required to prevent piracy, but whether they could give effect to legislation this session was a question he was not prepared to answer at present. Mr. FISHER (Wellington City) said that a few moments ago they listened to an unreflective and thoughtless statement from the Premier that he would set apart a day this session to discuss the Federation question. Mr. SEDDON said he promised at the commencement of the session to give an opportunity to discuss it. Mr. FISHER said it was a little difficult to tell when the honourable gentleman was joking, for he usually buried his jokes so deep; but he really wondered whether the right honourable gentleman meant to say that the Federation question could be discussed in one day. Did the honourable gentleman think the House could seriously and exhaustively discuss the question in a week? Would the honourable gentleman kindly say whether he was joking or not. Before dissecting the composition of the Commission, he would draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that the printing of the report and evidence alone cost \$680, to say nothing of the shorthand-writing and secretarial fees. The total cost of the Commission, as the estimates showed, was £3,800, and he asked the Premier to tell the Committee, if he would graciously condescend to do so, what justification there was for the appointment of the Federation Commission. The honour-

<page>69</page>

Australia in the month of January this year, at the time of the opening of the Commonwealth, and the people of New Zealand were informed by means of numerous interviews which appeared in the Australian newspapers, and by dialogues between the right honourable gentleman and many foremost statesmen of the Colonies of Australia, that he was distinctly opposed to the federation of New Zealand with Australia. It was his clear belief that it would not be advantageous to New Zealand to join with Australia. Well, the right honourable gentleman returned to this colony on the 6th February, having given the people of Australia to understand that there was not the least probability of New Zealand joining in the Federation. In the meantime a Commission had been set up to investigate and report upon the question whether they ought or ought not to federate with Australia—the question which the honourable gentleman had himself already determined. This being the case, he would like to be informed whether it was at all likely that the report of the Commission, if it had been in favour of federation, would have had the least effect upon the Right Hon. the Premier or his Government, he having so strongly expressed his view previously as being opposed to federation? Mr. SEDDON.—I did nothing of the kind. Mr. FISHER said that several Australian newspapers broadly stated that the right honourable gentleman was adverse to the federation of New Zealand with Australia, and regretted his attitude upon the subject. The honourable gentleman had on one or two occasions endeavoured to correct what he called the erroneous views disseminated by the newspapers of Australia, which views were based upon his own public utterances. The clear deduction from all that the honourable gentleman said in Australia was that he was opposed to federation, and therefore it followed that if the report of the Commission had been in favour of federation it would have had no effect whatever. It would have been mere leather and prunella. Therefore the expenditure of £3,800 upon the Commission was a deliberate and sinful waste of public money. He came now to the composition of the Commission. He differed with the member for Waihemo, who objected to city men being selected as Commissioners. His opinion was that it did not matter if the

whole Commission had been selected from the four cities of the colony, or from one city. It mattered nothing where the men were selected from, provided they were men capable of adjudicating upon such a large question. There were men placed on the Commission, he undertook to say, who really to this moment, notwithstanding all their travel and investigations, did not understand the ABC of the subject of Australian Federation. Mr. MASSEY (Franklin) said it would be useless to set apart a day to discuss the question of Federation. He was as strongly in favour of federation as any member in the House; but he recognised that, so far as the for discussing it in the way proposed by the Premier. At any rate, when the session was so near its close, it was impossible to do justice to such a subject. He thoroughly agreed with the member for Waihemo and the member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher) in that the Commission was not representative of the most important class in the community - the small farmers. There was not a single representative of that class on the Commission. After the end of last session a hint reached him that if he approached the Premier on the subject he would be appointed a Commissioner; but he did not ask for the favour. Mr. SEDDON said the honourable member would have made a very good member of the Commission. Mr. MASSEY thanked the honourable gentleman for his good opinion of him. Anyhow, when he saw the names of the gentlemen who had been appointed on the Commission he could have written out their report without going to all the expense incurred. They were appointed for the reason that they were opposed to federation, and it was really nothing but a farce to set up the Commission at all. As he had said, it was useless to discuss the question. The colony had made up its mind that it was not going to federate, and had to abide by the result; and public opinion could not be changed until it was recognised how foolish the colony had been in refusing to join the great Commonwealth of Australia. Mr. T. MACKENZIE (Waihemo) did not object to a proportion of city men being on the Commission, but what he did object to as far as those men were concerned was that they were not familiar with the agricultural interests. If they had been familiar with the agricultural interests it would have been all right, but they knew little about it, and to think that of the ten Commissioners only one was a country representative - had the Farmers' Union then been in force this would not have occurred. That it was a foregone conclusion what the Commission would report was undoubted. Why, not only had a majority expressed their united disapproval of federation, but one had dropped into poetry, and in verse declaimed against federation. He referred to the otherwise excellent poem by our worthy Chairman, Major Steward. And these were the Commissioners who were to approach with unbiassed minds this most important question of Federation. Every one knew what they would report, so that the thing was an expensive farce, and it was fore-ordained that we would not have the slightest chance of federating, no matter how necessary it might be in the interests of our farmers to do so. His amendment, he would like to say, was moved as a protest against the small farmers being unrepresented on the Commission and the disproportionate representation of our backbone industries; so that, as a matter of fact, agriculturists were unable to express their valuable opinions on this very important question. The exports of agricultural produce from the colony came to £10,000,000 sterling; gold,

<page>70</page>

sterling; so that, if anything, the farming community should have had a preponderance of representation on the Commission, and the gold-fields should also have been represented. But the towns were permitted to dominate all our works, although the towns were entirely dependent on the country, agriculture, and mining for their very existence. Mr. FISHER (Wellington City) said that when the Premier was in Australia he dwelt largely on the question of reciprocity, and the affection which one branch of the colonial family ought to show to another. We were brothers in heart - and much more "folther-i-do." But to show how much the minds of members of the Commission were dominated by the minds of the Government, it was only necessary to allude to the proceedings of the first meeting of the Commission held in Wellington, when the Commission, being influenced by the superior mind of the Govern-

ment, decided that its meetings should not be open to the Press. That conclusion evoked a chorus of indignation from the newspapers of the colony, and, in consequence, the Acting- Premier (Mr. Ward) wrote to the Commission protesting against the proceedings being closed to the Press. The Commission quailed. It collapsed. At the next meeting, at Invercar- gill, the question was again considered, and the proceedings of the Commission were thrown open to the Press, as directed by the Govern- ment. If the minds of the Commission could be dominated in that way by the Govern- ment, it was only reasonable to conclude that on the larger question of Federation the minds of the Commission would again be dominated by the stronger mind of the Go- vernment. As to the composition of the Com- mission, one might with reason have thought it would have been composed of the men most capable intellectually to meet the leading states- men of Australia. Could they imagine some members of the Commission he could name being called upon to argue the question of Federation with such men as Barton, Reid, Deakin, or Kingston-those men of towering intellect ? Why, the colony might as well have sent babes in swaddling clothes to discuss the question, as to send some members of the Commission to discuss such a subject with men of the intellectual power he had just named. If there really was a genuine desire to ascertain the minds of the people of this colony on the subject of Federation, and to contrast that opinion with the opinion of the people of Australia, was this the way to go about it ? He admitted that some of the New Zealand representatives were of equal ability with the Australian representatives. The Hon. Mr. C. C. Bowen was a credit to the colony. Captain Russell was a man who was entitled to represent the colony. Mr. John Roberts and Mr. W. S. Reid were capable men, but at the same time he saw no special reason why Mr. Reid should have been selected. The late Mr. Justice Richmond has placed on record his views on the subject of a federal judiciary, Mr. T. Mackenzie that great man on such a great subject were still available ; but he ventured to say that not one man who occupied a seat on the Commis- sion was able to say where Mr. Justice Rich- mond's views were to be found on that phase of . the .Federation question - the Australian judiciary. There could be no objection to the names he had mentioned, however, but there were others in regard to whom he for- bore to say anything. Over the names of the two gentlemen selected from the City of Wellington he would prefer to draw a veil. If it were intended that this colony should be worthily represented, it ought to have been represented by men who had given some pre- vious study to the question. If the matter went to the vote he would vote with the honourable member for Waihemo. The report and evidence stood as a monument of the most fatuous folly. No more ridiculous mass of evi- dence had ever been put together on the subject of Australian federation. It could only be looked upon with a feeling of pity and shame. It would have been far better to have spent the money in making roads than to spend it in this way. There was no reason for setting up this Commission, for the Government was in a posi- tion to say whether the colony ought to federate or not; and no report from any Commission would have influenced them in any way what- ever. The Right Hon. R. J. Seddon had de- creed ! What more was wanted? He agreed with the honourable member for Franklin, that the question had been trifled with in a most discreditable manner. Mr. PIRANI (Palmerston) said he believed this expenditure was one of the worst instances of the useless waste of public money the Go- vernment had ever been guilty of. He had been surprised at some of the men who had taken seats on the Commission, who he had not thought could have been guilty of encouraging the Government in what was plainly an effort to balk proper consideration of the question. The whole idea of the Government seemed to have been to get up a picnic for a few gentle- men. It was a pity they could not strike the amount off the estimates. Mr. FISHER (Wellington City) wished to make a remark that he would rather have made if the honourable member for Hawke's Bay had been present-namely, that that gentleman, nominally occupying the position of leader of the Opposition, ought not to have accepted a position on the Commission. As leader of a party he ought to have held himself aloof, so that, if the subject were to be honestly debated afterwards, he would be in a position to express a dispassionate and judicial opinion. Mr. SEDDON

(Premier) said he could not sit there and hear the member for Wellington City, or any other member, condemn gentlemen who had given their services to the colony as Royal Commissioners, and who had performed good service. They might blame the Government for making the appointment, or setting up the Commission; but he thought it very much out of place, and a grave injustice to the

<page>71</page>

them spoken of as they were being referred to that evening by the member for Wellington City (Mr Fisher). He thought that when the honourable member came to reflect on what he had said, and on the course he had adopted he would arrive at the conclusion that that was not the time or place to warrant him in doing what he had done. With respect to the gentlemen in Australia who had been referred to, he (Mr. Seddon) might say he had the pleasure of knowing them, and he had the pleasure of having their friendship. He looked upon them as very able men. But he would say that the gentlemen composing the Commission were men who were quite able to hold their own with any men in Australia. But it was not a question of sending them to meet Australian statesmen at all. They were simply collating evidence, with a view of bringing it before the New Zealand Parliament and the New Zealand people, with the view of giving reasons for or against the change that had been mooted. Taking the report, as based on the evidence given, he thought they could have nothing but the report which was before the House. Whatever change of opinion might take place and circumstances might occur which would cause a change of public opinion - New Zealand at present, he thought, was not ripe for a change, nor was there any desire at present to seriously consider a change in our Constitution, or to join the Commonwealth. The honourable member for Hawke's Bay had been attacked in his absence. He thought the honourable member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher) might have left the words he applied to the honourable member for Hawke's Bay unspoken. It was a question for the member for Hawke's Bay to say whether he would go on the Commission or not. As he had gone on the Commission, he did not think it rested with the member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher) to say what he had said against the member for Hawke's Bay. To have overlooked the member for Hawke's Bay in the appointment of that Commission would have been an act of discourtesy which he (Mr. Seddon) would not be a party to. That honourable gentleman had previously represented the colony in reference to the question of Federation. The honourable gentleman decided to place his services at the disposal of the Government on this occasion. He (Mr. Seddon) thought at the time that the Government were under a compliment to the honourable gentleman because he had been appointed to the Midland Railway Commission, and the Government had intimated they would prefer that he should go on the Federation Commission. He (Mr. Seddon) thought, therefore, that the member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher) would see that under the circumstances he had been unfair to the gentlemen whom he had criticized. The Commissioners had fairly represented this colony, they did good work, and there was quite sufficient in the evidence they had collated for members to come to a conclusion at the present time. He hoped members would come to the conclusion that the amount raised in years to come as having been money that was well expended. While this colony maintained its present position in relation to its neighbours, they should keep up a friendly relationship with them. He might say that when in Australia, he positively refused to commit himself either for or against Federation -- he stated that a Commission had been appointed, and until it reported he declined to express an opinion upon the subject. Mr. GRAHAM (Nelson City) moved, That progress be reported. He regretted that the member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher) should have delivered several successive speeches whilst other members remained silent, and he must complain of the time that had been wasted by the Premier and the member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher) in discussing this question at that hour of the morning. Mr. FISHER (Wellington City) said the Hon. the Premier had stated that he (Mr. Fisher) had made remarks reflecting upon the honourable member for Hawke's Bay in accepting a position on the Commission, because that honourable member was absent from the House. He would have made the same remarks if

the honourable gentleman had been present. In fact, he preferred on all occasions to speak of an honourable member in his presence. Motion to report progress negatived. The Committee divided on the question, " That the item, ' £3,800,' be reduced by £5." AYES, 17. Pirani Atkinson Hornsby Hutcheson Bollard Rhodes Russell, G. W. Fisher Lang Hardy Lethbridge Tellers. Haselden Massey Meredith Mackenzie, T. Herries Monk NOES, 34. Parata Hall Allen, E. G. Seddon Hall-Jones Arnold Smith, G. J. Heke Carncross Carroll Stevens Hogg Kaihau Collins Symes Laurenson Tanner Colvin Ward Ell Lawry Field Willis. McGowan Fowlds McNab Tellers. Fraser, A. L. D. Mills Barclay Fraser, W. O'Meara Wilford. Graham Palmer Majority against, 17. Amendment negatived. Mr. G. J. SMITH (Christchurch City) wished to ask the Premier a question in connection with the item "Expenses in connection with consolidation of New Zealand statutes, £100." Supposing next session the gentleman who was compiling the statutes had got most of the work done, would the honourable gentleman take steps to have the consolidation so far put into law, so that Parliament might have the benefit of it ?

<page>72</page>

effect to what the honourable gentleman asked. Mr. PIRANI (Palmerston) said there was a gentleman in Christchurch who was a first-class law draftsman, who had for some considerable time past been engaged on the work of compiling an abridged edition of the statutes. He referred to Mr. Badger. Now, the effect of this work being done by a Government officer would deprive Mr. Badger of reward for the time he had already spent upon the compilation of the statutes. He hoped the Government could compensate this gentleman in some way for his loss of time and money, or employ him to assist in the work that was being done under the Government, more especially as he felt sure the work would be too much for one draftsman. Mr. SEDDON said the matter would be referred to the Solicitor-General. Mr. HERRIES (Bay of Plenty) said it had been reported that the auxiliary oil - engine schooner for the Cook and other islands was not at all suited for the work, and that the money spent upon her had been practically wasted. They had also heard that there had been a strike amongst the seamen engaged on the steamer. He was disappointed to find that all information with regard to the colony's new possessions had not been laid on the table of the House long ago. The Committee should also know what instructions were given to Mr. Percy Smith, who had recently been sent on expedition to the Island of Niue. Mr. SEDDON said he intended to give all the information before the second reading of the Bill. The statement about the schooner was entirely wrong. She had made a good trip, and was reported to be very suitable for the work. There were no particulars yet as regards the difficulty with the men, but they might have the information down in the course of a day or two. As to the instructions given to Mr. Percy Smith, if the honourable member liked to read the correspondence between that gentleman and the Government's representative he could see what instructions were given. Mr. HUTCHESON (Wellington City) said he had been informed that the engineer employed on this schooner was not a competent engineer, and that he had not obtained his certificate; also that he did not receive the current rate of wages paid to certificated engineers. He hoped the honourable gentleman would give the Committee the details of the vote, "General Contingencies, £5,948," expended last year. Mr. HORNSBY (Wairarapa) would like to ask the Minister to favourably consider the idea of putting on the supplementary estimates a bonus to aid the flax industry. He thought this would be in the best interests of an industry which was of the utmost importance to the colony. Sir J. G. WARD said the details of the vote £ s. d. Advertising 210 Allowances in lieu of free quarters and lighting to Caretaker, Government Buildings, New Plymouth 22 18 8 Allowance to Acting Private Secretary to Minister of Lands 10 0 0 .. Books and publications .. 156 19 11 Cost of photographs, &c., of South Sea Islands 161 7 0 Cost of taking evidence and reporting as to charges of Southerley against the Public Trust Office .. 0 44 12 Carriage of telegrams 38 1 9 Cost of procuring deer for Government of Queensland .. 12 2 6 165 Directories for public departments 0 1 Freight and cartage 480 6 7 Fuel and light 296 0 10 Grant to Greytown Fire-brigade 25 0 0 Inspection of

weights and measures 22 8 4 Law costs 157 10 0 .. Newspapers 118 15 10 .. Official postages 296 0
 Payment to G. D. Hamilton for compiling hand-book on "Trout in New Zealand " 12 0 0 .. 0 Rewards for
 arrest of deserters 50 0 Removing books from Parliament- ary Library 15 0 0 Sessional allowance to
 Private Se- cretaries- Native Minister 0 50 0 Minister of Justice 0 25 0 . . . Premier 25 0 0 Sessional
 allowance to messengers 210 4 0 Subscriptions to telephones, &c. .. 300 14 0 Sundries, small amounts
 under 10s. 129 6 5 Travelling-allowances of Ministers 1,499 0 5 Travelling-expenses of Ministers .. 1,456
 19 9 Travelling - expenses of officers of 69 12 Colonial Secretary's Department Travelling - expenses of
 Registrar- General attending Conference of States in Sydney 68 8 6 Travelling-expenses of Labour dele-
 gates 34 2 11 Typewriters and accessories 149 1 6 Uniforms and overcoats for messen- 136 3 9 gers ..
 Mr. PIRANI (Palmerston) said there was an item in the "General Contingencies," for "Cost of
 Photographs, South Sea Islands, £161 7s.," and he would like to know from the Minister something about
 the instruc- tions given to the photographer who went on the excursion, because he understood that the
 Government photographer with the Royal tour was told to take a shot every time he saw the Premier near
 the Duke. It seemed to him it was merely personal expenditure on behalf of the Premier, and he thought
 by the time they went through the estimates they would make some extraordinary discoveries. Already
 the expenditure in connection with the Premier's trip on the "Tutanekai " in search of health had been
 shown to be as follows :-

<page>73</page>

1,100 Under "Colonial Secretary, Miscel- laneous " 582 Photographs, in " Contingencies" 161 Under "
 Printing," the Premier's book 200 £2,043 He did say this thing was being carried to an undue extent. He
 did not think, if the ques- tion was submitted to the electors as to whether £2,043, which had been spent
 on that trip to the South Sea Islands for the amusement of the Premier and a number of his friends, that
 they would say it was proper expenditure. He thought it ought clearly to be understood as to the extent to
 which we were going in these little fancy excursions. There was another item, "Grant to the Greytown
 Fire-brigade, \$25." Now, when the other brigades saved Government buildings and asked for a donation
 they could not get a cent out of the Govern- ment. Mr. SEDDON .- They deserved it. Mr. PIRANI said,
 "They deserved it," and deserved ten times more ; but he did object to making fish of one brigade and
 flesh of the other. He said it was an unfair thing to give one Gre-brigade £25 and make that the excep-
 tion in the whole colony. He had told the Government they ought to provide a certain subsidy for every
 fire-brigade in the colony, because they did work, not only in saving property and Government buildings,
 but in saving life, which no fire insurance covered. Now, as to the item, " Payment to Reuter's Telegram
 Company for special telegrams, [557." Two years ago he asked the Minister whether he would lay before
 the House copies of the telegrams paid for by the colony, and the Minister had assured him he would. He
 thought it would be interesting to see how the Ministry ran the cablegrams in the daily papers in the Old
 Country, and he did not see why there should be any objection to laying copies before the House. After a
 considerable amount of search he had managed to scrape up cablegrams in three of the London daily
 papers for the last twelve months which he thought would cost \$200, and it struck him that the balance of
 \$87 was expended on cablegrams which the papers in the Old Country put into the waste- paper basket
 because they were such rubbish. In connection with the item, "Telegrams be- yond the colony," for which
 £2,500 was voted, a sum of £9,750 was spent. Mr. SEDDON said the greater part of it was for cabling to
 South Africa in connection with the contingents. Mr. PIRANI said that was what he wanted to get out.
 Several times he applied to the Defence Department to get information about troopers in South Africa,
 who were ill, or wounded, and he never even got a reply. Mr. SEDDON assured the honourable mem- ber
 that he had never refused an application sent to him. Mr. PIRANI regretted that his personal ex- far as the
 Premier was concerned, he must say he had always received prompt and courteous replies from him ; but
 he had thought that by addressing his communications to the depart- ment he would have saved the

Premier some bother. It was time the Defence Department wakened up a little. Mr. GRAHAM (Nelson City) moved to report progress. He wished to place on record the names of those members who desired to go on with the business between the hours of one and two o'clock in the morning, when many members were absent and others exhausted. The Committee divided. AYES, 20. Atkinson Smith, G. J. Lang Collins Lethbridge Tanner Ell Wilford Massey Meredith Fraser, W. Willis. Hardy Monk Tellers. Haselden Pirani Graham Rhodes Herries Hutcheson. NOES, 29. Allen, E. G. Heke O'Meara Hogg Palmer Arnold Barclay Hornsby Parata Kaihau Carncross Seddon Carroll Lawry Stevens Colvin McGowan Symes Fisher McKenzie, R. Ward. McNab Fowlds Tellers. Hall Millar Field Hall-Jones Fraser, A. L. D. Mills Majority against, 9. Motion negatived. Mr. HERRIES (Bay of Islands) moved to reduce the item, "Payment to Reuter's Telegram Company for special telegrams, £300," by £1. He thought information should be given to the House about this matter. They should know what money was spent on the cablegrams. He had lately seen cables in the London Times which, he presumed, were sent by the Government, as they were sent by Reuter's Agency, and they were all messages of a partisan nature. They had a party colour. He hoped the honourable gentleman would tell the House how much of this money was spent in sending telegrams to London papers. Sir J. G. WARD said it was a mistake to suppose that the whole of the money was for cables sent to newspapers. The sum also included the cost of telegrams beyond the colony sent through Reuter's as well. Reuter's Company was sometimes used for sending Government messages. Honourable members would understand there were occasions when it was desirable to send cables Home in the interests of the colony. Whatever Administration was in power would find it necessary to send cables on important matters of general interest. Mr. ATKINSON (Wellington City) objected altogether to the attempt of the Government to constitute itself a sort of Press Agency. He considered many of the telegrams to be not of the slightest value. He could produce a

Government were sending Home. This telegram that he would read was sent at the expense of the colony on the death of Queen Victoria :- "Sad tidings reached us. Grief, profound sorrow ; we must bow submissively ; God's will be done ; terrestrial Crown surrendered ; assured Crown glory won ; heartfelt sympathy all peoples will go forth bereaved Royal Family ; earnest prayers offered our Divine Master ; strengthen them great hour trial ; they have lost loving mother, humanity true noble friend ; grief sorrow world-wide prevails irreparable loss. "SEDDON." The telegram was sent by the Premier from Melbourne or Sydney, and appeared in the London Daily News, and, presumably, in other English papers, though he had not seen it in the Times. He was not disposed to say anything as to the good taste or sincerity of this deplorable specimen of obituary eloquence ; he was concerned with it only in connection with the estimates from the standpoint of economy. It appeared to be one of the Premier's literary errors that every epithet should be duplicated or triplicated ; "diabolical and wicked," "worthy and revered," "rejoice and delight in," "grief and sorrow," were recent examples. Rhetorically the effect was weakening ; economically it was very serious that such verbosity should be cabled at the cost of the colony. If the rest of our public telegrams were inflated in the same way we could reduce the item by 75 or even 90 per cent. without any loss of efficiency. On this account he would vote for the amendment of the member for the Bay of Plenty. Mr. HUTCHESON (Wellington City) wished to make a few remarks on a previous item - namely, the item "Imperial Institute expenses, \$150." This was an effete moribund institution, and the expenditure was a waste of the taxpayers' money. He moved, therefore, That the item be struck out. Mr. ATKINSON (Wellington City) asked what the nature of the £150 contribution was ? Was it in the nature of a subscription ? Mr. SEDDON said it was under an arrangement that had been going on for years. Sir J. G. WARD said it represented the New Zealand share of the maintenance and for attendance. Amendment negatived. The Committee divided on the amendment, "To reduce the item 'Payment to Reuter's Telegram Company for special telegrams, £300,' by £1." AYES, 12. Ell Lethbridge Rhodes.

Hardy Massey Tellers. Haselden Monk Atkinson Pirani Hutcheson Herries. Lang NOES, 30. Allen, E. G. Field Hall Carncross Fowlds Hall-Jones .Carroll Fraser, A. L. D. Heke .Colvin Graham Hogg Mr. Atkinson Ward Parata Lawry McGowan Seddon Willis. Tellers. McKenzie, R. Smith, G. J. Millar Collins Stevens Mills McNab. Symes O'Meara Majority against, 18. Amendment negatived. Mr. HUTCHESON (Wellington City) drew attention to the item " Purchase of an auxil- iary oil-engine schooner for Cook and other islands, £5,100." Was there any insurance on the vessel ? If so, how much, and in what office ? Mr. J. G. WARD said the vessel was insured at Lloyds for her value. The extras incurred increased the amount put down. Mr. PIRANI (Palmerston) said that £200 was spent last year on " Sir George Grey's scholar- ship to each university." Did the Minister in- tend to continue that ? Sir J. G. WARD said that was on the Educa- tion vote. Mr. HERRIES (Bay of Plenty) suggested that the vote for "contingencies " should be split up in future. He thought that Ministers' travelling-allowances and expenses should be shown separately. Mr. PIRANI (Palmerston) asked if the work entitled "The Early History of the Colony " was finished. There was nothing voted for it this year. Sir J. G. WARD said it had been brought up to a certain point and was stopped there. In reply to the member for the Bay of Plenty, he might say that the Government had given the details of all the "contingencies " votes. Mr. PIRANI drew attention to the item, "Expenses connected with Cook and other islands, £582." That amount was made up in this way: There was £77 10s. set down for medical comforts, £40 of which consisted solely of alcoholic liquors. Sir J. G. WARD said that referred to last year. There was no vote for this year. Mr. PIRANI said there had no doubt been a saving in the expenditure this year as compared with last year. This year they were only asked to vote £500, whereas last year they were asked to vote £1,000. There was no doubt that the Premier's pleasure trip was taken out of that vote. Mr. HUTCHESON (Wellington City) said it was obviously improper that there should be this expenditure upon certain photographs- and poor photographs-for the glorification of the Premier. He moved, That the item be re- duced by £161, being the amount of the photos taken purely for the Premier's glorification. He moved this in order to indicate to the Pre- mier that it was time that he left the tax- payers' money alone in respect to such matters as that. Mr. SEDDON said the attacks of the honour- able member for Wellington City (Mr. Hutche- son) upon him showed personal animus. He thought the honourable member, and one or

<page>75</page>

ber that they were speaking to the Premier of the colony, and they ought to respect both him and the position. They should not do any- thing to bring that position into discredit with the outside world. He might mention that the photographer who had taken these photographs was one of the most efficient photographers in the colony, and the honourable member ought not to speak as he had done as it was calculated to do him an injury. Mr. HUTCHESON (Wellington City) wished to assure the Premier that in bringing this matter forward he was actuated by no personal animus whatever. What he objected to was the using of the taxpayers' money in the print- ing of these things, which were neither of edu- cative nor colonial importance. Mr. ELL (Christchurch City) did not think there was a single member in the House that begrudged the trip of the right honourable gentleman to restore his health, but he did not think the Government was justified in using the taxpayers' money to take these photographs. He thought it was about time to cry " Halt" in regard to expenditure of this kind. He hoped the Premier would believe that there was nothing personal whatever in any of the remarks he had made on the subject. Mr. SEDDON said the money was spent last year, and there was no vote for it at all this year : and when it was now moved to strike it out, and when the question was brought up over and over again, he could not help feeling that there was some personal animus on the matter. Amendment negatived. Vote, \$79,148, agreed to. Progress reported. #cc-zero The House adjourned at twenty minutes to three o'clock a.m.