

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL. Friday, 26th July, 1901. . First Reading-Third Reading-Gold-mining Industry-Vaccination-Goldfields and Mines Committee-Referendum Bill-Police Offences Bill- Imprest Supply Bill (No. 2). The Hon. the SPEAKER took the chair at half- past two o'clock. PRAYERS. FIRST READING. Land for Settlements Amendment Bill. THIRD READING. Cemetery Trustees Validation Bill. GOLD-MINING INDUSTRY. The Hon. Mr. REEVES asked the Minister of Education, If the Government will place a sum of money on the estimates as a bonus to -- any person who may discover a process by which gold can be recovered from black sand ? There were thousands of acres of land on the West Coast, and a large amount of land on the East Coast, consisting of black sand and auriferous deposit. The difficulty of separating the black sand from the gold, both being of high specific gravity, was very great, and he thought some inducement should be offered to people to discover a process by which this could be done. He might point out that the Government, in their wisdom, offered rewards, or bonuses, as they were called, for various things. . For instance, a bonus had been offered some time ago for the best mode of treating flax, a very valuable commodity, and one that he would like to see something done to improve. A respectable bonus had been offered for the production of a certain quantity of shale-oil ; and he might also mention that bonuses had been offered for quicksilver, iron, and various other products. He could not enumerate all the bonuses that had been offered, but he would point out that the offering of these bonuses cost the colony nothing unless successful methods were discovered. If a process were discovered by which the gold could be saved from this black sand, that would produce great wealth to the colony ; and if no one came forward with the necessary machinery for saving the gold the offering of the bonus would cost nothing. Under the circumstances, he thought the Government would do well to offer a sum sufficient to induce people to exercise their brains and ingenuity in endeavouring to discover some means by which one of the most valuable industries of the colony could be carried on. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER said, No doubt the question the honourable gentleman had brought under

notice was a very important one. The Government had at many times endeavoured to encourage inventions in similar directions, and he could assure the honourable gentleman that this particular matter that he had brought before the notice of the Council - namely, the discovery of a process by which gold could be recovered from black sand - he supposed he meant under remunerative conditions - would not escape the notice of the Government, and that, if possible, arrangements would be made by which a bonus would be offered. VACCINATION. The Hon. Mr. JENNINGS moved, That there be laid on the table of the Council a return showing for the past five years,-(1.) The number of births registered and the number of vaccinations recorded. (2.) How many cases for non-compliance of the compulsory clauses of "The Public Health Act, 1876," and amendments, have been instituted by Registrars during the past five years, and also how many persons have been fined for conscientiously refusing to have their children vaccinated. Sir, Dr. Karl Kubin, of New York, in the Medical Record, a paper published in that city in April last, gave some startling phases of the vaccination question, and the dangers arising there-

<page>666</page>

from; and he had placed a notice on the | families are overlooked. Trusting to hear you Order Paper so as to refer to the subject. might state that Dr. Karl Kubin was an advocate of vaccination; but the dangers he had seen arise from it being carelessly done had made him emphatic in his contention that vaccine lymph-even calf lymph -- was by nature septic, and contained numerous forms of germ-life, which were pathogenic in certain circumstances. He ventured to trouble the Council with a few of the facts recorded by Dr. Kubin, which were stated in the Lancet, to be found in the library. Dr. Kubin insisted in his paper that -- "Unless due precautions are taken, serious results will occasionally follow vaccination. The principal results incidental to vaccination are as follows : (1) Impure virus; (2) abnormal or paradoxical course of the cow-pox itself ; (3) improper performance of the act of vaccination by unclean instruments and hands of the operator ; (1) improperly prepared surface for vaccination and imperfect dressing, which allows secondary infection ; neglect on the part of the vaccinator to exercise supervision and control of the patient until the time of complete healing ; and coincident diseases, such as scarlet-fever, measles, and so forth." Dr. Kubin said, further, that the greatest care should be exercised. Now, he contended that when the clause in the Public Health Act dealing with vaccination was passed last session the fact of a medical gentleman being paid the ridiculously small fee of half a crown for performing this highly important duty did not receive sufficient consideration. The amount certainly was not adequate for him to exercise that great care which should undoubtedly be given in cases of vaccination. Believers in vaccination, who know the seriousness of the operation, would rather pay 10s., so as to have it done efficiently and thoroughly. He was inclined to think that in the past, and it might be so in the future, unless due care was observed by the authorities, vaccination might be performed in a perfunctory manner, and that not as much care would be exercised as would be given by a man who was employed to brand sheep on a

station. His other reason for putting this motion on the Order Paper was contained in a letter which he received from the Thames Goldfields, from a gentleman occupying a high confidential position there, and with the permission of the Council he would read it :- " Parawai, Thames, 8th July, 1901. "DEAR SIR,-Re Vaccination Question : To-day a working-man was arrested for not paying the fine for not having his child vaccinated, and would have been imprisoned had not a resident paid the amount. Do you not think something should be done this session to remove this most objectionable and uncivilised law from our statutes. Here matters are assuming a very acute stage on account of the activity of the local Registrar. Hence I implore you to again move in the matter of repeal of said law. It seems as though this law is being pressed upon working-men, and at same time many well-to-do He are again intending to do your best to give . E. H. TAYLOR. relief. - Yours, &c., "Hon. W. T. Jennings, M.L.C." He begged to move the motion standing in his name. Motion made, and question proposed, " That there be laid on the table of the Council a return showing for the past five years,-( 1.) The number of births registered and the number of vaccinations recorded. (2.) How many cases for non-compliance of the compulsory clauses of . The Public Health Act, 1876,' and amendments have been instituted by Registrars during the past five years, and also how many persons have been fined for conscientiously refusing to have their children vaccinated."-(Hon. Mr. JENNINGS.) The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER said there would be no difficulty whatever in giving the honourable gentleman the particulars specified in numbers 1 and 2, but it was absolutely impossible to comply with the direction for a statement of how many persons had been fined for conscientiously refusing to have their children vaccinated. He did not think any persons had been fined for conscientiously refusing. In the first instance, the Registrar-General informed him that it was absolutely impossible for him to discriminate amongst the names of the people who were fined as to whether they were conscientious objectors or not. The persons who had been fined had been simply fined for non-compliance with the provisions of the law, and apparently they could not have lodged conscientious objections, otherwise they would not have been fined. In these circumstances, it was impossible for the Registrar-General's Department to supply such information as the words indicated in the motion would convey. He therefore asked the honourable gentleman to allow the words to be struck out of the motion. The Hon. Mr. JENNINGS said that, with the permission of the Council, he would ask that these words be struck out. As to what the Minister had said, here was a case stated by Mr. E. H. Taylor where a man had absolutely been fined, and would have been imprisoned, for the non-vaccination of his children. The Hon. the SPEAKER .- You accept the amendment ? The Hon. Mr. JENNINGS .- Yes. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER would be pleased indeed if the honourable gentleman would supply him with the name and address of the person who had lodged the objection referred to. He would make inquiries into the matter, and give the honourable gentleman the result of the inquiries. The Hon. Mr. JENKINSON thought the Hon. Mr. Jennings would be foolish if he allowed all these words to be cut out, because he wanted to find out how many persons had really been fined for not having their children vaccinated. If these words were cut out, the honourable gentleman would not get that information. The Minister would acknowledge that it would be easy to find out the number of per-

<page>667</page>

sons recorded as having been fined, and if the | was a but thinly veiled fault-finding with the words "for conscientiously refusing" were struck out the return would be of no service at all. The Hon. Mr. FELDWICK said it would be a very difficult thing for a Magistrate to decide whether any man " conscientiously refused " or did not " conscientiously " refuse to have his child vaccinated. According to the letter which had been read to the Council, the Magistrate appeared to have decided that the man's objection was not conscientious, and therefore to have fined him. It seemed to him to be an extraordinary, and, in fact, a preposterous, state of things. The Hon. Mr. McLEAN did not think they need have much sympathy with these people. They had power under the Act now under cer- tain

circumstances to get freed from the necessity for vaccination. He had seen it reported that after an epidemic in a place all these conscientious gentlemen left their conscientious objections in the background and got their children and themselves vaccinated very soon ; and glad they were to get it done too. Their conscience then went by the board. He was quite sure vaccination was a necessity when an epidemic arose, and no one would see that necessity quicker than the honourable gentleman himself and those who objected to vaccination. And why should there be any complaint from these people, when, as he said, they had under the Act at present a certain process provided by means of which they could obtain relief? He thought that was sufficient. He considered this objection to vaccination was an objection that would not hold good for one moment. Were we to have an epidemic of smallpox in New Zealand-and we had seen that it was not very far from us lately-these conscientious objectors would be ready enough to take the alarm. At any rate, that disease was in the other colonies, and, as people were coming here regularly from "the other side," he thought it was a very necessary precaution that people should be vaccinated. The Hon. Mr. T. KELLY said that he did not object to the motion, but he must protest against the idea of allowing people to be careless of the duty of having their children vaccinated, and the community being liable to suffer in consequence. The child was not only the child of its parents, but the child of the State as well. The child had to be protected, and he thought they had gone quite far enough in affording means of relief to so called conscientious objectors. It appeared to him that the man referred to by the Hon. Mr. Jennings had neglected to have his child vaccinated, and had therefore broken the law, and on this text they had had a dissertation to the Council that he should not obey the law. He had no sympathy with that sort of thing. As the Public Health Act of last year had made ample provision for conscientious parents to obtain exemption certificates, neglect to do so, of course, involved the usual penalty under the Act. The Hon. Mr. SCOTLAND said he believed that in the Hon. Mr. Jennings's motion there Act of 1876. While entertaining a limited belief in the necessity for such an Act, he thought it was true that under certain circumstances vaccination might become a very dangerous operation. Still, for all that, he would not vote for the repeal of that Act were such a proposal before the Council. He could not close his eyes to the fact that cases of smallpox in the Old Country had diminished wonderfully in the last few years. He could remember, when he was a schoolboy, at the school he attended there were 270 boys, and it struck him even then, at that early age, how many boys there were in that school pitted with smallpox. Not only that, but in walking about the streets of London he used to notice also the number of faces, many of them undoubtedly at one time beautiful faces, of people marred by this terrible disease. Now, however, it was very rarely indeed that one met with a case of the kind ; but he believed that the diminution of cases of smallpox in England was mainly owing to the great improvement in sanitary arrangements. The streets of London were much cleaner now, and he believed, as a rule, the houses were cleaner than they were in those days. Personal cleanliness also was attended to more than it used to be. If, therefore, it were proposed to repeal the Act of 1876 he would not be found supporting such repeal. While opposed to compulsory vaccination, he thought it was wise to keep the Act on the statute-book, so that it might be held not exactly in terrorem, but in readiness to meet any occasion of an outbreak of smallpox at any time, which God forbid we should ever see in this colony. The Act would be ready to put in force, and to prevent the spread of this terrible scourge to the human race. The Hon. Mr. BOLT could not see the object of having a return of this sort. Last year he thought, when the Public Health Bill was before the Council, this question was discussed in a very exhaustive way, and provision was made for people who had conscientious objections to exempt their children from vaccination. Surely in the face of that there was no occasion to have a return such as this. So far as the question itself was concerned, he believed vaccination was a necessary thing. There was no doubt that owing to the sanitary reforms which had taken place-more especially in the Old Country -people had come to the conclusion that there was no virtue in vaccination. He thought that was a conclusion that was not

warranted by fact. He believed there was great virtue in vaccination, and he also believed that if we had now in this colony, or in this city, an epidemic of smallpox a motion for this return would be rejected at once. As the question had already been fully considered and full provision made by Act of Parliament, he did not see there was any necessity for the return at all. The Hon. Mr. SHRIMSKI said, No doubt the honourable gentleman who had moved this motion was seeking out of kindness of heart to benefit the people by enabling them to exempt themselves from vaccination. But where he was

<page>668</page>

trying to save one or two he might be endanger- | by day. With the exception of one of the ing the lives of many thousands. With regard to the return, he was of a different opinion from that expressed by the Hon. Mr. Bolt. He (Mr. Shrimski) thought such a return would enable them to judge better the amount of mischief that had already been done. The sooner they knew what mischief had been done the sooner would they be able to stop it. The Hon. Mr. W. C. SMITH thought the contention of the Hon. Mr. Bolt would not hold water for a minute. It was necessary to see how the Act passed last session had been working, and this return would enable members to see whether it had worked well or not. For that reason he would support the motion. The Hon. Mr. JENNINGS asked if the Hon. the Minister would be satisfied with the motion on the word "conscientiously " being struck out before the words "refusing to have their children vaccinated." The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER said he was quite satisfied with that, only he thought "neglecting " should be substituted for the word " refusing." The Hon. Mr. JENNINGS preferred to stand by the word "refusing." The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER said it was neglect in most cases. The Hon. Mr. JENNINGS was prepared to allow the motion to go to the Council as it stood. He would move that the word " con- scientiously " be struck out. Now, in regard to the exploded and far-fetched argument of the Hon. Mr. McLean, that argument had been used almost from time immemorial. If smallpox was to break out in this country he had no doubt many people would get vaccinated, be- cause people would do under fear what they would not do in their calmer judgment. But use#cc-zero he was satisfied that there need not be any great apprehension ; if any cases occurred our means for isolation were so good that danger would soon pass away. It was amusing to hear the Hon. Mr. Kelly talk in the strain he did ; also the Hon. Mr. Scotland. They went back to the days of their childhood. Surely honour- able members would admit that there had made in regard to been great strides medical science, as well as in everything else since the boyhood of either of those gentle- men. Here was one of the highest authorities in the medical world of America, and one who had been accepted by the Lancet as an autho- rity upon this particular subject, who had pointed out the very great dangers arising in connection with the lymph being by nature septic. He . would call the attention of those honourable gentlemen who were prepared to continue the same old practices followed by their forefathers in regard to vaccination to this : If all the intelligence in the world were concentrated in his honourable friends Mr. Bolt and Mr. T. Kelly, what about the great num- ber of people in the United States of America, where compulsory vaccination was not in force? Vessels were arriving there from all ports of the world, and thousands of people, even from small- pox infected districts, were landed almost day States of the Commonwealth-our next-door neighbours-vaccination was not compulsorily enforced in Australia. In Britain compulsory vaccination of children had been done away with. and also in the majority of the cantons of Switzer- land it had been abolished. Did those honour- able gentlemen claim to possess superior know- ledge over these other people of the world ? He knew even in this colony there were several doc- tors who refused to allow their children to be vac- cinated. If in the minds of the people of the colony there was a necessity for compulsory vaccination there would not be so many cases of unvaccinated children, as the return he asked for would show. In regard to what had been said about provision being made for persons to record conscientious objections, he would say that there were only four months' notice given to persons to record their objections. The time was altogether too short. It seemed to him not right to put any man in the position of being fined and imprisoned in this

country for non-compliance with the vaccination - laws. He would submit his motion to the Council. As had been pointed out by one honourable gentleman, it would give information as to the number of vaccinations performed during the past five years, and also give a true account as to how many people had been fined. The Hon. the SPEAKER said he would put the motion, omitting the word "conscientiously." The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER was sorry the motion was to be put in that way, because he must then vote against it. The Hon. the SPEAKER would point out that, the honourable mover of the motion having replied, he had no power to take any further amendment. The Council divided. AYES, 15. Baillie Louisson Harris Barnicoat Jenkinson Ormond Pinkerton Bowen Jennings Kelly, W. Feldwick Taiaroa Gourlay Kerr Williams. NOES, 15. Arkwright Reeves Swanson Tomoana Bolt Rigg Scotland Jones Twomey Kelly, T. Smith, A. L. Walker, L. McLean Walker, W. C. Stevens The Hon. the SPEAKER said he would give his voice with the "Ayes." Motion agreed to accordingly. GOLDFIELDS AND MINES COMMITTEE. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER, moved, That Standing Order No. 162 be suspended, and that the names of the Hon. Mr. Johnston and the Hon. Mr. Twomey be added to the Goldfields and Mines Committee. He was sorry to say that two old and respected members of the Mines Committee had not been able to attend the session this year. He did not wish to strike the names of those gentlemen off the

<page>669</page>

Committee, as they had been members of it for many years. He therefore preferred to ask the Council to appoint two extra members, and for that purpose moved the motion of which he had given notice for the appointment of the Hon. Mr. Johnston and the Hon. Mr. Twomey. Motion agreed to. REFERENDUM BILL. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER.- Sir, in moving the second reading of this Bill. of course, to a certain extent we must admit it is a new principle that we propose to place on the statute-book. At the same time it is a principle that we have been getting pretty familiar with, and although it has not yet been passed into law, still the people of the country have for some time been accustomed to treat it as if it was a principle that should be adopted in our legislation in order to give expression to the wish of the people in certain directions. I know there is one old objection to it, and that is an objection that holds good to a certain extent-that is to say, it requires from us consideration as a reasonable measure in addition to what it bears on its face. It requires consideration, I may say, because the only country in the world where it has been thoroughly adopted, and where it was manufactured, is the Confederation of Switzerland, a country whose conditions are very different from ours and almost every other country in the world, and between which and the circumstances of these colonies it is almost impossible to make a comparison. But at the same time, the fact that it has been an acknowledged principle of legislation in Switzerland to a larger extent than is proposed in this Bill gives it, at all events, the respectability of a tried principle in another country. In some of the Australian Colonies the principle has been adopted to a It has even been spoken of in limited extent. this colony as being adaptable to certain occasions, and this is the first time that it has reached this Chamber, since the Government has brought it down as a proposal with the conviction that the mind of the colony is sufficiently made up on the subject, and believes that the result of the measure being adopted will be satisfactory, and will put an end to a great deal of unrest in regard to certain questions. Now, I feel quite certain in my own mind that to put an end to unrest is a very great benefit as regards many questions that may have been troubling the public mind for a good many years. I believe many proposals that have troubled the public mind could have been exploded by the help of a reference to the people, as is proposed under this Bill, and it would have been much better for the public mind. In fact, I would go a little further and say: From one point of view the Bill does not go far enough-that is to say, that the only measures that can be referred to the people under this Bill are Bills that have got the protection and support to some marked extent of at least one House of the Legislature. In Switzerland they carry this provision a great deal further. They carry it so far as to give the power of

initiative under it. If a certain number of electors demand it from the Government, certain propositions can be placed before the electors of the country whether they have been introduced to the Parliament or not. Well, this Bill does not go so far as that. And I am almost inclined to think, from some points of view, it would be a very great benefit to the public to put questions to them much earlier than they can necessarily be put now. However, Sir, the proposal is that there should be a referendum for certain questions under certain conditions. The first proposal is contained in clause 3 and the first part of clause 4, on the occasion of a deadlock between the Houses of Parliament. Now, if a measure is rejected by one House for two sessions running, the second rejection of the Bill shall be followed by a submission of the question to the people by referendum. The second contingency is that both Houses may pass a Bill containing the provision that the question shall be immediately submitted to the referendum. Then the Bill would apply. The third question is not confined to a Bill, but extends to any proposal or resolution : That is, if both Houses pass a certain resolution affirming the desirability of submitting any proposition to the people by referendum, then it shall be given effect to. And then, fourthly, if a Bill is passed twice by the House of Representatives and rejected twice by the Legislative Council, and the House of Representatives so resolve, then that Bill shall be also submitted to the referendum. The only difference is as regards Government Bills introduced by message from His Excellency the Governor. If such a Bill is rejected, then it goes to the electors. Also if a Bill passed by both Houses contains a provision that such Bill shall be reserved for the referendum. Also- " If a resolution is passed by both Houses in favour of submitting to the referendum any legislative proposal (other than a Bill) set forth in such resolution ; or "If a Bill is passed twice by the House of Representatives and rejected twice by the Legislative Council, and the House of Representatives so resolves -- " then it shall be submitted to the referendum. Then in order to obtain a certain finality in the matter, and in order to prevent unnecessary troubling of the electors too frequently on any one subject upon which they are supposed to have made up their minds, in clause 15 it is provided :- " It shall not be again submitted for a period of three years after the gazettement of the result of the poll taken on the first submission unless at least ten per centum of all the electors on the electoral rolls at the date of the taking of the poll so request by petition to Parliament. " It shall not be again submitted unless the provisions of section four of this Act are complied with afresh." That is to say, the Bill has again to be passed twice by the House of Representatives, and it also requires a resolution of that House. Clause 16 states that the Act shall not apply to-

<page>670</page>

" Any Bill or other legislative proposal which deals with the construction or maintenance of public works of a purely local character, or with parliamentary procedure, or which the House of Representatives, by resolution, declares to be a matter of urgency; nor to " Any local or private Bill." I trust, Sir, this Council will give the Bill calm and careful consideration, and will decide that it is a measure which it is right and proper should be passed into law. I know, myself, it would allay the feeling of unrest on many subjects on which it is claimed by the promoters of certain views that the mind of the colony is not properly represented in Parliament. I need only mention one question, which we have had brought before us every session for many years past-the question of Bible-reading in schools. I believe if that question were submitted to a referendum of the people it would be the means of once and for all settling that question; I believe it would prove that the people, by a very large majority, are fully persuaded that the one essential quality of our national system of education is that it shall not be denominational in any sense or shape. The Hon. Mr. JENNINGS .- What about the question of vaccination ? The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER .- Possibly that might be submitted too, but I do not think that would be likely to result in non-vaccination. But when there is sufficient interest taken in a question, and when there is a sufficient disturbance of the public mind, it is very much better that such measures should be settled in a definite and constitutional way than that they should be brought up as side-issues to disturb the broader grounds that should be taken at a general

election. beg to move the second reading of the Bill. The Hon. Mr. McLEAN .- Sir, it appears to me from the speech we have just listened to, and from the speeches that have been made in another place, that the representatives of the people are not yet educated up to the acceptance of this Bill. We are told very little here about the effect of it, and from the speeches of two or three members who spoke on the measure in another place it is evident that the country is not prepared for a Bill like this. This referendum question has never been a burning question at any of the elections, and I think before we follow in the footsteps of a small country like Switzerland we should go into the matter much more fully than we have. As to those done up to the present time. large questions, such as Bible-reading in schools, which are now and again agitating the public mind, why could they not be submitted to the electors at a general election, just as the question of the liquor traffic is submitted from time to time now. There is nothing whatever to prevent that ? I feel sure the House would be guided in respect of any such question by the preponderating vote of the electors. What does a Bill like this mean to the country? I do not say this Bill, because it certainly is not a Referendum Bill in the true sense of the word. But if we consider the expense of a Bill like this, where the whole of the machinery of a general election is put into force, I would like to ask how many of these questions would the country stand being sent to the referendum with all the expense of a general election in each case. Then, again, the Bill says that in the event of a Bill being thrown out twice by this Council it shall be referred to the referendum. Sir, the Bill is decidedly faulty. What would be the use of sending a Bill to the referendum which had been passed at about four o'clock in the morning in another place, and a few days afterwards rejected by this House? Is there any reason why a Bill that has been rejected by this House should be sent to the country? I am quite sure, Sir, that when at a general election the people of this country expressed their approval of any particular measure this Council has never been backward in accepting the position and passing the Bill. Nor has this Council ever thrown out any measure without being fully prepared to uphold their action in the country, and the country in many cases have upheld this Council. But, Sir, whenever the country has not upheld our contentions this Council has accepted the position and passed the Bill. No doubt, there is a suggestion of the abolition of the Council, and that is evidently the main object of this Bill : but I say that, if questions were to be submitted to the people before they were properly educated up to them, the result would be that only those who were favourable to carrying the measure submitted to them would vote - nobody else would take the trouble to vote at all - and we should never get at the real opinion of the public on the matter. Some people have complained that the Council stood in the way of the women's franchise ? Well, Sir, the Council stood in the way of women's franchise until the Bill was passed again in another place, after a second Parliament had been elected. And, Sir, I am not sure that these great upholders of the female franchise are now so very much in love with it, and with its result. I think there are a good many who have changed their opinion upon that question since the Act came into force. It was, at all events, thought that the Prohibitionists were going to be very largely helped by it; and, though I have no sympathy with prohibition, I have always helped that party, in order to get the liquor traffic brought under proper control. But, Sir, what has the female franchise done on that question ? Has it not put us under the government of the liquor traffic entirely ? This country is governed now by the liquor traffic. That is the result of the female franchise. And if you come across sensible women you hear them declare they would be better without it. However, I do not wish to go further into that question. And with regard to the prohibition question itself, I do not know that if you were to submit that question to a plebiscite now you would settle it. Indeed, it would not be settled. for I am perfectly certain that no one would add a large majority - a majority such as would be

<page>671</page>

acceptable for the determination of that question in this country. I am sure it would be impossible to get a vote for prohibition, but we might get a vote to control the liquor traffic better than it is now controlled. I



am quite sure you could get that, and it is a pity that Prohibitionists do not ask for reformation instead of prohibition. That would be better for the country, and we would all go to their aid, for I am sure every one would be glad to help them. Sir, the questions which would be put to the country by a plebiscite, at the same expense as a general election, would not be advanced much. Then, Sir, it has been hinted that the disabilities on women cannot be removed, in consequence of the opposition of this Chamber. Sir, when the Women's Property Bill came up what was the position taken up by this Council ? The Council helped it in every way, and passed it. Then, what about the disabilities of women? How many members of the other House will vote for women sitting in the Assembly ? Not many, I trow. Then, the reference to the Land for Settlements Bill was most unfortunate. What was the obstruction here ? How much of the Act that is now on the statute-book was in the Bill as originally brought forward by the Government? Did not this Council, from the chaos of that Bill, bring out a workable measure—a Bill which the Minister of Lands accepted without any question whatever, which he swallowed readily ? He was much obliged to the Council for the position in which they had put it, for the Council had given him a workable measure that has done good work for the country in the place of a Bill that would not have worked at all. I say the Government were very unfortunate in suggesting that question as one of those that should be dealt with under the Bill now use#cc-zero before us. The Hon. the Minister said that this country was very familiar with the prospect of referendum. Well, Sir, I generally read about most of what goes on in the country at election times, but, with the exception of a few faddists, I do not know that this proposal has ever been seriously entertained by any one. I am quite satisfied that if the other House seriously considered this matter the members would have endeavoured to educate the public by making appropriate speeches upon it, instead of passing the Bill, as they did, virtually in silence, without seeking to educate the people regarding it at all. The honourable gentleman said that Australia had adopted it. Well, I do not know where they have accepted it. An Hon. MEMBER. - In South Australia. The Hon. Mr. McLEAN. - What question has ever been put to the country by referendum ? An Hon. MEMBER. - The women's franchise. The Hon. Mr. McLEAN. - Well, I have not heard of it. But I, for one, would not stand in the way of the Referendum Bill for a moment if it were properly put before the country, and the country had properly pronounced upon it, even if it was the death-knell of the Council. I would be satisfied if the subject were properly threshed out in the country, for the people are the judges of what legislation there ought to be, and I, for one, am always ready to accept their decision ; but until the matter has been much more deliberately considered by the country than is the case now I shall certainly vote against the Bill, and I hope to see it rejected. Debate adjourned. POLICE OFFENCES BILL. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER. - With regard to this Bill, I may say it proposes to alter a certain part of the Police Offences Act. It has been found by experience that some alteration of that law should take place. If honourable gentlemen will turn up the Act of 1884, section 3, subsection (29), they will find that it reads as follows : One of the offences liable to a penalty not exceeding £5 is, --- " Uses any threatening, abusive, or insulting words or behaviour in any public place within the hearing or in the view of passers by, with intent to provoke a breach of the peace, or whereby a breach of the peace may be occasioned." Clause 2 of the Bill proposes to put in the word " or " between the words " public place " and " within," in the second line of subsection (29) of section 3 of the principal Act, and it will then read- " Uses any threatening, abusive, or insulting words or behaviour in any public place or within the hearing or in the view of passers by." And this proviso has been added also :- " Provided that the term ' public place ' in this subsection shall have the meaning given in section eighteen of the principal Act." " Public place " includes " any public place within the meaning of the same words in section two of this Act." Then, subsection (2) of section 24 of the principal Act is hereby amended by striking out the words " or uses any profane, indecent, or obscene language." It would then read,- " Sings any obscene song or ballad, or writes or draws any indecent or obscene word, figure, or representation, in any public place or within the view or hearing of any person passing therein, or residing

in such public place." And the next subsection takes the place of what is struck out :- " Any person who uses any profane, indecent, or obscene language in any public place as defined in section eighteen of the principal Act, or within the view or hearing of any person passing therein or residing in such public place, shall be liable to imprisonment with hard labour for any term not exceeding one year, or to a penalty not exceeding twenty pounds." I propose in Committee to alter that by striking out the words "view or," so that bad language being used in the hearing of any person shall be an offence ; and, lastly, clause 4 provides that section 26 of the principal Act shall be amended by the addition of the following subsection : "Who habitually consorts with reputed thieves or prostitutes, or persons who have no visible means of support." That is adding to the description of persons who would be deemed to be idle and disorderly. I

<page>672</page>

think this Bill is technical enough to be referred to the Statutes Revision Committee, and I therefore trust the second reading will be agreed to and that it will go to the Committee. I beg to move the second reading. The Hon. Mr. JENNINGS .- Sir, I merely wish to say one or two words in support of this Bill. In regard to the use of profane and disgusting language by adults, I think the highest penalty that could be imposed is one that should meet with the concurrence of every honourable member of this Council. I remember some time ago being on the gold-fields in another portion of this Island, and in the next room to me language was going on that would have made one of the bullock-drivers in the olden days turn green with envy. I do think that some very strong and stringent law should be put in force in regard to making adults particularly liable to the highest penalty the law can impose for using disgusting and filthy language. I have very great pleasure in supporting the Bill introduced by the honourable member. The Hon. Mr. T. KELLY .- This Bill is a very simple amendment of the present law. As far as I can see, it is simply making the Police Offences Act of 1884 consistent with itself. At present it is not consistent with itself. The definition of "public place," in section 18 of Part II. of the Act of 1884, does not apply generally. Section 2 of this Bill brings subsection (29) of section 3 of the 1884 Act under the definition of section 18, being an extended meaning of "public place " as regards the using of insulting or abusive language. Under the present law there is no option of a fine for the punishment of any person using profane, indecent, or obscene language in a public place as defined by section 18. The Magistrate has no option in the matter ; he must imprison the offender. It is the only thing he can do. Now, this Bill gives the Magistrate the option of fining the person accused in a sum not exceeding 420. I think that is an improvement of the law. The only other new part I can find is this in section 4, which amends section 26 of the principal Act by inserting the words " Who habitually consorts with reputed thieves or prostitutes, or persons who have no visible means of support." That is a very desirable amendment, and, therefore, seeing the Bill is but a small amendment of the present law in the right direction, I have much pleasure in giving it my support. The Hon. Mr. JONES .- I am glad this Bill is going before the Statutes Revision Committee. It seems to me to require some supervision. For instance, in subsection (2) of clause 3 : "Any person who uses any profane, indecent, or obscene language in any public place as defined in section eighteen of the principal Act. or within the view or hearing of any person passing," and so on. Well, Sir, there are two phases of the offence indicated here -- the using of obscene language within the view of a person, and the using of it in the hearing of another person. How is anybody to know that a person is using obscene language except he hears it ? The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER .- I am going to alter that. The Hon. Mr. JENKINSON .- There is a matter not provided for in this Bill that is indirectly, and I think unjustly, included in the Act of 1884 which I want to bring before the Council and try to get it amended. Subsection (2) of section 3 of the Act of 1884 reads as follows :- " Any person guilty of any of the following offences is liable for every such offence, omission, or neglect to a penalty not exceeding five pounds, that is to say " (2.) Rides or drives, or wheels any truck, barrow, or carriage of any kind upon or

along any public footpath, or carries any load on his shoulders or otherwise, to the danger or obstruction of persons using such footpath." Now, I cannot do better than just read a letter which appeared in a late issue of the Christchurch Press, and which I think will convey the intention I have regarding the clause I have just read. It says, - "Professor Bickerton, who was fined by Justices the other day for riding a bicycle on & footpath in the Mile Road, put a question to the Bench which, so far, has been unanswered. The Grecian Sphinx, it will be remembered, used to ask conundrums, and if they were not answered forthwith proceeded to devour those to whom they were propounded. We do not suggest that the Justices are in serious personal danger from the energetic professor, but the question which he put is certainly deserving of some attention in the public interest. His defence was that when he was discovered riding on the footpath the road was absolutely impassable for a bicycle, and he asked what he was to do. The Bench replied that he might have wheeled his machine on the path, upon which he asked whether that too was not an offence in the eyes of the law. To this the Bench made no reply, and since then Professor Bickerton has repeated it in our columns, again without result. His has been like a voice crying in the wilderness, hearing only its own echo in response. " We are unwilling to leave the professor in this unsatisfied condition. If nothing worse happens, we fully expect that, if he gets no answer to his cry, he will again betake himself to bicycling on footpaths, with a view to getting some authoritative statement of the law. Yet it must be confessed that the law is a ticklish subject, particularly as applied to bicycles. If the act took place in the city it would appear that it would be an offence as gross to wheel a bicycle on a footpath as to ride it. There is a city by-law which says, 'No person shall drive, impel, or wheel any bicycle along any footpath.' We understand, however, that Professor Bickerton's particular crime was committed outside the city boundary. In this case he could have been prosecuted under either the Public Works Act or the Police Offences Act. The former prohibits 'riding or driving any horse or vehicle on a footpath constructed for foot-passengers only.' It would be a nice point for the Court to decide as to whether 'vehicle'

<page>673</page>

in this case includes a bicycle ; but, if it were held in the affirmative, we might take it for granted that it applies to perambulators also. The Police Offences Act imposes a penalty not exceeding 25 on any one who 'rides or drives, or wheels any truck, barrow, or carriage of any kind upon or along any public footpath, or carries any load on his shoulders or otherwise, to the danger or obstruction of persons using such footpath.' Here, again, it is a nice point as to whether the qualifying clause at the end of this section applies to 'wheeling any vehicle,' in the first part, as well as to 'carrying a load,' in the second part. The sum and substance, therefore, is that as regards riding a bicycle on a footpath outside a borough the law is as clear as the mud on the Mile Road at the time of Professor Bickerton's adventure. As to the common-sense view of the matter, however, we have no doubt whatever. We have no sympathy with the cyclist who rides along footpaths in the city or suburbs past citizens' gates, imperilling the lives and limbs of children and others who may be issuing therefrom. On the other hand, we see no objection to a cyclist being allowed to take the path on a quiet country road when the road itself is impassable, and no danger or inconvenience is occasioned thereby to any of His Majesty's subjects." Now, that is taken from the Christchurch Press, which is usually reckoned to be a very sensible sort of a paper, more especially by a certain section of the community. It certainly is not an upholder of fads or faddists. I think, with it, that an amendment of the Police Offences Act is required, to some extent at least, to nullify the effect of this particular subsection (3). One's common-sense must show one that there is absolutely no danger in wheeling a bicycle along a footpath ; and in the case of Christchurch, for instance, and it also applies elsewhere, where there are miles of footpath outside the city boundary, and which are seldom or never used except at certain hours of the day, where the roads are not as good as they might be, it must really be apparent that there is very little danger in even riding a bicycle along a

footpath. However, I do not want to go so far as that at present. This is the amendment I shall endeavour to get embodied in this Police Offences Bill :- "Notwithstanding anything contained in subsection two of section three of the principal Act, it shall not be an offence for any person to wheel (but not to ride) a bicycle on any public footpath." I do not think there should be any difficulty in getting such a clause as that passed. Even if this is put in this Bill, the public safety is completely assured under the Public Works Act. while within the cities there are stringent by-laws which amply deal with the matter, and immediately surrounding the cities there are contiguous boroughs which have their own by-laws ; but in many cases the foot paths go outside those boroughs, and under the Police Offences Act the police have no other course open to them but to take a man's name and have him summoned and fined for even wheeling his bicycle on the footpath, when the road may be quite impassable. I own that it is seldom a policeman is indiscreet enough to take action in such a case, but I want to utterly remove the possibility by repealing the Act in so far as it may refer to bicycles. I trust when the Bill goes into Committee this amendment will have the support of those members of the Council who ride bicycles, and, as to those who do not ride bicycles, I would ask them to learn, and to pass this clause in the meantime. When they do learn the art they will then realise the full benefit of my amendment. Bill read the second time. IMPREST SUPPLY BILL (No. 2). This Bill was read the first, the second, and the third time. The Council adjourned at ten minutes past eight o'clock p.m. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. Friday, 26th July, 1901. First Readings-Imprest Supply Bill (No. 8)-Miners' Rights Fee Reduction Bill-Shops and Shop-assistants Bill-Totalisator Abolition Bill. Mr. SPEAKER took the chair at half-past two o'clock. PRAYERS. FIRST READINGS. City of Auckland Loans Consolidation and Auckland City Borrowing Bill, City of Christchurch Electric Power and Loan Empowering Bill. IMPREST SUPPLY BILL (No. 2). On the question, That the House go into Committee of Supply, Mr. FISHER (Wellington City) .- Sir, I move, as an amendment, That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the conduct of the Police Department as administered by Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge. I move this amendment because of the widespread complaints which have reached me from all parts of the colony in regard to the administration of the Police Force by Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge. Before I proceed further I want to make myself very clear upon one point. It is sometimes assumed by the men who compose the Police Force of the colony that this motion, of which I have given notice during two sessions, is directed against them. I wish it to be distinctly understood that my proposal in no way applies to them. Its scope is limited entirely to the higher officers who act under direct instructions of Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge. Now, the beginning of this series of attacks was made by Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge, and took place two years ago, when he endeavoured by insidious means to remove Mr. Inspector Pender from his position in the Force. Now, there is no more respected officer in the whole

<page>674</page>

and it came with an ill grace from a man of such limited qualifications as Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge to endeavour by such means to move a man of such high standing. Mr. Inspector Pender can look back with pride upon a long and honourable career. He has performed more noble service to this colony than Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge would be capable of doing if he lived here for fifty years. Mr. Inspector Pender has passed through what it is usual to call the heat and burden of the day, and if there were any desire on the part of any person-a Minister of the Crown or any other person-to remove Mr. Pender from his position, that ought to be done in a manly, straightforward, and honourable way. But what have been the means adopted by Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge to secure Inspector Pender's removal? First of all, then, he sets & certain class of officers of the Force, who are his willing and pliant tools, to spy on the other half of the Force-to spy on the men who are loyal, and have for years and years displayed their loyalty, to their old commander and officer, Inspector Pender. The first attempt of this kind was made through the instrumentality of Mr. Sub - Inspector Mitchell, a man well fitted to do such dirty work ; a man who was

advanced in the Force by Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge so that he should be better able to annoy and harass Inspector Pender. The insolence of Sub-Inspector Mitchell became intolerable. He had to be removed to Auckland. Another method adopted by Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge to injure the Police Force of this colony is this : Not satisfied with instructing the officers of the Police Force-not the men, but the officers-to spy upon each other, he himself walks through the streets in plain clothes watching every movement of the men. I will give you a sample of this kind of supervision. Sergeant Griffiths, one of the oldest and most respected sergeants in this colony, was reported by the Commissioner for being " seen speaking to a constable and smiling." He was reprimanded and removed from Wellington. Sergeant Griffiths told me the whole of the petty story. Again, a constable named Surgenor was reprimanded and received orders to remove to Auckland for being seen speaking to a bookmaker in Willis Street -so it was alleged by the Commissioner. Now, it happened that I passed along Willis Street on that very evening. I saw Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge at the time when this constable was said to have been seen speaking to a bookmaker, and, having seen and heard what took place, I am in a position to detail the circumstances to the House. Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge was walking ahead of the constable, and the gentleman pimp, who is always in his company at night --- An Hon. MEMBER .- Who is he ? Mr. FISHER .- I will tell you presently who he is. The gentleman pimp was walking behind. This is their method of trapping their man. The constable was therefore sandwiched between them. Just as I passed I heard the bookmaker say to the constable, " What is the row?" There were three or four men in the middle of the street talking loudly, and the constable said, "I do not know," and walked on. That is precisely all that took place. Next day Mr. Tunbridge sent instructions to the head office at the police-station to the effect that Constable Surgenor was to be reprimanded and to be removed to Auckland for this offence of having spoken to a bookmaker in the street. Constable Surgenor at once saw a person in authority, and when it was found that the charge was utterly unfounded and that there was absolutely nothing in it, everything was withdrawn -the reprimand was withdrawn, and the removal was withdrawn. Then, because Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge became the idol of the prohibition party, he began to believe that he was in reality the Governor of the country- a petty despot he truly is. He believed himself to be possessed of powers co-equal with those of the Premier. An Hon. MEMBER .- The Premier brought him out. Mr. FISHER .- If the Premier did bring him out, and, of course, he did, it is an act he ought to be sorry for. Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge is a man dressed in a little brief authority. He believes to this day that, through the power he acquired through the setting-up of the Taylor Royal Commission, the mantle of authority has fallen from the Premier's shoulders to his, and that he is now a great power in the land. When he failed in removing Inspector Pender by such unworthy means-and may he ever fail-then he attacks the young officers under Inspector Pender. Clearly he thinks that by removing the men who are loyal to Inspector Pender he will weaken Inspector Pender's position in the Force, and that by that means he will ultimately get rid of him. It is the underhand, the undermining trick. It is a long-thought-out plan, but it will never succeed in the case of Mr. Inspector Pender. The Minister of Justice, who is also Minister in charge of the police. Says that one of these officers who is about to be removed-Acting-Detective Nixon -- is to be so removed because cases of crime have recently gone undetected in the City of Wellington. If that is so, why blame Acting-Detective Nixon ? Let us put the logical position : Why blame Acting-Detective Nixon, who is a rising young officer, who has advanced rapidly, and is a credit to the detective branch of the Police Force of this colony. "Crime is undetected." says the Minister of Justice. Then, I ask him logically, what is Chief Detective McGrath doing? Should not the allegation, if there be any force in it, lie not against Acting-Detective Nixon, but against Chief Detective McGrath. and if blame is to be laid at the right door, if the right horse is to be saddled. why remove Acting-Detective Nixon, whose sheet is a clean sheet He has been noted for commendation by every officer under whom he has served-even by Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge himself. Why should he

be removed from Wellington ? while. in the case of Chief Detective McGrath, there are two. if not three, black marks on his sheet.

<page>675</page>

Mr. R. MCKENZIE. - How do you know ? Mr. FISHER .- I will show you directly from the report of the Commission which investigated the charges laid by Inspector Pender against Chief Detective McGrath. May I say the honourable member for Motueka appears to be utterly ignorant of the exact facts of the case ? Chief Detective McGrath was twice or three times reprimanded by Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge, not by Mr. Inspector Pender, as the honourable member for Motueka ignorantly appears to assume. It is said that "Crime goes undetected." That is the statement of the Minister of Justice. Now, will any one tell me why crime should go undetected in the City of Wellington ? About two weeks ago a burglary was committed in Cuba Street, Wellington, when a safe was opened and \$104 stolen from the safe. Information as to the intention to commit that burglary was given to Chief Detective McGrath by detectives under his own charge a week before the burglary took place. The place was watched for one night, and then the men were detailed for other duty. When the burglars found the detectives were taken off, what easier ? The burglary was committed. And yet the Minister in charge of the department says that crime goes undetected. He is quite correct ; but where does he place the blame ? He places the blame on Acting-Detective Nixon, who is the man who gave the information a week ahead. The man who ought to be moved from his position is Chief Detective McGrath. And let me here say this: Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge has said, not once but many times, to Acting-Detective Nixon, " If your conduct is good. if your sheet is clean, you will not be removed from Wellington." and upon that assurance Nixon has bought and partly paid for a house. And now let the honourable gentleman tell me if he can why Nixon is being removed ? His conduct is good, and his sheet is clean. We in Wellington know, and this Parliament ought to know, and the people of the country ought to know, that there is a dangerous feud existing in the head office of the police. Inspector Pender and his loyal men on the one hand. and Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge and I call them his disloyal men on the other hand ; and in consequence of the bitter differences between these two cliques the public interests are seriously suffering, and I say that a Committee of this House should be at once set up to discover in what quarter the blame should be placed. Here is another very curious thing. Before the Taylor Police Commission 3.0 Mr. Tunbridge made great complaint to the members of the Commission and to Parliament that the department was too much subject to political influence -that he found members of Parliament recommending men for appointment to the Police Force. That he made a strong ground of complaint. Now, when Mr. Tunbridge was travelling in Southland a year ago a man applied to him for appointment to the Police Force. Mr. Tunbridge said he could do nothing, but he told the man to get a recommendation from two or three members of Parliament, and then his appointment would be all right. If that statement is not true let Mr. Tunbridge deny it, and I will undertake to prove its truth. And then, forsooth, he complains of the political interference of members of Parliament, after recommending a man to go to members of Parliament to get a recommendation to take to a member of the Ministry. Then, take that disgraceful episode of last session -- the case of Mr. J. A. N. Salmon, a man occupying a responsible position in a lawyer's firm in this city. The police are instructed from Mr. Tunbridge's office to invade this man's premises without any warrant or any authority whatever. And upon the information of whom ? Upon information laid at the Police Office by Lady Stout, a member of the Social Purity Society. Lady Stout, I suppose, is an influential person. Under no other circumstances would Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge have moved in such a case. When the case came into Court, Mr. Salmon established his respectability as an old Thorndon resident, and proved very conclusively that no charge of cruelty could possibly rest against him. Then, when evidence was heard, Dr. Findlay, who had charge of the case for the prosecution, threw up the case, and handed his brief to the Magistrate to show how he had been misled. He was ashamed, and apologized for

appearing in the case. This is the police of New Zealand as administered by Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge. Here is another case, reported in Christchurch Truth of the 19th August, 1900, and I ask the House to listen to this. The case is a little ancient now, because the Premier refused to allow this subject to be brought before the House last session. The case is headed, "Peculiar Police Methods : What may happen to an Innocent Man," and then it goes on : " The action of the police in connection with the arrest of a young man, Thomas Chapple, who appeared at the Police Court yesterday, charged with having been illegally on premises, appeared on the face of it so peculiar that a representative of Truth made some inquiries concerning his treatment. It seems that Chapple is suffering from the effects of a severe fall from a ladder, which has interfered detrimentally with his health, and brings on fits of giddiness, to which he is occasionally subject. After dropping his stick over Jensen's fence Chapple states he went into the garden to search for it, and one of these fits came on him, his mind being occupied at the same time with some serious family trouble. When he was apprehended by the prosecutor Jensen the latter was inclined to accept his explanation and let him go, but a man, A. J. Wilkinson, who came to Jensen's assistance, suggested that he should be taken to the lock-up for the police to deal with the matter. The watchhouse-keeper asked if the stick was in the garden, and a constable was sent for it, and found it, and a charge of being illegally on premises was laid. There was no suggestion that considering the circumstances of the case the prosecutor should lay an information, and Chapple was locked up without further parley. Before in-

<page>676</page>

carcerated in the cells he asked leave of | Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge in this strain ? the watchhouse-keeper to ring up his friends and let them know where he was, because his mother would be anxious. The watchhouse-keeper's reply was that the sergeant would do that. Before being finally left to himself in the lock-up Chapple again repeated his request that his friends be communicated with, and gave the address of a house on the opposite side of the street to his, whose owner is always prepared to answer the telephone, and is a friend of the Chapple's, in order not to inconvenience the police. He was not told anything more by the watchhouse-keeper as to whether his friends had been communicated with, neither was he asked whether there were any other friends he would like to communicate with, or if he wanted to get bail. Being ignorant of the procedure of the police-station, he was left to himself. At half-past six o'clock in the morning his father, having found that he was not at home, came to the conclusion that he had been detained by some illness, and went to the house where he had been on the previous evening. He was told that his son had gone home at the usual time. Thinking it possible that he had had a recurrence of his fainting fits he went off to the police-station, where he found the young man in the lock-up. Mr. Chapple immediately took steps to bail out his son, and they were about to leave the station when he found that his boots had been taken. Another watchhouse-keeper was on and knew nothing about any boots, and Mr. Chapple was forced to go home and procure more foot-gear before his son could leave the station." Now, suppose the police to be justified in arresting that young man, was it not also demanded of them as a matter of justice and feeling for the lad's parents that they should have telephoned, as he requested, to let them know that he was detained at the police-station ? No ; he was kept there till the morning, and his father, as the report says, fearing his son had been attacked by one of his usual fainting fits, went to the police-station and found him there. Now, here is the information for my friend the member for Motueka in regard to Chief Detective McGrath's reprimands, which he attributes to Mr. Inspector Pender, instead of to Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge. This is taken from the Evening Star, Dunedin, of the 10th July, 1900. These are the findings of Mr. Commissioner Ponton on the charges brought by Inspector Pender against Chief Detective McGrath :- " Charges 1, 2, and 3 .- With regard to these charges, I concur with the conclusion of the Commissioner, who had the whole correspondence before him. The evidence taken at the inquiry threw little further light on the matter, and the documents

show, as found by the Commissioner, that the Chief Detective had not shown the consideration, respect, and obedience due to the rank, age, and experience of the Inspector." That is putting it very mildly. He should at least have been disgraced, until he learnt how to speak with respect to his superior officers. What if Acting-Detective Nixon had spoken of | that Mr. Inspector Pender is fit only to receive That is one charge proved. " Charge 5 .- ' Showing want of tact and discretion in ordering acting-detectives to style themselves constables.' The Chief Detective on learning that it was the custom in Wellington to use this title to the men so acting at once revoked his order. The custom was different where he had previously served." What useful purpose could Mr. Chief Detective McGrath or any other Chief Detective serve by raising such a silly objection as this. It was simply airing himself -putting on frills. "Charge 6 .- ' Making insolent and disrespectful remarks in his memos. of 7/10/99 re charges against McLean commenting on the Inspector's order to prosecute.' The Commissioner in this case found that the remarks were entirely out of place, and censured the Chief Detective for his want of loyalty, almost approaching hostility, to the Inspector. I differ from both the Inspector and Commissioner in the interpretation of the Chief Detective's minute. In my opinion, his remarks were intended to show his displeasure at the conduct of his subordinates in not avoiding the trouble with McLean, and were not in any way a reflection on the Inspector's order, which, as the Commissioner says, was ' a very proper one.' " There it will be seen that Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge censured Chief Detective Melirath for " want of loyalty, almost approaching hostility, to the Inspector." Then, what should have happened? Suppose Acting - Detective Nixon had been guilty of such an offence? That is another charge proved. "Charge 7 .- ' Neglecting to report Detective Henderson for being absent from duty, and improperly trying to screen him.' This charge was dealt with by the Commissioner, and I concur with him in finding that the Chief Detective was to blame. He should have reported the absence from duty sooner than he did." The Chief Detective was to blame. That is another charge proved. "Charge 11. ' Insubordinate language to the Inspector in stating "I have borne with you patiently for some time." "" Here is language from a subordinate to an Inspector in charge of a city police district. Was such impertinence ever known ? I will repeat the language : "I have borne with y.] patiently for some time." How considerate of Mr. Chief Detective McGrath, a fledgling in the service, to speak to a veteran of the standing of Mr. Inspector Pender and say, " I have borne with you patiently for some time." The unblushing cheek of it. Mr. Poynton find -. - "These words are regrettable, and should not have been used ; but, looking at the previous correspondence. and what led to them. they can be truly said to have been written under great provocation." Mr. R. MCKENZIE .- An old-age pensioner. Mr. FISHER .- The member for Motueka seems to think, judging by his interjection.

<page>677</page>

an old-age pension. I should like the member for Motueka to make that remark to Inspector Pender personally. I am inclined to think that the response would not be very much to Mr. McKenzie's advantage. I am able to answer him adequately in parliamentary language. " Charge 12 .- ' Neglect of duty in not forwarding brief in the Buck arson case to the Inspector at once, thereby causing delay in Court the following morning, and making false statements in connection therewith.' There is a conflict of evidence as to the time when these papers were placed in the Inspector's box. Weighing the evidence given at the inquiry, and checking it by the reports made shortly after the occurrence, there is a doubt in my mind as to whether the Inspector may not have been mistaken as to the papers not being in his box when he left the office." This last charge shows that Chief Detective McGrath was constantly being charged with neglect of duty. There may not be much in this last charge ; but one thing at least is clear - namely, that Mr. Commissioner Poynton wished to let Chief Detective McGrath down as lightly as he could. There are reprimands throughout the report, light though they be, and light though they may be made to appear on Chief Detective McGrath's sheet. I say that on such findings as these, and being convicted of insolence towards his superior officer, Mr. Inspector Pender, Chief Detective McGrath, in the interests of the ser-



vice, should have been removed or dismissed. Now, Sir, I dwell for a moment on the new system introduced into this country by Mr. / Commissioner Tunbridge -- the spy system. This gentleman pimp, in addition to perambu- lating the streets after dark with Mr. Com- missioner Tunbridge, gathers information for the Commissioner in various other ways, and if the Premier does not know who this gentleman pimp is I say it is his bounden duty to find him out. It is known to every one in this city who the gentleman pimp is. I use the phrase " gen- tleman pimp " to differentiate the pimp who is ! cision they must have "reasonable ground " clothed as a blackguard and the pimp who is clothed as a gentleman. I say that the methods introduced by Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge happened at seven o'clock in the morning. into this country have caused a reign of terror. No man feels safe. It is so different to our old colonial ways, our freedom, and our confidence in each other. Adopting the methods of T. E. Taylor, Armishaw, and Checketts, he sends round plain-clothes detectives to the hotels of the colony. I have travelled through the colony -perhaps not so much recently as Mr. Com- missioner Tunbridge -but wherever I go I find complaints from the leading hotelkeepers as to the ways of the constables of the Tunbridge type. I was at Grevmouth a short time ago, and was asked by Mr. Revington, who keeps a first-class hotel there, to make representations to this House as to the conduct of the constables of that district, because, he said, if the repre- sentations were made by Mr. Guinness they would say that Mr. Guinness took only a locally coloured view of what took place. He thought with the deliberate intention of tempting the the representation would come better from a member who was not the local member, and he asked me particularly to bring this matter be- fore the House to show the sort of police tyranny that was exercised in that town. I can speak of the tyranny exercised in other towns of the colony, and especially in the City of Wellington. In Mr. Revington's case two gentlemen were sitting in the hotel just after eleven o'clock. They had had their glass, and were conversing on ordinary subjects, when a constable walked in and ordered them out of the house. One was a Justice of the Peace-nothing in that, of course - and the other was a merchant of the place. And this is what may happen under the system of tyranny introduced by Mr. Com- missioner Tunbridge. As to the plain-clothes trick, the law is well laid down in England. The system in Wellington, as I say, is nothing short of absolute tyranny; but the law on the subject is clearly laid down in Duncan versus Dowding, Law Reports, 1897, Queen's Bench Division, page 575. "There must be reason- able grounds for catering." A plain-clothes constable dare not enter a hotel or public- house unless he has "reasonable grounds for entering." If a plain-clothes constable does enter a hotel without reasonable cause, the hotelkeeper-and I wish I were a hotelkeeper for a moment for the purpose- is entitled to precipitate the departure of that plain- clothes constable by a firm but gentle shove from behind. What happened in the Smith case - the Cricketers' Arms case. Two plain-clothes men climbed over a fence to get into the house at about seven in the morning. They found a boarder on the premises. An information was laid, and was, of course, promptly dismissed, because there was " no rea- sonable ground " for entering. Then, there was the case of the Post Office Hotel, certainly one of the most respectably conducted houses in the city. In that case the plain-clothes men jumped in over the back of the man who was washing out to see if there was any one in the bar. As I have said, under the English de- for entering the premises. They must believe that there are people there drinking. This Is it reasonable to suppose that there would be people in the bar drinking at that hour of the morning, especially at the Post Office Hotel? But these men had the temerity to go in. If I had been there they would have gone out in a hurry. But upon this subject we have a valu- able opinion from a colonial Judge. Judge Kettle, in the Kreissig case, reported in the Wanganni herald of the 28th April, 1900, said this : - " Mr. Kettle, after giving judgment, referred to and condemned the methods of the police in securing convictions by inducing people to break the law. The Police Force Act, he said, laid down that constables were appointed for the detection and prevention of crime, and they took an oath to do all they could to ' pre- vent' crime. The two constables, by the wish of their superior officer, went to the restaurant

defendant to commit an offence. He considered they were particeps criminis, and liable for aiding and inciting to commit an offence (see section 49 of the Justices of the Peace Act, and similar sections of the Criminal Code Act). There were two classes of police-those for the prevention and those for the detection of crime. It was quite fair to take all reasonable steps for the purpose of 'detecting' crime already committed, but it was not British nor fair to induce any one to commit an offence so that a charge might be brought against him. Mr. Kettle added that he was quite aware that Magistrates differed on the question, and that some held that these methods of detection were perfectly legitimate, but that was not his opinion." Now, Sir, what experience has Mr. Tunbridge in the organizing of a Police Force? None, absolutely none. Mr. Tunbridge is not a policeman. He is a London detective, gravitating from Scotland Yard - that hot-bed of rottenness and corruption, from the time of Meiklejohn downwards. Mr. Tunbridge has no experience in organizing a Force. He is not an organizer. In obsolete criminal theories Mr. Tunbridge may be an authority of some kind, but his antecedents, and being an essentially city man of a bygone period, stamp him as being utterly unequal to the intelligence of up-to-date criminal experts, or to the varying conditions of a colonial community. He is, doubtless, good enough to shadow hotelkeepers, and harass them to the limit of exasperation, but that is about all that can be said of him. Sir, it was an evil day when Mr. Tunbridge was imported to this country as Commissioner of Police, and I hope, at all events, - Mr. SPEAKER. - Time is up. Mr. R. MCKENZIE (Motueka) .- Sir, considering the violent attack that has been made by the honourable member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher) upon Mr. Tunbridge, I should expect to see the head of the Police Department in this House make an explanation. In fact, Sir, I have nothing at all to say about or against Mr. Inspector Pender, and I recognise that he has rendered very able and valuable services to this colony. At the same time, I recognise that the Minister of Justice, as a duty to the tax-payers of the colony, should have retired Inspector Pender some years ago. No fault at all can be found with Inspector Pender, only that he is too old for the position at the present time. As for the charges made by the honourable member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher) against the Police Force of this colony, I am sure that none of them ever came under my notice, and that our Police Force is now better organized and administered than previously. Ever since Mr. Tunbridge has been in the colony I think there has been an improvement in the Police Force ; and I think it is a most serious matter for the head of the department to sit in the House and let any honourable member make such charges against the police without giving an explanation and coming to their assistance and defence where they cannot defend themselves. Mr. McGOWAN (Minister of Justice) .- The honourable gentleman who has moved the amendment is to me an enigma, and the position he has taken up to-day is to a certain extent a surprise. My reason for not getting up at once and replying to the honourable member before the honourable member for Motueka seconded the amendment was because I was under the impression that the House thought the honourable member for Wellington City was only recounting his own grievances, and that he was not speaking altogether for the benefit of the colony. I believe the amendment would not have been seconded if the honourable member for Motueka had not done so for the reasons he has stated. Without getting at all into a heated frame of mind, it is just as well, perhaps, when an attack is made on a public officer who has no opportunity of defending himself, that the statement made should be calmly looked at. Though this matter has come upon me somewhat as a surprise, still I am in a position to be able to meet several of the charges made by the honourable member. With regard to the first matter mentioned-namely, the removal of Sergeant Griffiths from Wellington-let me tell the honourable member that that officer was removed at his own request. Sergeant Griffiths had been a very short time here when one of his sons died, and that was, of course, a great blow to him : and in addition to this his wife's health was not good, and he desired to be removed to Dunedin, and he was so removed. The honourable member has a very effective style. and has asserted that Mr. Commissioner 11-

bridge has acted as if he were Governor of the colony. I admit that I have not had as bad an acquaintance with the Police Force as t' honourable member, but I can say this with respect to Commissioner Tunbridge: that I have always found that officer anxious to discharge his duty to the colony in the manner possible, and I have always found him prepared to deal fairly with all cases that came before him, and to deal justly with the officers under him. If it were otherwise I would have no hesitation in saying so. because I am no more a friend of Commissioner Tunbridge than I am of the officer whom the honortaire 1 member has been cracking up so highiv. do not know why, a case of this kind should be taken in order to condemn one man Th. re by setting another on a pinnacle. is no necessity for doing so. The Wollington people and the members of tims House know that disputes have existed mu Wellington for some considerable time between the two branches of the police service in ties city. This was well known during last session of Parliament. Complaints have also ! ! ! made that crime has not been detected. Tis is simply owing to these disputes, and ace mi-e the Minister and the Commissioner of L'oise have endeavoured to settle these disputes - disputes which have been growing more pro- nounced, until the two sections of the l'okce Force, instead of working together, have reaih

<page>679</page>

particular leaning to any particular part of the Force. I only wish to do what is right to the Force as a whole, and I will not be deterred from doing that by the member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher) nor by any other member of this House, when I think I am in the right. With regard to Acting-Detective Nixon, I may say he is an excellent officer, and the proof of that is that both I and the Commissioner have recognised his services in this way: Although he is only an acting-detective, what are we doing with him ? First of all, it was proposed to remove him to Christchurch, and a considerable deputation waited upon the Premier and myself and asked that he should not be removed to Christchurch on account of his health, the application being backed up by a certificate from his doctor. We complied with that re- quest, and, instead of being removed to Christ- church, he was removed to a warmer climate, and at the same time he was given a better position. Yet the honourable member says we have done wrong to Detective Nixon. So long as I have anything to do with the police and the administration of the Force I shall strictly carry out what I believe to be best in the interests of the colony, and if it is necessary that a man should be removed from one place to another and it is necessary that members of the Force should be removed from time to time-I shall do so, and I shall not allow any political influence to interfere with the interests of the service of the colony. If I fail to do that, then it will be time for somebody else to take my position as Minis- terial head of the Police Force. It is the police who suffer in these cases, and it is the public who suffer. The honourable member made some remarks about crime going unde- tected in Wellington. It is unfortunate that a feeling should exist between the two branches of the Police Force here, but I may point out that the action which has been taken by the honourable member tends to increase that feel- ing. I do not want to say one word which would in any way disturb the honourable mem- ber's temper or his views on this question. I know that he has particular views in regard to the Police Force and as to how they treat the public. The honourable member said that a system existed by which men are virtually em- ployed to do a moral wrong for the sake of find- ing out those committing a similar crime. I say that system is not in vogue, and the honour- able gentleman knows it as well as I do. The police exist for the prevention of crime and for the detection of crime, and it is in order that the two branches of the Force should work in In harmony that changes are being made. regard to his remarks as to what Judge Kettle said, I think it would be no great injury if the law was so altered that those who buy drink after prohibited hours, as well as the publicans who sell it, should be punished. I have just one or two things to say with regard to the honourable gentleman. He has taken a great interest in the police. I will give one or two instances in which the honourable member has interested himself. With regard to members of the Force, he requested that Detective Neill should be transferred to Christchurch. Why was he not so removed ? I will be very

glad to comply with the request of the honourable member, or with the wish of any other honourable member when that wish does not affect what I consider to be the public good ; but I shall not comply with the request of any member of the House when I consider that request interferes with what I consider to be the public good. I am responsible to this House for the proper administration of the department.

Detective Neill was not sent to Christchurch because it is a rule of the service that no detective or police officer is sent to a place where his relatives are engaged in the liquor traffic. That is the reply to that.

Then, with regard to the promotion of ex-Constable Costin, the honourable member requested that he should be advanced to sergeant's rank ; but the man's health prevented this, and the result was that he was not so advanced. Now, with regard to another appointment-namely, Mounted Constable Abbott, of Wellington. The honourable member requested that he should be appointed to detective-work. The plain explanation of the refusal is that he is not fitted for such work, and I shall not, at the request even of a member of this House, appoint an officer to a position which he is not fitted to fill. I must have confidence in my officers ; if I have not, then I shall remove them ; but I shall not do so until I find them unfaithful to the service or unsuited to the positions which they fill. While I find 3.30. they are anxious to do their duty it is my place to protect them. Mr. FISHER. Who was the officer recommended for that position ? Mr.

McGOWAN .- I cannot say at the moment, but perhaps if I had spent as much time in preparing my notes as the honourable gentleman spent over his I would have been able to tell him. Another request that he made was to have Acting-Detective Cox made a detective ; but there was no vacancy. In fact, the honourable gentleman wants to run the Police Force in Wellington. He may try to do that, but I can assure him that he cannot run me. I know that he is independent and likes to enjoy his independence, but at the same time I am not going to allow the Police Force to be run according to his wishes. Of course, if he makes a request to me that I consider to be for the public good, then no one will be more ready than I to take suggestions from the honourable member. I will not, however, do so until I find out whether it is right or not; but I need not continue this matter. It seems to me that for some reason or other the honourable gentleman desires to bring on the floor of this House his grievances against Mr.

Commissioner Tunbridge. I shall be only too glad to have investigated any particular complaint that he may bring under my notice. He has now had an opportunity of airing his grievances here ; and, further, the honourable gentleman has been a frequent visitor at the Police Office. I will undertake to say that since I have had charge of that department the honourable

<page>680</page>

gentleman has been in the Police Office ten times as often as I have been-I mean for information. Mr.

FISHER .- Will the honourable gentleman kindly inform me what the gentlemen on the other side are laughing at ? Mr. McGOWAN .- Sometimes I am able to explain, but in this instance I am not able to do so-possibly they are laughing at me, and, if so, I have very little objection. He who laughs last laughs best. I think I have now said enough to show that there are no real grounds for the complaint of the honourable gentleman, and certainly there is no ground for the setting-up of a Commission. No doubt there has been a certain amount of friction, and it is just as well that explanations should be made.

Without, I hope, disturbing the feelings of the honourable gentleman, I will be glad to do my best to have that friction removed, and I believe that I will be successful. I will not, however, succeed if honourable members are to interfere in every instance. It is not right that any one in charge of a department should be continually interfered with by honourable members, however desirous they may be to do that which is right. I believe the honourable member desires to do what he considers to be right in this matter ; but I think I am right in my view, and, being responsible for the department, I must do that which I consider to be in the best interests of the public, and not as Mr. Fisher thinks. Mr. MILLAR (Dunedin City) .- I desire to congratulate the Minister who has just sat down upon the vigorous reply he has made to the unfounded charges of the honourable member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher). When we hear the charges against

Commissioner Tunbridge so fully disposed of by the Minister of Justice there is no need to say any more on that matter; but I can assure the honourable gentleman that both in the Force and by the public that gentleman is looked upon as the right man in the right place. No man in this colony has done more effective service than the same gentleman. The Force has been reorganized, and justice is being done to them. The trouble in connection with Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge is that he is too clever a man for many of the schemers in the Force, and because of that a few of these schemers are trying to raise this cry. What has caused the honourable member's action? Perhaps honourable gentlemen are not aware that the prime mover in the whole trouble in Wellington is a disappointed man—a man who was sent to England to bring out a Christchurch lawyer who was wanted, and when that lawyer arrived the officer referred to expected to be made a Sub-Inspector. Instead of that he was left where he was and put in charge of the Wellington office. From the date that Chief Detective McGrath was promoted and transferred to Wellington this man has done his best to get him out of the service, and was a party to trumping up a series of charges against McGrath. From that day Mr. Wright has been doing his utmost to have McGrath removed or dismissed. No one desires to say a word against Inspector Pender—the services that he has rendered in the past are admitted. But he is now too old for the position. One of the principal arguments in favour of the superannuation scheme was that it was impossible to continue these old servants in the Force, and to do them justice pensions would have to be provided for them. As a consequence of this the Act was agreed to. The understanding was that these old officers would be pensioned off. Instead of that they are still being retained. Take the case of Mr. Wright, who trumped up twelve charges against Chief Detective McGrath. The Public Trustee was appointed to go into the whole matter. One charge Detective McGrath admitted. Three, I think, were practically minor charges. They had to rake throughout the length and breadth of the Force to find anything against him. As for the rest, they were dismissed. The honourable gentleman knows what the summing-up of the Public Trustee was. What was one of the causes of the Chief Detective treating the Inspector in charge in an insubordinate manner? The honourable gentleman talks about detecting crime; but if he were in a department, what would he think of the head of that department passing him over and giving information about a case to a subordinate? That is what Inspector Pender did in Wellington. Was it to be wondered at that the Chief Detective would not put up with that conduct? The whole thing was a scheme to get McGrath out of the Force, and to enable Wright to get his place. Commissioner Tunbridge has now had time to weigh the whole of his men, and I think he has got Mr. Wright's measure, along with that of many other members of the Force. But, Sir, we can quite understand what is the trouble, because the Minister says the member for Wellington City wishes to run the Police Force in Wellington, and therefore I can quite understand the attack on Detective McGrath. Detective McGrath is in Mr. Wright's road. and Mr. Wright, if I am not misinformed, has been in communication with the member for Wellington City, and, therefore, to get rid of Detective McGrath and make room for Mr. Wright the honourable member has made this attack on the Chief Detective. Why, Sir, Detective McGrath's character can be given by every Magistrate in the colony in whose Court he has practised. He is admitted to be one of the ablest men who has gone into the Courts on behalf of the police, and as a detective he is recognised to be the equal of any man in the Force. That, Sir, is a fact that can be proved conclusively. For myself, I would be quite prepared to give a Royal Commission tomorrow, and if there was brought forward the evidence that it is possible to bring forward against certain schemers in the service the result would be that instead of being appointed Chief Detective, or put into some other position, they would find they would have to look for work elsewhere. Sir, it is surprising to me that the Minister, knowing the difficulty—and I think this is the only point at which

<page>681</page>

he displayed weakness—did not remove the | Speaker, I rise to speak with a good deal of difficulty—that was causing all the trouble. Furthermore, I am informed that this officer was ordered to be removed from

Wellington, and, if I am not mistaken, the member for Wellington City was one of those who came to the Minister and asked that the officer should be allowed to remain. I may be wrong in that, but I think I am fairly correct in what I say. Mr. ATKINSON .- Which member for Wellington City ? Mr. MILLAR .- I refer to the honourable member for Wellington City who spoke this afternoon. Sir, I am sorry the officer is still in this city. I think if the Minister had done what I am told he intended to do namely, to remove the officer to another sphere, and had let him know that his scheming had been seen through - the Police Force in Wellington would have been on a different footing altogether to-day. I do not think it is Inspector Pender who is doing it all. I think Mr. Wright is the cause of it. At any rate, that could be easily proved by removing him to another place where his services would be better appreciated. Sir, if the member for Wellington City makes an attack on any member of the Police Force in future I hope he will give better grounds for his charges than he gave to the House to-day. when he attacked Commissioner Tunbridge and Detective McGrath. Mr. WITHEFORD (Auckland City). - Sir, I consider that the colony is fortunate in having at the head of its Police Force such an eminent man as Commissioner Tunbridge. To have an efficient head of the department is a question that affects not only Wellington but the whole of the colony, and, speaking for Auckland, I may say that matters were never so satisfactory as they are at the present time, which is one result of Commissioner Tunbridge's management. I fully concur with the sentiments that have been expressed by the Minister of Justice to-day. It is not because I am a consistent supporter of the Government that I am supporting the Government in this particular matter. It is because I consider the Minister is in the right. Sir, I remember the time when Commissioner Tunbridge rendered great service to the British Government. He possesses to an extraordinary extent the confidence of the British Government and also of the people of England, and it is really a matter for congratulation on our part that we have such an eminent man at the head of our Police Force. Commissioner Tunbridge's experience has not been confined to Great Britain. When matters of extreme urgency had to be carried out on behalf of the British Government - matters in connection with the Police Department - Mr. Tunbridge was selected as the ablest man in Great Britain to go to North America, to South America, to South Africa, and to the Australian Colonies to carry out most important duties on behalf of the Government. Therefore I cordially support the appointment of Mr. Tunbridge, and I think we have in him the right man in the right place. Mr. WILFORD (Wellington Suburbs) .- Mr. Pender on this matter, as I was counsel for Inspector Pender in the charges which were made against him, and also in the counter-charges made by Detective McGrath against Inspector Pender. I therefore feel the responsibility of my position, and whatever I may say may be considered by narrow-minded individuals to be to a certain extent prejudiced on behalf of the gentleman for whom I was acting. Consequently, I shall do my best to be temperate, and I shall not by heat or exaggeration embellish the few facts I wish to put before the House. In the first place, it will be admitted by honourable members, no matter what their views may be in this House, and no matter what their views may be with regard to my views on the matter, that I have had some experience of the Police Force in Wellington in the last ten years. When I tell the House that about four thousand criminal cases come before the Court in Wellington every year it will be seen that the number is considerable, and any one who has the fortune - or the misfortune, whichever way you like to put it - of having to appear in the Court frequently must daily be brought into close communication not only with the local police - the Inspector, the Sub-Inspector, and the sergeants - but with Commissioner Tunbridge as well. Sir, I wish to approach this matter from a far broader basis than that from which the member for Wellington City approached it. I do not want to take up the attitude taken up by that honourable gentleman, because I do not want to cast reflections on Commissioner Tunbridge; but I will say this, and I say it authoritatively : that the state of things that exists in the Wellington Police-station is against the welfare of the administration of justice in this city. I know as well as I am standing here that at the present time there are two parties in the police-station of the City of Wellington. I know that one side is headed by Chief

Detective McGrath, while on the other there is Inspector Pender. It must be an unhealthy thing in the detection of crime if you have a split in the camp of the parties who have to detect crime. What is to be the result so far as the colony is concerned ? Let us imagine the case of a fugitive offender arriving in the city, and his case being put into the hands of one of the "sides" in the police - station. Why, that "side" may go out on the street, and be carrying out its duty, and the other "side" may also be on the street and may pass the offender without knowing he was wanted by the police. Sir, I am satisfied of this : that though a Royal Commission to inquire into the actions of Commissioner Tunbridge may not be the right thing, the Minister of Justice should inquire into the state of things that exists in this city as far as the constitution of the Police Force is concerned. Sir, I need not indulge in any personalities whatever. I will discuss the matter as broadly as I can. If the state of things that I say exists here actually exists, then it may be said to reflect on Commissioner Tunbridge if he is aware of it.

<page>682</page>

If he is not aware of it, it will be brought under his notice to-day, and if the matter is discussed temperately and ordinarily, and without showing heat, or venom, or spite, it will help to do good, and perhaps will also help the Minister in charge of the department to alter the state of things that exists at present. I was sorry to hear the warmth imported into the speech of the member for Dunedin City (Mr. Millar). That honourable gentleman and I get on very well together. On labour matters I am instructed by him at times, and I am pleased to be, as he is a man who has studied those questions thoroughly, and understands them. The honourable member is an old politician, but even in an old politician I suppose at times feeling runs away with discretion ; and his friendship for a man whom he knows as a friend - Detective McGrath - caused him to make remarks which on calm reflection, and when he is correcting his Hansard proofs, he will regret having made. But he is usually generous; and were he generous to-day he should stand up in the House, as every one should who believes in discipline, and in having an honest man at the head of affairs, and say " Well done Inspector Pender, for the work you have done for New Zealand." From the time Inspector Pender fought in the Crimea to the present day there has never been a black mark against his name; he is an honourable man, who has done his best in the interests of justice, and the only crime he can be charged with is that he is old. I read a few weeks ago of a resolution passed by a body - I forget its exact denomination - which has to do with the administration of the Police Force in England, in connection with the retirement of an old officer in the Force. It was suggested that this old officer should retire because he was past the age-limit as set out in the police regulations. He replied to the suggestion : "Why should I retire ? My brain is clear ; my intellect is the same, I hope, as ever: I am able to carry out the duties, and I am prepared to go on with my work and to do my work as I have done it in the past, and I hope the matter will not be pressed." On account of its being known that, notwithstanding his age, he was still able and ready to do his work, the members of the Police Force at Home were so pleased that the old Inspector was still ready to go on, that amongst themselves they contributed a purse of sovereigns and presented him with it, and the Board -- whatever was its constitution, I forget -- increased his salary for the remaining portion of his life of service. He died some fifteen months later ; but for the remaining fifteen months his salary was increased on account of his honourable service in the past. We know all about the Provident Fund into which members of the Police Force pay. Do honourable members know that Mr. Pender pays about \$40 a year out of his salary into that fund ? If he retired he would get about #240 a year. But he prefers to work and pay in rather than retire and draw out. Earnestly, and with honesty of conviction, I believe Mr. Inspector Pender is as capable of doing his work to-day in the Court as he was ten years ago.

Hon. MEMBERS .- Hear, hear ; No, no. Mr. WILFORD .- Very well ; if honourable members say "No" I am quite prepared to let them say so, but if they were constantly defending criminals when Inspector Pender is prosecuting, they would very soon find out whether that gentleman has ability or not. I can assure honourable members they have no idea of the intuitive abilities of Inspector Pender. A young

member stands up in the House and presumes-as I have no doubt it will be said I am doing - to show members who have grown grey in the House the way they must go. So the younger members intend to dictate to an old member like Mr. Pender when he comes to the Court to undertake the duties that pertain to his office. I say-and the legal profession will bear me out in this, for they know-that when you have to fight Mr. Pender you have to look out what you are doing, and to conduct your case capably if you expect to attain any good result. Mr. Pender is quite as fit to conduct prosecutions as he was when Mr. Tunbridge came here. In the Silverstream murder case and the Petone murder case he proved this, and he has conducted some of the largest criminal cases in New Zealand successfully. Mr. Tunbridge knows this also. He is a fair gentleman, and will be prepared to admit this. Let me say one word and answer the statement of the honourable member for Dunedin City (Mr. Millar) in regard to Sergeant Wright. He does not know him : I do. If he knew Sergeant Wright he would not have spoken as he did. He was telling us what somebody else told him. I ask him here, has he ever seen Sergeant Wright ? Does he know him ? He does not ; he would not have the faintest idea if Sergeant Wright were sitting behind him now. He has merely told the House what he has been told. Would honourable members, if they were sitting as a jury, take the slightest notice of the evidence of a witness who told them what somebody else had told him ? No, they would be just. I am sure they will be just so far as Sergeant Wright is concerned. I know this about Sergeant Wright. Sir, I notice the honourable member for Dunedin City (Mr. Barclay) interjects. I will tell you why. It is because he has a motion on the Order Paper for Inspector Pender to retire. It is put in these words. " Why have not the Government carried out the Police Regulations ? In English this is. " so-and-so. " " Why does not Mr. Pender retire ? " Honourable members will understand the interjection of the honourable member. Mr. BARCLAY .- I never opened my mouth. Mr. WILFORD .- No, I know : you spoke. but you did not say anything. Let me say this in conclusion - because the honourable member for Dunedin City (Mr. Millar) is a worthy for. and he will be just when I tell him this : that Sergeant Wright, of the Police Force, is not only a man of more than ordinary ability, but he is a man who is fully up in criminal law : he is not a mere policeman in the style of run-

<page>683</page>

ning a man in for being drunk and disorderly, . that at no previous period, excepting during the but he is fully posted in the various branches of criminal law. Here is another honourable member from Dunedin interjecting -- the member for Caversham. He asks me how do I know ? He has only got to have as much to do with criminal work as I have and he will soon find out. And he would know that counsel engaged in the criminal jurisdiction of the Court come constantly into communication with Inspector Pender, Sub-inspector Wilson, Sergeant Wright, and also with Mr. Tunbridge. Mr. Tunbridge knows this, and would bear me out in what I am saying. I ask the honourable member for Dunedin (Mr. Millar) to do justice to those who are absent, and cannot reply, and not make statements that will be sent broadcast throughout the colony reflecting on Sergeant Wright, about whom he knows nothing. During this short speech I have made I have said no harsh word of any one. I have spoken in favour of Inspector Pender and Sergeant Wright : and in regard to my honourable friend's particular detective, Mr. McGrath, I say nothing at all, because I had to prosecute in the case against him, and therefore my mouth is closed. There are no recriminations in my speech ; I only speak up for the men that the honourable member for Dunedin City is running down, and ! of whom he has no knowledge at all. I hope good will be done by bringing under the notice of the Commissioner and the Minister the fact that things are not as they ought to be in the Police Force in Wellington. That they are not will be admitted by every one. And, Sir, I am certain, if the Minister of Justice will not only say he will have a stiff back to act, but will act up to what he said in the House to-day, the Police Force will be a credit to the colony. I agree that, so far as the personnel of the Force is concerned, there is a distinct improvement in the last year or two. The criminal cases in Southland, in which the bearing of the men; the way they give evidence ; the reports they put



in-of which I have seen numbers and numbers -- are altogether different from what they were even within my knowledge five or six years ago; and I believe it is the rarest thing in Wellington to find a policeman attempting to distort evidence. I have seen the maxims as set out in the police-station for the guidance of officers : " Be temperate, and never attempt to get a conviction by forcing the evidence given." I am prepared to speak up for the Police Force as a whole in the colony, and I am not going to make imputations against a single individual : to my mind it does no good. Let the Minister and Mr. Tunbridge take notice of what has been said, and go to work to do away with the anomalies that exist in the Police Force, and they will do a great deal of good for the colony which will be appreciated and valued by all. Mr. NAPIER (Auckland City) .- As far as the city I have the honour to represent is concerned, there is absolutely no necessity for this Commission. Since 1883 I have had an extensive Court practice in the City of Auckland, and I have been brought into intimate contact time that Inspector Broham was in charge, has the Police Force in that city been as efficient as it is to-day. There is a greater esprit de corps, and a more thorough knowledge of the duties of their position among the members of the police in Auckland than ever before. I would not have risen but for a remark which was made by the honourable gentleman who moved the motion with regard to Sub-Inspector Mitchell. Now, I have known Sub-Inspector Mitchell since 1881, when he was watch-house keeper at Auckland, and I have followed his career with the greatest interest in the intervening period, and I say unhesitatingly that there is no smarter or straighter officer in the whole of the Police Force than he is. The manner in which he conducts his cases at the present time in the Auckland Police Court would be creditable to any criminal lawyer. He is calm, temperate, has a good knowledge of law and Police Court procedure, and I am sure that the Police Force of this colony and the country are to be congratulated upon having so efficient an officer as Sub-Inspector Mitchell. Mr. HANAN . Invercargill. -- The honourable member for the Suburbs in his remarks referred to a little heat which was manifested by : he honourable member for the City of Dunedin (Mr. Millar), when he spoke on this occasion. I have no doubt, Sir, that that feeling which was exhibited by the honourable member for Dunedin was due to a consciousness on his part that an attempt was made last year to drive a most deserving officer . I refer to Detective Metirath - out of the Police Service of this colony. Now, Sir, I cannot be said to be a friend of Detective McGirath, but having had ample opportunities of judging of that official's character and abilities as a detective, by reason : of my connection as counsel with important detective was engaged, I have no hesitation in saying that as a detective he is second to none in this colony. Strange to say, it is only when that gentleman comes to Wellington that we hear the slightest complaint made against him. During the whole of his service in Otago his conduct as a man commanded the highest respect, while there was entertained the highest admiration for his ability as a police-officer. The honourable member for Wellington Sub-urbs stated that Inspector Pender is an honourable man; but I also claim for Detective McGirath that he too is an honourable man. I am exceedingly pleased that the conspiracy, or attempt, which was made last year to drive Detective McGrath out of the service failed, and I hope, Sir, that he will long continue his creditable connection with our Police Force, and only regret that we have not more men of his character and professional capabilities in the service of this colony. I have no hesitation in saying that if the persecution of Detective Metirath had been successful last year it would have been a step inimical to the best interests of the Police Force as well as inflicting a great injustice on a highly efficient, experienced, and most deserving public servant.

<page>684</page>

Mr. SEDDON (Premier) .- I think the House will admit with me that there has been a waste of time this afternoon, and they will admit with me the wisdom of the remark I heard in the House some time ago-namely, that we ought to keep the Police Force off the floor of this House. It was political influence and interference that at one time was the means of placing the Police Force of this colony in a false

position ; and when, as Minister in charge of that department, I fought against the House interfering, there was a strong feeling created as the result against myself. An Hon. MEMBER .- You did not put your foot down. Mr. SEDDON .- I did put my foot down. You can turn a torrent, if you lead it ; but, when in flood, put something across it at right angles, and you will fail to turn it, and your structure would be swept away. And therefore in stopping a political torrent you have to be careful that you do it carefully and firmly. I might say here at once that the responsibility of bringing out Commissioner Tunbridge falls upon my shoulders. An Hon. MEMBER .- The best thing you ever did. Mr. SEDDON. - Very well. If my visit Home to the Jubilee celebrations did no other good for the colony, I say that that was one. And not only that, but, as that gentleman's qualifications have been brought on the floor of the House to-day, I might say that before the selection was made I asked the Chief of the Police Force of Great Britain to assist me in the selection of a capable officer, and, after a little time he recommended Commissioner Tunbridge. He said, "If you can get him, he is the best man I know of in the whole of the British force." Of course, it is well known that Mr. Tunbridge enjoys a pension from the British force, but on account of the climate at Home and other considerations he himself was in favour of coming out here, and ultimately he accepted the position of Chief Commissioner of Police in this colony ; and we know that after his arrival a crisis occurred in respect to the Police Force. Affairs some time previous were under the charge of Colonel Hume, who prior to coming to this colony had not had police experience. He was put there against his own inclinations, and on the ground of economy ; and Colonel Hume, under the circumstances, did fairly well. But owing to an increase in the population, and a correspondingly increased police supervision, we decided that there should be a change, and when Mr. Tunbridge arrived here the first thing that met him was the attack on the floor of this House, and before he had had time to fully know or to grasp the strength or position of his Force, he was suddenly confronted with a Royal Commission and an investigation; and, taking into consideration, as we must, the difficulties surrounding the matter, Commissioner Tunbridge came out of that inquiry, and so did the whole Force, with credit. And the inquiry proved-I have no hesitation in saying it-that, as far as the Police Force is concerned, there was the material there to make it a most efficient Force, and the result has been, I think, to the satisfaction of the people of this colony generally. I say this because it is due to the Commissioner, and it is also due to the police. I said the same thing on the floor of this House when the attack was made upon the Force. An Hon. MEMBER .- You had not a Minister then to stand up and defend them. Mr. SEDDON .- There was just one thing that I regret in my life, and that was that I did not take it upon myself to reply at that time for the Police Force. That is what I do regret, for there was abundant material at command to have met every charge of moment that had been made against the Force. However, I am glad this has been brought forward, if only to demonstrate to the gentlemen opposite that this is not a "one-man Ministry." I am pleased to find my colleague the Minister of Justice defending the position and his department, and he has put the matter before the House and the country in a light that, I think, the gentlemen opposite never anticipated. I, at all events, know all about it. Well, I can understand that this would be the opportunity the honourable member for Wellington City left open, and when he asked the question, "What are you laughing at ?" we can well understand that the honourable members opposite were laughing because they found a Government supporter attacking a department on its administration. At all events, the Opposition have always been on the alert, and if a Government supporter attacks any of the departments controlled by Ministers it is very satisfactory to the Opposition, and they were pleased, no doubt, this afternoon, from that point of view ; and that. I may tell the honourable member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher), is what they were probably amused at. I regret that Inspector Pender's name should be brought on the floor of the House-some members speaking unfavourably of him, and others extolling and defending him. I say those who do that are no friends of Inspector Pender ; they are not friends of any officer in the police service, because the moment an officer comes on the floor of the House, either to be

extolled or attacked, then that particular officer becomes noted, and it is an injury to him in the police service. Were it not that I know Commissioner Tunbridge to be a man who would not be influenced, I would feel that what has taken place on the floor of the House this afternoon might be prejudicial to Detective Nixon. It certainly cannot help him in the service. Mr. HUTCHESON .- Did the Opposition do it ? Mr. SEDDON .- No, it was not the Opposi- tion who did it ; but I say that any officer whose name is brought up under the conditions of to-day is liable to be prejudiced ; and unless you have a strong minded man at the helm. that officer may suffer in the service. Now. I should be very sorry if what has happened should injure Detective Nixon. I say every police-officer in the service of the colony under-

<page>685</page>

stands that when he is told he is to go to another place in the interests of the service he must go. This, I say, is a fundamental principle that you must lay down, and you must support the head of your police, because if you do not do so, and if those removals are stopped by political interference, your Police Force must suffer. There may be, of course, cases and times for reconsideration when there are circumstances which perhaps were not known at first, and then it is reason- able to take them into consideration. But the general principle must be affirmed and main- tained -- that when an officer is told to go he must go and do his duty cheerfully wherever he is sent. Mr. HUTCHESON .- Did Sergeant Wright go ? Mr. SEDDON .- Shall I tell the honourable gentleman what happened here last session in respect to Sergeant Wright ? Mr. ATKINSON .- Last week. Mr. SEDDON .-No, not last week. We had the Dunedin or South section of the members last session-Mr. Millar, Mr. Barclay, and other members An Hon. MEMBER .- No. Mr. SEDDON .- Well, there was a deputa- tion, at all events, of southern members in fa- your of Detective McGrath, and some rumour was afloat that Detective McGrath was to be shifted from Wellington, and the southern members and Dunedin members- Mr. ARNOLD .- You had better name them. Mr. SEDDON .- I know, at all events, that Mr. Millar was one of them; and I say they protested against Detective McGrath being shifted. In respect to Sergeant Wright, it was not known at that time what was going to happen. Then they protested against Sergeant Wright being removed. Mr. MORRISON .-- Who did ? Mr. SEDDON .- The Wellington members. Mr. ATKINSON .- How many Wellington members-one ? Mr. SEDDON .- No; more than one- I should say, to be correct, members of the Wel- lington District. Let me say that the situation then was that we had one section of members -- or, rather, some members speaking in the in- tere ts of one officer and saying he ought to be kopt hore, and that to remove him would be an injury to the Force; and another section of members saving of another officer, "If you shift him it will be a reflection on him." I say, to take up that position, as you have it now in all its nakedness, must be injurious to the ser- vice, and it is not in the interests of these officers. Hon. MEMBERS .- Hear, hear. Mr. SEDDON .- Very well. It was considered by the Minister of Justice that it would be better to see how matters would work after this conflict, and if any improvement would take place. I may say that a considerable improve- ment did take place : the warning had its effect. That there should have been recently a renewal of the difficulty is painful to me ; but the Minis- ter in charge is capable of dealing with it, and he thought one way of dealing with it was by removing Nixon, who was not, and who should not in this case be considered one of the parties, as between the McGrath and Wright trouble, for that occurred nearly two years ago, and has for a long time been dead and buried. I say he was not, but, in the interests of the detective force, my colleague has deemed it necessary to remove Detective Nixon, and I say that ought to be allowed to stand so long as he is not injured. I may say there is no desire on the part of my colleague to injure Nixon in the slightest or to reduce him in rank or position. My colleague has said that the position he has given Nixon is superior to the position he previously held, and that being the case, there has been no injustice done. Let me, in conclusion, say this : that the Government want to have the Police Force kept as perfect and independent as it is possible to keep it. We want Parliament to give its confidence to the Commissioner and to the Inspectors, because each require to be strengthened,

considering the unpleasant duties they have to perform. We all admit the great service that Inspector Pender has rendered to this colony, and I say here that I would never be a party to detract in any way from those services. In fact, if we were to do so I believe there would be great public indignation. I can also say-and I will never believe anything else-that, so far as Commissioner Tunbridge is concerned, he recognises and appreciates those services, because he has been for years an officer in the Police service at Home, and knows the difficulties that Inspector Pender has had to go through with his - lengthy service, and to hold the position that he does in the service. I feel satisfied myself that there is nothing unpleasant between Commissioner Tunbridge and Inspector Pender. I cannot conceive, knowing Commissioner Tunbridge as I do, that there is any feeling. I am certain that he has one desire, as Inspector Pender has one desire -- namely, that crime should be suppressed, that order should prevail, and that the officers shall do their duty. And, of course, in the Police Force, unless the whole detective branch is working in harmony with the others, it is impossible to prevent crime, or, when crime has taken place, to bring the offenders to justice. We must have harmony, or else injustice will obtain, and it will not promote harmony in the Force ; it will not promote the suppression of crime ; it will not promote the ends of justice if police matters, and particular members of the Force, are to be brought on the floor of the House. The question brought up by the honourable member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher) has been on the Order Paper some days, and probably it not being answered may have caused the honourable member to become impatient. At any rate, it has not been any fault of the House that the answer has not been given. I believe my colleague would have given the same answer to the question, though in fewer words, that I have given to-day, and the matter would not have been raised on the floor of the House at all. At all events, when we come to view the

<page>686</page>

position calmly and dispassionately, the House and the country will support the Government in saying that we will not have the police, from the Commissioner down to the humblest member of the Force, dragged into our political life and politics. But we must keep them and support them in their arduous and often unpleasant duties in the protection of property and life in this colony. I would ask the honourable member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher) to withdraw his amendment, and allow us to go on with the Imprest Supply Bill. Mr. MILLAR (Dunedin City) .- I believe the Right Hon. the Premier said, whilst I was out of the Chamber, that I formed part of a deputation last session to request that Chief Detective McGrath should be kept here. I state most emphatically that I never interviewed the Premier last session on behalf of Chief Detective McGrath. Two sessions ago, when the northern men were interviewing the Premier with regard to shifting Chief Detective McGrath, I was one of a deputation of southern members who went to put Detective McGrath's case before the Premier. So far as Detective McGrath himself is concerned, I have not spoken a word to him for about fifteen months. Mr. SEDDON (Premier) .- If I made a mistake it was only in the matter of the session. It is true what I said: that the honourable member was one of a deputation that waited upon me, only it was not last session but the session before last. Mr. J. ALLEN (Bruce) .- There was one remark made by the Premier in his speech that I wish to say a word about. He said that honourable members on this side of the House were rejoicing in the fact that a member on his own side of the House had attacked a department under the charge of a Minister. I, for one on this side of the House, was not laughing, and I did not laugh once while the honourable member for Wellington City was speaking. I did not laugh, because it was no laughing matter. I rejoice, as every member on this side of the House will rejoice, whenever a member on that side of the House attacks the Government rightly, and I will laugh as much as I can laugh. But on this occasion I regret, and I believe that every one on this side of the House regrets as do members on the other side of the House, the speech delivered by the honourable member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher). To me it is an open expression of what I believe has been taking place secretly, silently, and surreptitiously. The honourable member has come out in the

open to-day, and he has been attacking the administration of the Police Department, and attacking the Commissioner in charge of the police. With what object? Because I am afraid that the scheme that has been going on secretly and silently has not had the effect that the honourable member desired it should have, and so he comes out into the open and attacks a man who has done good service for the colony, which every one has recognised to-day by their voiced opinions. And for what purpose? As I indicated, for no other Mr. Seddon purpose than that he hopes by perpetuating this attack in the House, where he cannot be met by the Commissioner of Police, to influence the department with respect to appointments and removals in the service. If that is his intention I hope it will have no effect, and I hope the country and the Minister in charge of the department, so long as the Commissioner is doing his duty-and I believe he is doing his duty-will uphold the Commissioner and resist these attacks, whether they come from this side or from that side of the House. Now, Sir, whilst I am on my feet I would like to say this: that it is rumoured that not only individual members of the House-such as, for instance, the honourable member for Wellington City, Mr. Fisher, I do not know whether I ought to include the honourable member for Wellington Suburbs, Mr. Wilford, the counsel for the petitioner in this case-but members seek to use influence with the department. I hope the Minister will be able, not only to resist the influence brought to bear upon him from individual members of the House, but I hope, too, Sir, that he will be able to resist any influence that may be brought to bear upon him from other members of the Ministry. Sir, if rumour be true, the Minister has a hard fight to fight; and, Sir, the Hon. the Minister will find those who sit on this side of the House with him to a member, if, when his department is menaced, he keeps a stiff back and keeps the department under his own control, and resists the influence for bad of his own colleagues. Sir, the words used by the honourable member for Wellington City to-day, in making his vile attack-I can use no other word to describe his attack upon the Commissioner of Police - I should hope might have been excised from Hansard. I hope it will never go on record that any member of this House, nor, I believe, in the other, is in accord with what the honourable member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher) has done or said in this matter. Mr. BARCLAY (Dunedin City) :- I think it is right that I should say a few words in regard to this matter, though I will endeavour to say them as shortly as possible. I think I ought to congratulate the honourable member for Wellington Suburbs on the calm, temperate, and dispassionate manner in which he treated the question, although I must confess that he seemed to make rather a virtue of necessity. He said, with an assumption of much virtue, that he would be temperate and dispassionate, and would say nothing that would hurt the feelings of Mr. McGrath. I think, Sir, that it would not have been easy for him to say much that would have discredited or injured the character of that gentleman before this House at all events, in the minds of those who know him. So that if he were temperate, and moderate, and dispassionate, it was to a large extent because he could not well be otherwise. Now, I think my colleague, the senior member for Dunedin City, laid before the House, perhaps with some little heat, the true facts of this matter. All New Zealand knows, I support, the eminent services that have been rendered to

<page>687</page>

it by Inspector Pender; but all New Zealand also knows that that gentleman is now considerably up in years, and what I suggest to honourable members is this: that the Inspector is not what it was admitted by so young now as he was. The honourable member for the Suburbs that he was of considerable age. No doubt he has his faculties, and no doubt he is still an able man, but advancing age brings with it a tendency to rely on subordinates; it brings a tendency to lean on some one in the staff; it brings a tendency to depend on some one in the office, or some member of the Force to assist and to help, and the actual state of affairs in this case is, I believe, that the Inspector has been leaning too much on the gentleman whose name we have heard mentioned already to-day-Mr. Wright. Now, I ask this: Is it, or is it not, a fact that Mr. Wright considers that he should have been appointed to Detective McGrath's position,

and has openly expressed that fact ? An Hon. MEMBER .- NO. Mr. BARCLAY .- I say it is. Mr. FISHER. - Mr. Tunbridge 4.30. provided him the position of Sub- Inspector. Mr. BARCLAY .- A Sub-Inspector is not what Detective McGrath is; and I say that Mr. Wright considers that he ought to have been appointed to Mr. McGrath's position when Melirath was appointed. If that is so, and he is the officer upon whom the Inspector leans, what must be the result ? Naturally, what has occurred -disorganization, and through disorganization there will result the failure to detect crime, and the administration of the Police Force will not be so effective as it ought to be. It has been stated that Inspector Pender, if he chose to retire, would receive a pension of \$240 a year. I would ask this : Would not the best solution of the matter be for that officer to accept his pension, and then, no doubt, there would be a free hand in dealing with the rest of the staff in the office, and re- arrangements might be made to put the whole department here upon a proper basis ? I think the House is pretty well aware of the position of matters, and therefore I do not think it is necessary that I should elaborate further. I would just like to say before sitting down that Detective McGrath was a detective in Dunedin, and he did good work in the Police Court there, and, so far as I could judge, he was a very smart and competent officer. Mr. MEREDITH (Ashley) .- I concur with the remarks made by the Minister of Justice in his defence of the administration of the Police Department, and I sincerely trust that the honourable gentleman will continue the course he has laid before the House this afternoon. If he does so, I will undertake to support him, and I believe he will be supported by the whole of the members of the House in seeing that the efficiency of the Police Force of the colony is maintained. I compliment the Premier on the appointment of Commissioner Tunbridge. No better appointment has ever been made in the interests of the public service of the colony. I exceedingly deplore the wanton attack made on the Commissioner of Police by the honourable member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher). To say that he displayed a want of taste would be a very mild term indeed. I consider that his action this afternoon most reprehensible, and to think that a gentleman with his generous instincts should make an attack upon a public servant who is not able to defend himself on the floor of this House is something that I did not expect from him. I can only conclude that he has been misinformed, and has been smart- ing from delay in the Government answering certain questions he has on the Order Paper. I never was before Commissioner Tunbridge, but he has been frequently before me in my capacity of Chairman of the Public Petitions M to Z Committee. When ex-policemen petition the House to be reinstated or given compensation, I might say that in every case the decision of Commissioner Tunbridge has been sustained by the Committee. We have found him to be an honourable and straightforward man. If he has erred in the administration of his depart- ment it has been on the side of mercy. In- spector Pender has been referred to. I have known Inspector Pender for the past thirty years. I known him, Sir, to be a most offi- cient and capable officer, and if he wanted a testimonial - although I do not think he requires it - I should be glad to give him one extending over a period of thirty years. I may state that there are only three policemen in my electorate. A sergeant and constable live not far from where I reside. I am on intimate terms with these members of the Force, and they all speak in the highest terms of the treatment they have received from Commissioner Tunbridge. I have never heard a complaint made against his adminis- tration. I hope he will continue to act fear- lessly and faithfully to administer the depart- ment under his control in the future as he has done in the past, and if he does so I am sure he will have the support of the members of this House, and even, I venture to believe. of the member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher) who on this occasion has stepped from that dignified position he so frequently takes up on the floor of this House. Mr. PIRANI (Palmerston) .-. Until the Pre- mier spoke just now there was not one word said in this debate as to political parties. The leader of the House was the first to import into a subject like this, a subject that should be quite free from party politics-and he ought not to have used sneers at the expense of the Opposition-an attitude that he ought not to take up. The honourable gentleman told us that the Opposition was laughing because of the attack by a member of the

Government party on the Ministry. Why, the laugh was when the Minister was speaking-and the Premier himself joined in the laugh-when the Minister of Justice said that the member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher) was in the police office twenty times for once that he (the Minister) was there. I say it is a serious thing for a matter like this to be brought before the House, and what the members of the Opposition admired more than

<page>688</page>

anything else was the declaration of the Minister in charge of the department that he would allow no political interference with the administration of the department as long as he thought he was right. And the Premier applauded him in that like the rest of us ; and I say there are occasions when men can rise above political considerations - when men should rise above party and appreciate a frank declaration like that, no matter by whom it is made. It seems to me that the Premier thinks he is effective when he raises the bogey of the Opposition, and he seems to think it settles an argument against him-so far as his supporters are concerned - if he says it emanates from the Opposition. But it is strange how some things come home to roost. In 1898 the Police Commission used almost the same words which the Premier has uttered to-day. How did the Premier deal with it? I will read a paragraph from the Police Commission's report : - " It is of the highest importance, in order to secure efficiency and proper discipline, that this feeling that outside influence is necessary for advancement should cease to exist, and that men should realise that promotion depends on their efficiency, and the good opinion of their own officers, and it should be regarded as the duty of all prominent men, politicians especially, to abstain from using their influence on behalf of members of the Force, and not to encourage them to break one of the Police Regulations, and so expose them to punishment ; but, so long as the internal affairs of the Force are under the personal control of a Minister, it is probable the influence referred to will be brought to bear upon him." In the House that year the ex-member for Invercargill, Mr. J. W. Kelly, moved a motion which included these words : - " That the question be amended by the insertion of the following words after the word ' That,' in line 1 : ' as a result of the report of the Royal Commission on the Police Force, it is desirable that immediate provision should be made,-(1) For the removal of the Police Force from political control, as the Commissioners report that the Police Commissioner should have absolute authority in regard to appointments, transfers, promotions, and dismissals.' " How did the Premier treat that motion ? Did the Premier face a division on it? No. The Premier is always bold when he has got a majority with him, but on that occasion he ran away, because the majority was against him, and got one of his supporters to move the adjournment of the debate on that question, and from that time to this the House has not had a division on the main question. And I say this : that I believe a very large majority of the members of this House, including the Premier himself, if put to the test on this question of political control of the Police Force, would declare just as strongly against it as the Police Commission did. Mr. SEDDON. - No : the Minister must have control-he must have the responsibility. Mr. PIRANI. - We are getting revelations to-day, and I do not regret the tabling of the | Tunbridge, Mr. Fisher said that that gentleman amendment of the member for . Wellington City (Mr Fisher), because it has resulted in obtaining from the Premier some admissions that are instructive to those opposed to party government. The year before last we are told we had a deputation of Wellington members- there was only one city member in it-asking the Government to remove an officer of the Police Force from Wellington. Mr. SEDDON. - It was to stop him being removed. Mr. PIRANI. - It was to have Chief Detective McGrath removed. Mr. SEDDON. - No, no. The Wellington deputation asked that Mr. Wright be kept here. It was at that time surmised that Mr. McGrath would have to go, and the southern deputation asked that he be kept here. Mr. PIRANI. - The Wellington deputation, knowing that if Mr. Wright was to be kept here Mr. McGrath would have to go, recommended the Premier not to have Mr. Wright shifted: and the Dunedin deputation of Government supporters mind you, we do not notice the Opposition moving in the matter - I say a southern deputation of Government supporters

waited on the Premier for the purpose of counteracting the efforts of the Wellington deputation and trying to keep Chief Detective McGrath here. The Premier countenanced that sort of thing; and if there has been any subsequent development, he did not tell us about it. He did not tell us about the deputation which waited upon the Premier this session, which consisted of the member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher), the member for Wellington Suburbs (Mr. Wilford), the member for Parnell (Mr. Lawry), and another member whose name I forget. Mr. FISHER .- Mr. Witheford. Mr. PIRANI .- Yes; who waited upon the Premier in reference to this very matter. Mr. SEDDON .- Who told you? Mr. PIRANI .- The member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher) has just confirmed it by giving Mr. Witheford's name as the fourth party to the deputation; and let the Premier rest at that. These moves are emanating from the Government party, not from the wicked Opposition members. This is allowed to continue by the Premier, who makes no effort to remove the control of the Police Force of the colony from that political influence which he says is inimical to it. Mr. SEDDON .- I will see as many deputations as like to come along. Mr. PIRANI .- I would not mind it a bit if the Premier took no notice of them: but the Premier has given way by keeping Mr. Wright here, and keeping up a state of friction such as we were told of by the Minister in charge of the department. No one knows better than the Minister in charge that this must be detrimental to the best interests of the department, because it causes those on whose behalf influence has been used to think that they have only to bring more influence to bear to get the Minister eventually to give way. In regard to Commissioner

<page>689</page>

was the darling of the Prohibitionists; but I think he is very much mistaken, and I am sorry that he has taken that view. Mr. FISHER .- The Prohibitionist newspaper said so. Mr. PIRANI .- Not "the darling." Mr. FISHER .- "The idol." Mr. PIRANI .- I would like to see the newspaper before I accept the ipse dixit of the member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher). In some cases the Prohibitionists are dissatisfied with the Commissioner's action. Mr. FISHER .- They are never satisfied with anything; nothing will ever satisfy them. Mr. PIRANI .- Nothing will satisfy them until liquor is totally prohibited. Mr. FISHER .- Would you like to see it done? Mr. PIRANI .- I would like to see the experiment tried. Commissioner Tunbridge stands between the Liquor party, with its powerful political influence, used for its own purposes, and the Prohibitionist party, who want to bring about an improved state of affairs, and owing to these two influences the man has a very difficult task to perform. We have never had a man in the public service of this colony who has carried out a difficult task so well as Mr. Tunbridge. I say that if the whole cost of the Premier's trip to the Mother country was for nothing else than to bring him here it is money well spent. Any one comparing the Police Force of to-day with that of a few years ago cannot but feel an admiration for the man who, in so short a time, has worked such changes in it. We should feel proud to know that we have a man of his capacity at the head of the Force, and anything that is done to lessen his authority must be detrimental to the good order of the colony. Mr. SEDDON (Premier). - The honourable member for Palmerston has quoted my action in respect to that paragraph in the Police Commissioners' report, and Mr. Kelly's amendment in the House. I now take up the same position as I then took—that the responsibility of the administration of the Police Force must be vested in the Minister in charge of the department, and in no self-governing colony could you divest yourself of that responsibility by giving it to a paid servant. It is well known that the trade, as it is called, on the one hand and Prohibitionists on the other are ever in conflict. The Commissioner between these two conflicting sections of the public is placed in a difficult position, and so is the Minister of Justice: but we must see there is a fair compliance with the law, and, that obtained, the great bulk of the people would be satisfied. That done Ministers need not fear any political influence. Of course, members of Parliament have a responsibility, and I am sure there is no man who would either injure the service or wish that there should not be fair administration of the law. Mr. PIRANI (Palmerston). - Sir, I wish to make a personal explanation. The motion I quoted, and



which the Premier refers to, says nothing about removing the Force from the - Minister. Mr. SEDDON .- Oh, yes, it does. Mr. PIRANI .-- There is not a word about the Minister in the motion. It is merely that the Force should be removed from political control -- that is, the sort of control we had some years ago. Mr. SEDDON .-- It is to make the Commissioner of Police independent of Parliament and of the Government. Mr. PIRANI .-- No. Mr. BOLLARD (Eden) .- Sir, a good deal has been said this afternoon by members who support the Government and by Ministers themselves on this matter; and if the debate has been prolonged for some time the Premier has himself to blame for it, for he insinuated that we on this side of the House were pleased to see the attack made by a member of the Government side of the House on a Minister, and on the Police Force. Sir, I can assure the honourable gentleman it pained me to hear that remark. We are as much annoyed that the honourable member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher) should have brought on his amendment as the Premier himself is. Sir, speaking for the northern part of the colony-for Auckland, which is the largest city in the colony-and of the police management there, I say that a great improvement is patent to everybody in the police management since Commissioner Tunbridge assumed charge of the Force. Previous to that, owing to the political influence of the Government, the police, as in other parts of the colony-the Police Commission Report will bear me out - were a disgrace to the Government of the day, and Ministers were responsible for it. To get out of the difficulty the Premier imported one of the best men he could get in England to reorganize the police. Sir, I think every member of this House and every respectable man in the colony will admit that a great improvement had been made in the Force since he took over the charge of it. Speaking as a Justice of the Peace, and as one who in that capacity has had a good deal to do with the police in Auckland, I can say that the police of that city are now a credit to the Police Force of the colony. On the one hand they all do their duty without being officious, and on the other they respect the Commissioner. As far as I know, every man in the Force respects the Commissioner. They say he is a strict disciplinarian, but at the same time fair and just to the men : and I say, Sir, that is the class of man you want to have at the head of the Police Force. That being my opinion. I was surprised to hear statements made in the House to-day that he will identify himself with one side or the other, and I could not allow the discussion to go on without expressing the opinion I have formed of Commissioner Tunbridge and of the excellent manner in which he conducts the Police Force, especially in the northern part of the colony. Mr. ATKINSON (Wellington City). - Sir, there are two gentlemen who are entitled to our congratulations as a result of this debate -- Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge, and the Minister

<page>690</page>

in charge of the department. I regret as much as does the member for Bruce that the Premier should have suggested that there was any hilarity, or even pleasure, on this side of the House occasioned by the attack of my junior colleague upon Commissioner Tunbridge and some of his staff. I can say with confidence that the administration of the Police Force would be still more to my taste if it was still less to the taste of my junior colleague. I can say that Commissioner Tunbridge's administration would be much more to my taste-even more to my taste than it is now-if he had a freer hand than he has now. But it is clear, from the candid admission of the Premier in this debate, that both he and the Minister in charge of the Police Force are still pestered by deputations of members from one part of the colony or another, acting on behalf of this or that officer, in order to get the recommendation, perhaps, of the Commissioner, or it may be the minuted decision of the Minister, overruled on behalf of the particular gentleman they represent. It is perfectly clear, therefore, that, though the right honourable gentleman's tone as to interferences was all I could desire, he himself is liable, whatever his wishes may be, to political interference at the hands of his political followers. Mr. SEDDON .- I cannot refuse to see members. Mr. ATKINSON .- No, that is so ; but the honourable gentleman must not take it that I am saying this by way of censure. I am simply pointing out the fact that, whether he likes it or not - and he may find it possibly a

great nuisance-but, whether that is so or not, it is clear there is an attempt to exercise improper control over the Police Department by the perpetual heckling of Ministers by members, and by organized deputations that wait on Ministers from time to time. It seems to me clear, on the honourable gentleman's admission, that, whatever his wishes may be in the matter, the Police Department is not as free from political control as I think its best friends would desire it to be. However, so admirable an account has been rendered on behalf of the department that I do not propose to deal with it at any length at all. I should like to say, personally, that I have never listened with greater pleasure to the Minister of Justice than I did this afternoon. I may say he never did himself such full justice, at any rate in this Parliament, as he did this afternoon, and it must have been a pleasure to him to find that he had both sides of the House practically unanimous with him in his very spirited vindication of the officers under his charge. But there were two or three other parties attacked by the junior member for Wellington City in his speech for whom no defence has been made, and therefore on their behalf I wish to say a word or two. He referred to a caso that has been mentioned in this House before. He mentioned names, but in what I say I would prefer not to do so. He referred to the case of a child, and a charge which, he says, was brought against a respectable Thorndon resident. He said that the information was Mr. Atkinson laid in the police-station by a lady-I will not mention her name-who was a member of a "social purity" society in Wellington, which is his humorous way of describing the Society for the Protection of Women and Children. Mr. FISHER. - The Salmon case. Mr. ATKINSON. - My friend says it is the Salmon case, and, if the name must come out, I may as well say that is the correct name. He says that the counsel who brought it to the Court was so ashamed that he threw up his brief. Now, I am here for defence and not for attack, and I desired to leave out even names. I shall say nothing harsh unless I am provoked. nor anything that would give pain to the genth - man who was prosecuted in that case; but I wish to put briefly before the House what the circumstances were. This was a case of a child who had suffered very cruel injury. The child's foot and part of the leg were in a horrible state. A kind of festering gangrene was on it. and the whole condition of the child was pitiable, squalid, highly nervous, and terrified. may say the child had sought refuge with a neighbour while in this condition, and the child and neighbours were interviewed by the responsible officers of this society and by one or two members of the Police Force. Their statements were taken in the usual way; I am not quite certain whether they were submitted to the police at first or not. But they were taken in the usual way, and were submitted to one of the honorary solicitors for the society, Dr. Findlay, and upon his advice an information was laid and the prosecution took place. I do not think there is any honoural! ; gentleman in this House who would dispute the qualifications of this particular gentleman to advise upon a case of this kind, seeing that he has attained eminence in the profession, and has done a large amount of very responsible work for the Government, and has done it very well. Well, when the case came into Court the child was the essential witness. Honourable gentlemen will understand there may be cases of this kind-that an essential link in the chain of evidence may be a weak one, and, though the case may be absolutely conclusive as a whole, yet without this single link in the chain the whole thing is gone. The foundation of this case consisted in the child's statements, repeatedly made and taken down in the presence of witnesses. The child was put in the box, and the question was as to whether the injuries were the result of accident or cruelty. The child absolutely withdrew all the statements previously made. What else was there then for the solicitor to do but: withdraw the case? All the other evidence was simply corroborative. The whole thing fell through when the child abandoned his story. He had been in the hospital for some weeks, and had not been allowed to be interviewed by anybody except in the presence of one of the accused. Honourable gentlemen may recollect the version given by the honourable member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher, in his speech. I hope I have made it plain. I have not attempted to excite the feelings of

the House. But I hope I have made this plain to the House : that Dr. Findlay had nothing to be ashamed of; that the society concerned had nothing to be ashamed of ; and the police did nothing to be ashamed of. The best police, the best society, and the best counsel in the world could have taken no other action than they did. That is a brief summary of the essential facts of the case. I am sorry I have had to occupy the time of the House ; but, seeing that innocent persons have been attacked and they had no one else to defend them, I thought it my duty to give the details of the matter. Though I am one of the honorary solicitors for the society, I speak without prejudice. I knew absolutely nothing of the facts of the case until the matter had become public property ; but I have now a thorough and detailed knowledge of the circumstances, and if any honourable gentleman challenges my statement it will be my duty to lay the whole of the circumstances before the House. Mr. MONK (Waitemata) .-- I wish to occupy the time of the House for a few remarks, as I do not want to pass over what has taken place this afternoon without giving an expression of opinion. My particular grievance, and that which prompts me most to say anything at all, was the language used by the Premier to those sitting around me on this side of the House. The Premier may laugh, but I think it is a very serious thing indeed when the Premier can use such language as he did on such an important matter, as to think that we should feel any pleasure at such remarks made by any member of the House as were made use of by the honourable member for Wellington City. Mr. SEDDON. - I was laughing at something that I was reading. #cc-zero Mr. MONK .- I am simply alluding to the expression made use of by the right honourable gentleman-that it gave pleasure to the Opposition to hear the Government criticized by one of their own party. If it were possible for a member of the Opposition to use the language used by the member for Wellington City, there is not one of the Opposition but would have felt intensely disgusted, and would have resented it. The Ministry may feel satisfied that they can command the support of the Opposition whenever they require it in such an instance as has taken place this afternoon. No one who listened to the statements of the honourable member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher) could have helped feeling intensely depressed with a feeling of sorrow and regret. I am speaking for myself, and I believe I am expressing the feelings of all those honourable gentlemen sitting around me. I can only describe it as language that ought never to be expected from any honourable member of the House-the proper term for it would be that in the construction of his charges he used "gutter slang." That is the mildest term I can use for it. Let me say one word further. I do not think there is any honourable gentleman on the Government benches who will ascribe to me a desire to merely flatter ; but I am ready to accord my warm and hearty compliments to the Minister of Justice for the attitude he exhibited this afternoon. And let him or any other Minister on those benches pursue that course and he can command our support and sympathy. An Hon. MEMBER .- Do not get him into trouble. Mr. MONK .- Even the Premier can command the support of this side of the House as warmly as any members in the Chamber if only he will take up a certain line of conduct. The division between us is not the ins and the outs, but what is right as against what is wrong. That is all we are aspiring to, and, though there may be much divergence of opinion, yet if my single vote could now take the Ministry off those benches, I would not give it. I prefer that they should stew in their juice until the country realises what will be the result of many of the measures they have introduced. I may be wrong, but I am honestly expressing my convictions with regard to some of their measures. Not all do I condemn ; there is some good, but much I believe to be seriously harmful. I will go back to the remarks made by the Minister of Justice. His administration, so far as I have noticed, has been thoroughly creditable to him and to the Ministry. He has, so far as I am aware, not made any appointments of Justices of the Peace but what do him credit ; they are men who will discharge their duty to the country in an honourable manner. And if the Government would only continue such appointments, instead of Justices of the Peace being, so to speak, a mark of discredit, it would be one of honour, and to be respected by the people who are subjected to their administration. Further, let me say, so far as I know of this matter, there is a

distinct improvement in the tone and character of the police at the present time. Policemen do not now feel that if they are of the "right colour," and go to the Ministry when they have been guilty of misconduct, they can manage to persuade the Minister to reinstate them in their position, as I know was done formerly. I have also heard members of the Police Force express themselves as feeling that their position is much improved, and that their status is much better than it was. They have a prospect now to look forward to, and they have also a feeling that, in the administration of the police of this colony, they are dependent for their position upon ability and the manner in which they may conduct themselves, and I say that is just what we need. In one respect I am not sorry-but only regret the language which has been made use of by the member for Wellington City-that this debate has occurred, because I think it has caused this House on both sides to give an expression of their opinions that will go to strengthen the Police Department and support the administration of justice as conducted by the Minister, and ultimately prove beneficial to the country. Mr. J. W. THOMSON (Clutha) .- Inspectors of police, constables, and police-offices are all very good in their way, but it is quite possible to have too much of even a good thing. I think

<page>692</page>

that this afternoon we have spent too much time altogether in talking about Inspectors of police and police-offices, and the sooner we change the subject the better it will be. Four years ago some not very reputable things regarding the police were brought up in Parliament. It was evident that there was a want of good firm administration. From what I can learn the Police Force of to-day is much more efficient than it was four years ago. For this we are indebted chiefly to Inspector Tunbridge. All this goes to show that there is no foundation for a great deal of what has been said to-day with regard to that gentleman. I simply know him by sight, but from what I have heard about him he is a very efficient officer. Mr. HUTCHESON (Wellington City). - I rise to say one or two words in approval of the speech of the Minister of Justice in this debate. I had no knowledge until I sat in the House and heard the remarks of the mover of the amendment that it was the intention of my colleague, Mr. Fisher, to bring this matter up ; so the insinuation made by the Premier that it had the tacit approval of the members for Wellington has no weight whatever as far as I am personally concerned. I regret the incident entirely in one way, and I am exceedingly pleased at it in another way, because it has demonstrated beyond cavil that the whole of this House, practically speaking, approves of the present administration of the Police Department, and views it with favour. It was really a national service the then member for Christchurch, Mr. Taylor, did when he succeeded in persuading the Government to establish that Police Commission, and I cannot agree with the Premier that it was any misfortune at all for Commissioner Tunbridge that he was appointed to take charge of the Police Force at that time: on the contrary, it was the means of giving him such an insight into the weak points of the Force as it would have taken him years to have discovered in the ordinary course of events. In, therefore, that Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge had an opportunity afforded him of going through the whole programme of the past, I think the House and country is indebted exceedingly to the late member for Christchurch City for having taken the interest he did in that inquiry. There is another department -what I might call a parallel case - where the Premier has followed the same policy with equally satisfactory results, and that is in the administration of the Marine Department. For the very much improved administration of that department, and the bringing out of Captain Blackburne to take charge of it, the country is also indebted to one or two honourable members to whom the Premier is neither thankful nor friendly disposed. Now, the Premier stated loosely that the Wellington members had interviewed him in connection with the removal of some officer of the Force, and I am glad of this opportunity to deny absolutely that ever I waited on him or any other Minister at any time for any such purpose. He also assured the House that no other Minister interfered with I tend to purify the political life of this colony, the Minister in charge of the Police Force. I think he must have forgotten that there has

been quite a recent and successful attempt to interfere with the deliberate decision of the Commissioner of Police. I refer to the case of a local officer who, when instructed by the Commissioner to proceed to another part of the colony, resorted to the old familiar plan of getting a deputation to wait on the Premier. with the result that he is still here ; and the Premier is still the political purist, who says that he does not interfere with the administrative duties of his colleagues. In the spirited defence of his department, and the strong denunciation of political interference with its administration, it was gratifying to every member of this House to hear the Minister of Justice declare that he would allow no man in this House, or out of it, to run his department while he was Minister. Let us hope and trust he will maintain that attitude. And, Sir, if the Premier and his colleagues had acted always upon the sentiments the Minister of Justice expressed, probably I should not now be sitting on this side of the House. Because they have never done so was why I came away from them. However, it is exceedingly satisfactory to discover occasional indications that they themselves feel the curse of political interference, that they honestly desire to be free from the blighting influence of political intrigue surrounding them, and which must be detrimental to the administration of every department of the State. I noted that the Premier in his speech made naïve and full confession of his experiences when in charge of the Police Department. I interjected, " Why did not you put your foot down and stop it ?" the Premier very aptly replied, " One cannot stop a roaring torrent all at once." Quite so. Now, I ask, who created that torrent ! Was it not he who made the first breach in the dyke? Was it not he who widened that breach so that the torrent of insubordination and demoralisation swept the Police Force from one end of the colony to the other ? We know from the evidence of the Marine Commission that he was the man who was particularly susceptible to improper political influence. We know from a thousand sources that he is mainly -- indeed, I may say, solely -- responsible for the widespread belief that the only road to success, the only reward for merit, lies through the foul slum of political influence. But if his words this afternoon are to be taken as evidence of contrition, and his determination to turn a new leaf, none will be more glad than I, for Ministers on those benches know that from the very first moment I entered public life I steadfastly resisted any influence brought to bear upon me to interfere with them in the discharge of their high and responsible duties Sir, if Ministers would say to members, and especially their own followers, " Do not come seeking to interfere with the administration of my department ; you will get no special favours for political supporters from me," it would do even their own followers such service as would

<page>693</page>

We would have this position : members could truthfully say to all and sundry amongst their constituents who sought any improper advantage, "It is no earthly use you asking me to see the Minister, because the law has been laid down that he will not be interfered with in the administration of his department." If that were followed out in the affairs of the colony political life would become comparatively clean ; the Ministry would have the support of every decent man and woman in the community : they would also find their own life very much easier, and would give more satisfaction in the administration of their respective departments. Mr. LAWRY (Parnell) .- Sir, I think it is due to the honourable gentlemen on the other side of the house to congratulate them on their change of front. I remember when the late honourable member for Christchurch City, Mr. T. E. Taylor, moved in this House that a Commission be set up to inquire into the administration of the Police Force of this colony, that those honourable gentlemen applauded him every time he said that the Police Force of New Zealand was one mass of corruption. An Hon. MEMBER .- True. Mr. LAWRY .- True. What did the Commission prove? That we have a better Police Force in New Zealand than exists in any other British Dominion. An Hon. MEMBER .- They are better now. Mr. LAWRY .- And why are they better now ? Because they had common-sense men like myself to represent them in the House. Sir, the honourable member for Eden referred to the Police Commission. Does he not remember that at the time that Commission was set up the Police Force had been for a long time under

the administration of Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge ? Mr. BOLLARD .- No. Mr. LAWRY. - Then, the honourable gentleman's memory is pretty defective. Sir, I do not indorse one single statement made by my honourable friend the member for Wellington City in reference to Commissioner Tunbridge. I believe Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge is a most efficient officer, and I believe that he discharges his duties with great impartiality. But I do not believe that Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge is any more infallible than the Right Hon. the Premier. What I do complain about our Police Force, and about our police system, is this : that every police-officer in New Zealand, every police-officer in England, obtains promotion for detecting crime. I say that when a police-officer has reason to take a person into custody, if he finds that person to be innocent it is more his duty to prove to the world that he is innocent than to move, as they are doing, heaven and earth, and perdition, as it were, to prove the charge made against the accused. Then, Sir, reference has been made to what the police have done to hotelkeepers. I know in Auckland, at the time when burglaries were rampant and when robberies were committed almost every night, the whole Police Force were unable to detect or arrest these burglars. But at the same time it appeared to me that the whole of the Police Force of Auckland were devoting their entire energies in trying to entrap and convict publicans for selling liquor after prescribed hours or for Sunday trading. An Hon. MEMBER .- That was before the Commissioner's time. Mr. LAWRY .- This is in the Commissioner's time. Some honourable gentlemen referred to the removal of Acting-Detective Nixon, I was very proud indeed to hear the Minister of Justice say that that young man was a most proficient officer. I remember, Sir, when the honourable senior member for Wellington's champion was in the House-Mr. T. E. Taylor - that he got up and said that the young man Nixon was unduly advanced in the Police Force because he had been secretary to one of my election committees. Sir, what did the Police Commission prove ? It proved, and it was attested on oath, that this young man Nixon had never been on any committee of mine at all, and that when I ran the election first for Parnell he was one of my very strongest opponents. Surely he ought to be a good man under such circumstances, because he was true to his convictions; and I wish the honourable member for Palmerston and the honourable senior member for Wellington City could say the same thing for themselves re their political pledges. Sir, I do believe honestly that the honourable member for Wellington City was somewhat intemperate in his speech this afternoon : at the same time I believe the honourable gentleman was honest in his convictions. He believes what he said about Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge ; but I believe, Sir, that the House voiced the feeling of the country when it applauded the administration of Mr. Commissioner Tunbridge generally. Sir, I have never approached the Minister of Justice relative to his administration of the Police Force of this colony. I say, Sir, that the sooner political influence is taken away from members of this House, or, rather, the sooner the time comes when they will not be allowed to use their political influence re appointments, the better it will be for the House, and the better it will be for members individually, and the better it will be for the country. Sir, I have on two or three occasions recommended young men for the Police Force of the colony ; and why should we not give simple recommendations, as members of the House, just as if we were private individuals ? There never has been an appointment made that was not a credit to my recommendation.

Mr. MCLACHLAN (Ashburton) .- I have no intention of addressing the House at any length on this question, for it seems to me to be a most extraordinary charge, laid under the forms and protection of this House by the honourable member for the City of Wellington, assisted by the honourable member for Wellington Suburbs, who has told us of a condition of affairs that I have never seen in New Zealand. The honourable member for the Suburbs has told us of the depravity of the people. He has told us that thousands of criminals come before the Court in Wellington every year. That is a remarkable statement to come from a leading barrister who

<page>694</page>

[HOUSE.] Imprest Supply 694 ought to know the facts of the case. I should have thought, in place of

Wellington being full of crime and immorality, as it is under the influence of Parliament it would have been almost pure ; but it appears to be the most wicked place conceivable. I almost think from what has transpired that there may be some collusion between the honourable member for Wellington City and the Commissioner, for expressions of opinion in favour of the Commissioner have been drawn from almost every member of the House. I have very little acquaintance with Commissioner Tunbridge or any policeman, and probably no man in Parliament knows less of the inner workings of the Police Force, and it is conceivable that there may be differences of opinion between the heads of the department. Now, I have known Inspector Pender almost ever since he arrived in the colony. I was in Canterbury before he arrived there, and I have known him intimately; in fact, he is the only policeman I have known intimately, and I am sure that no man who has ever held a position in the Police Force is held in higher respect than Inspector Pender is held in in Canterbury. If Inspector Pender is too old for service-if the heads of the department say that he should be retired- I hope this House will make liberal provision for him, and give him such a retiring-allowance as he is entitled to. I regret that occasions of this sort should be used for the purpose of casting slurs upon officials. It is both undignified and unprofitable, and a course that I, for one, will never countenance. Amendment negatived, and motion agreed to. The House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means. On the question, That provision be made in accordance with His Excellency's message, Captain RUSSELL (Hawke's Bay). - I should like the Colonial Treasurer to inform the Committee how it is that we now require a sum of £940,000 to be passed through on imprest on the 26th of July of this year, when last year we only had required 5750,000 at a similar time. That is an increase of \$190,000 which the Colonial Treasurer wants by way of imprest. I hope he will give us some reason why the amount is so vastly increased. Mr. SEDDON (Colonial Treasurer) .- It is owing to the increased estimates, and, as stated when the last Imprest Supply Bill was in debate, very large orders from the Agent-General came to book, and I have been told there is \$40,000 additional to what we had. It is the increased general expenditure that necessitates this increased imprest on the Public Works Fund and Consolidated Fund. Captain RUSSELL .- There may be a necessity for increasing the expenditure ; but really the estimates have nothing to do with it. Can the Premier not give us a clear idea of what the expenditure is? \$190,000 is a vastly increased sum, and the estimates can have nothing to do with it. Mr. SEDDON .- If you increase the public works expenditure, and also increase your expenditure (No. 2). [JULY 26 imprests of your officers must also be increased If you keep down the expenditure, then your estimates are not so much. Mr. MASSEY (Franklin) .- A plain question has been asked of the Premier, and I do not think he has given any reply to it. We are entitled to have this information. Mr. SEDDON .- If you increase the expenditure you must increase the imprest. Mr. MASSEY .-- But in what way is this money being spent ? Can the honourable gentleman give us an explanation at all ? Mr. SEDDON .- I say it has been expended in accordance with the direction of Parliament and on the lines of what has been previously appropriated. We are not going outside proper authority, not in a single iota. Resolution agreed to, and reported to the House. Bill read a first and second time. On the question, That the Bill be read a third time, Mr. MASSEY (Franklin) .- I wish to remind the Premier, Sir, that certain returns which were ordered last session have not yet been laid on the table. I want to remind him particularly of one return which on my motion was ordered-a return showing the travelling-expenses of Ministers for the year ending the 31st March, 1900. We have not yet seen that return. I consider that when a return is ordered, and is not produced within reasonable time, that Ministers are treating the House with contempt ; but, unfortunately, a majority of members do not mind being so treated with contempt. I wish to remind the Premier that within a few weeks, in all probability, he will be asking the House to pass estimates, and I want to say that probably he will find that the estimates will go through more easily and more quickly if these returns that have been ordered are forthcoming. Now, a word about the way the business of the House is conducted. The Standing Orders provide that questions may be

asked and answered in the early part of the session on three days of each week, and later on on four days. On how many days have questions been asked this week ? On one day, and this is the last sitting-day of the week. It has been the same with private and local Bills. The Standing Orders provide that private members' Bills shall take precedence on Wednesdays -. Mr. SPEAKER .- I think the honourable member must speak on the financial aspect of affairs, and must not raise a discussion on general matters. Mr. MASSEY .- I thought I was within my right in discussing grievances before granting Supply. Do you. Sir, rule me out of order. Mr. SPEAKER. - Yes. The discussion of redress of grievances before grant of Supply is confined to the motion for going into Committee of Supply or Ways and Means, and does not extend to the stage of the Bill appropriating the money. Mr. MASSEY .- Then I shall take another opportunity to deal with the matter which I

<page>695</page>

[HOUSE.] Imprest Supply 1901.] his reply will state when the return to which I alluded will be laid on the table. Mr. SEDDON .- I must admit that the honourable member has been very courteous to me, and that he was quite within his right in asking the question, and I can only say that I omitted to give the instructions to get the return completed. With so many things to attend to it escaped my memory. I think I promised to give the return, and there is no reason for keeping it back. That is what they make their capital out of. They think there is something wrong, and when there is any delay they complain, and then, when they get the return, they are like the little boy-they do not know what to do with it. The money has gone ; the money is spent, and not only that, but it is .within the amount appropriated by Parliament; and as long as it pleases the honourable member it does not affect the Government. He will get the return in due course. Mr. MASSEY .- In due course ? Mr. SEDDON .- I mean to say within a reasonable time. It is only a fortnight since the order was passed. Mr. MASSEY .- I beg the Premier's pardon : it was ordered last year. Mr. SEDDON .-- I tell the honourable member it was also ordered this session. Mr. MASSEY .- Allow me to correct the Premier. The return was ordered last year. Mr. SEDDON .-- I will show you that it was ordered this session. Mr. MASSEY .- That is another return. Mr. SEDDON .- I recognise that the order of the House has a right to be complied with. The resolution passed this session is as follows : - "That there be laid before this House a return (in continuation of H .- 29, 1899, and a similar return ordered last session) showing, for the financial year ended 31st March, 1901,- (1) The amounts drawn by each member of the Executive for travelling-allowances ; and (2) the amounts charged by voucher for actual travelling-expenses of each member of the Executive." And then I suggested that there should be certain additions to it. Those additions were : "Showing separately the amounts in each case for allowances or expenses incurred in connection with matters outside the colony, and in connection with other than ordinary matters." So that the honourable member must admit that the motion of this session is a double-barrelled one, namely :- " That there be laid before this House a return in (continuation of H .- 29, 1899, and a similar return ordered last session)." Mr. MASSEY .- In continuation. Mr. SEDDON .- No, no. A similar return ordered for last session was not for the financial year ending 31st March, 1901. That is dated the 16th July. This is a double-barrelled one, and, of course, I do not object to it ; double or single, it is all the same to me. The honourable member wanted to emphasize the fact that last session he had ordered a return, and that it Bill (No. 2). 695 started. The House ordered the return last session, and is entitled to it, and it only wants notice to the Treasury to get the return and the return will be supplied. There is no reason whatever for keeping it back. I do not wish to go into the other question, which you, Sir, have ruled is not admissible. All I can say is this : that as Colonial Treasurer I am anxious to get the finance for the year fixed as soon as possible The expenditure is going up, and is in excess of last year's. There were certain reductions in taxation that we promised last year to make. I allude to the reduction in the mortgage-tax; and I now find that it will be almost impossible to give that, with our increased expenditure, unless we supplement the revenue in another direction, and that other direction is by



increasing the graduated land- tax. This is a matter we shall have to consider, and where we find that the expenditure is such as to warrant the consideration of further ways and means the sooner we have the Financial Statement the better, so that I am not keeping back that Statement, nor other financial matters. The colony gets very good value for any expenditure with respect to Ministers' travelling-expenses and allowances. The expenses are generally a little higher during the year when there is a general election on. Mr. MASSEY .-- That is why we want it. Mr. PIRANI .- I would like you to come to my district again next general election. Mr. SEDDON .- It is strange the honourable member wants me, but when there he wants me away further. There is not the same general interest as regards Minister's travelling-expenses in the middle session as in the first session after a general election. Some honourable members then seem particularly anxious to know the travelling-expenses of Ministers. I only know this : that Ministers do not go to half the places they are invited to visit; and if not welcome why should there be so many invitations ? It is a pleasure for Ministers to meet the people, and the expenses are very well spent. As regards the return the honourable member desires, I hope to have it in a day or two. Mr. MASSEY .- The Premier says, Sir, that the return in question was ordered a fortnight ago, but I am going to show that it was ordered on the 19th September last year. Quoting from the Journals of the House of that date : " On the order of Mr. Massey, That there be laid before this House a return (in continuation of H .- 29, 1899) showing, for the financial year ended 31st March, 1900,-(1) The amounts drawn by each member of the Executive for travelling - allowances ; and (2) the amounts charged by voucher for travelling-expenses of each member of the Executive." That is the return which I referred to. Now, with regard to the motion of this year, 8.0. it was as follows : -- "That there be laid before this House a return (in continuation of H .- 29, 1899, and a similar return ordered last session) showing, for the financial year ended 31st March, 1901,- (1) The amounts drawn by each member of the

<page>696</page>

amounts charged by voucher for actual travelling-expenses of each member of the Executive." The words "in continuation of H .- 29, 1899, and a similar return ordered last session " are in brackets, proving that the return moved for this session was a continuation of the return which was ordered last session, but which was not produced. It was not intended to include the return ordered last session. The words are as clear as it is possible to make them. Mr. SEDDON .- The honourable member need not try to get out of it. He may not have intended it to include the return of last session. but why did he not put it plainly, and word the motion as those motions are always worded ? Why did he want to mention the previous year ? Mr. MASSEY .- I wanted to remind you it was not produced in that year. Mr. SEDDON .- I say the honourable member's motion is an order from the House to produce two returns. Mr. MASSEY .- No. Mr. SEDDON .- Then, the other return was not a return at all. I say the honourable member double-banked it, as shown in his motion this year. If he intended it simply as a reminder of the return of last session, well and good. At the time he made the motion the other return had not been forthcoming, and he therefore wanted to remind the Government of the return. Mr. PIRANI .- You are coming out of this badly. Mr. SEDDON .- Oh, no, I always come out well, and on top. If the honourable member for Franklin wants to make things plain in the future he should say exactly what he means. Why did he not say he referred to a return #cc-zero ordered on a given date -- the date he has just given to the House? I say there can be no doubt of what was intended ; and there is no doubt about the amendment, because I asked the honourable member to separate the two returns, and he agreed that it was a double-banked motion -- one showing the amounts of allowances and the other the expenses incurred in connection with matters outside the colony. What I referred to, of course, was to my trip to the Islands. I did not want the cost of that trip to be put in the ordinary return, and the honourable member agreed to that. Now, why did he do so ? Mr. MASSEY .-- Wrong again. Mr. SEDDON .- No. I am not wrong. It was last year that I went to the Islands. Mr. PIRANI .-- That was not " Ministers' expenses." Mr. SEDDON .-- You may call it what you

like, but there were expenses, and the honourable member knows it. You cannot do without expenses, and the trip on that occasion was well worth all the money it cost the colony. Now, coming back to the matter at issue, I say I took the motion of the honourable member for Franklin to be a double-banked motion, and I believe it was so intended. It was amended as a double-banked motion. However, I repeat now that we have no object to gain in keeping the return back. It was simply an oversight in not giving an instruction to the Treasury. That instruction will now be given, and the return will be produced. As to the threat about the estimates being kept back or unduly debated. I say we are as well able to debate on this side of the House as are the gentlemen opposite, and we are full of debate. Bill read a third time.

**MINERS' RIGHTS FEE REDUCTION BILL.** Mr. R. MCKENZIE (Motucka). - Sir, P. : rising to move the second reading of this Bill it is unnecessary for me to go at length into its provisions. This is the third time it has been before the House ; it has already passed; the Goldfields Committee unanimously for two sessions, but, for various causes, it has not yet reached the statute-book. Miners' rights were first brought into use to provide for the cost of goldfields police and escort service in the early days. In those days a miner did not find any great difficulty in paying 10s. or 61 for a miner's right. But miners at present find it hard to make anything like ordinary wages, and therefore I consider the time has arrived when the miners' rights should be made as low as possible. In fact, in 1898, when the Goldfields Committee were dealing with the Mining Act it was a moot point whether the miner's right fee should not be abolished altogether. However, there was a difference of opinion, with the result that nothing was done. It cannot be disputed by any one - in the House or out of it - that the mining community is the heaviest-taxed portion of the people of this colony. They produce gold and nothing else, and consequently have to buy and pay taxation on every thing they use ; and I must say this House of late years has not been very considerate or lenient with them in the way of reduction of taxation. The small modicum of relief that would get under this Bill is a very small relief indeed. There is another phase of this question. The miners' right fee is a tax on his earnings, and no other class in the community has to pay 10s. a year for the right to earn wages. It is said that small farmers have to pay a high rate for the land they rent. For every acre a miner rents he has to pay 7s. 6d. a year. it does not matter whether he gets anything out of it or not. He also has to pay heavy local rates : if he only has a tent he has to pay 1s. a year rates. A great many years ago the miner's right was reduced to 5s., but during a period of depression, when the Atkinson Government was in office, it was raised to 16s. In most of the other colonies it is only 5s. Personally, I believe it ought to be abolished. There is a clause dealing with the rights in the New South Wales Province : this clause was inserted at the request of the late Minister, Mr. Cadman. I commend the Bill to the favourable consideration and approval of honourable members. I am sure they are anxious to see every one in the community on an equal footing.

<page>697</page>

Mr. McGOWAN (Minister of Mines). - I think it would do no harm to inform the House that the condition of affairs with regard to mining is very much altered now from what it was some years ago. The provisions of the Mining Act have been so modified during a number of years that it has really become an infliction for miners to pay for miners' rights, because the right is not now an element of title. In the early days the miner's right was an element of title wherever he went, but that has been eliminated from the Act ; and under the conditions that exist now with regard to taking up ground under lease, seeing that the right does not involve a matter of title, it is really time that the fee should be reduced. The difficulty the honourable gentleman referred to with regard to the North still exists, and how it is to be ultimately got over is not clear ; but the clause in the Bill is an attempt in that direction, and the Government would perhaps be able to deal with it by purchasing all Native right to mining lands. And this would be an instance in which there would be no great injustice done to the Natives so far as the miner's right is concerned, because, as a rule, where the greater portion of the land is auriferous it is not fit for cultivation of any kind, and the

Natives derive no benefit from it excepting through the mining. If, therefore, the Government were in a position to have the right of purchase over such land, it would be an advantage to the whole community. But, even if it cannot be done in the North, there is no reason why justice should be denied the miners in the South, and I think the time has now come when the House should wipe out any fee that is not required, or is a tax on the labour of the miner, and I have great pleasure in supporting the Bill. Bill read a second time. SHOPS AND SHOP-ASSISTANTS BILL. Mr. BARCLAY (Dunedin City) .- Sir, it will not, I think, be necessary to keep the House very long in respect to the measure which I have to submit to-night. The Bill is entitled "The Shops and Shop-assistants Act Amendment Act, 1901." but it is better known by the name of "The Domestic Servants' Half-holiday Bill." Honourable members will recognise it as one of the "slaughtered innocents" of last year. It was before the House last session ; it went to the Labour Bills Committee ; it passed through the Labour Bills Committee, and was reported to the House. I do not know that it is necessary for me to say very much in favour of the Bill. I take it almost for granted that this House will pass the second reading almost unanimously. It is a measure which has been submitted to the House before- not in this Parliament, but the last Parliament. It passed its second reading in last Parliament, and I feel sure that this House is not less liberal or less disposed to legislate in the interests of those who work longer and harder than they ought to without relief. The Bill also contains provision for restoring the weekly half-holiday which was taken away from the chemists. The provision is inserted in accordance with the almost unanimous wish of the chemists throughout New Zealand. A half-holiday is observed. I believe, by chemists in Wellington, Invercargill, Napier, and other places. It is the almost unanimous wish of the chemists in Otago that the half-holiday should be restored. When the Shops and Offices Bill passed through another place evidence was taken in respect to a similar clause ; and it was agreed that it was a proper clause and should be put in, and accordingly it was inserted in the Shops and Offices Bill. The clauses in my Bill simply give expression to the wish of the chemists. Then, I need not enlarge to honourable members on the position of domestic servants. I think that class of workers is almost the only class now that has no regulated hours. Nearly every class of labour commences at a particular hour and ends at a particular hour. In the case of domestic servants - a term, by-the-by, that I strongly object to, preferring the title "house-assistants," though I use the word "servants," because it is at present more customary -- of course, that is not so. The regulation thing, so far as I understand it, is that a domestic servant gets one evening off in a week, and perhaps she gets every alternate Sunday a half-holiday. My Bill proposes that on one day in the week-which day it shall be is left to be arranged between the mistress and servant- the girl should get a half-holiday. I am glad to say this is done in a great many houses. A large number of mistresses find that it is convenient to allow their servants a half-holiday during the week, and they accordingly do so. And I say, that if it can be done by a large number of ladies there is no reason why it should not be done by all. If a half-holiday can be given on, say, Sunday afternoons, there is no reason why the girl should not have at least one half-holiday in the week. As I have said before, I am glad to think that my task is easy to-night. Honourable members know as much about this matter as I do, and I am assured I shall have their sympathy and support in respect to this Bill. When the Bill came before the House last year it created some interest and remark throughout the colony, and from Auckland to the Bluff there was a great deal of correspondence in the newspapers ; there were literally scores of letters in the Auckland and Dunedin papers, and, almost unanimously, they went in the direction that a half-holiday was a desirable thing, was a practical thing, and a thing which ought to be given to a hard-worked and underpaid class of the community, and that Parliament ought to grant it. I admit that of late years the condition of the domestic servants has been to some extent improved. It has been improved in this way : that there are so many girls who will not, if they can possibly avoid it, go into that state of bondage that the supply of girls has lessened. The supply having been lessened, the rates of pay have to some extent been raised, and additional privileges have

in many cases been secured by the girls. But the reason is that the conditions of the work have in the past

<page>698</page>

been so objectionable, so obnoxious, that the girls have made up their minds, if they possibly can, to avoid that form of labour ; and small blame to them. I can quite understand that no girl would care to enter into domestic service if any other occupation at which they could make a living at all were open to them. I say this Bill will be a boon both to mistresses and to servants. I say if the conditions are made easier for the girls, if the girls are put on a better social footing, if they are not treated, as they so often are, as if they belonged to a sort of pariah class, as if they belonged to some very low caste, the owners of the houses will find that there are plenty of suitable girls to assist in house-work and to help overworked mothers of families. Of course, this Bill does not intend to reform at one sweep all the evils of the domestic servant system. only hopes to take one small step in that direction ; but even one small step is something, and I invite honourable members - and I have reason to believe they will respond to the invitation- to support the Bill, and pass its second reading on the voices. Bill read a second time.

TOTALISATOR ABOLITION BILL. Mr. ELL (Christchurch City) .- Sir, this Bill is an old friend, which has been before the House on many former occasions. It has been supported by a considerable number of members on the various occasions on which it was brought before the House. I believe there is a very strong feeling in the country against the totalisator, for the reason that the public have arrived at the conclusion that, instead of decreasing gambling, it has given rise to more That is the general impression gambling. amongst the public throughout the colony. Sir, I would like to call the attention of honourable members to the opinion expressed by Mr. Justice Edwards in addressing the grand jury in Christchurch last year. His Honour, when charging the grand jury, pointed out that out of thirty prisoners a large percentage-some sixteen persons-were young New-Zealanders. He did this with great regret. If there was any country in the world where there was no excuse for crime it was the country in which we lived. He expressed the opinion that gambling, in its many forms, such as the totalisator, was responsible for this. Such. Sir, is the opinion of one of our Judges, and Mr. Beetham, a very old Magistrate, has on many occasions condemned the evil influence of the totalisator in unmeasured terms from his position on the bench. But we can go further. We have the opinions of members of this House with regard to the gambling evil and its influence on the community, as expressed in the laws on our statute-book for the checking of gambling. I need only remind honourable members that we have on many occasions passed laws with the object of, as far as legislation will do it, restricting the natural gambling propensities that unfortunately exist among our young people. In the Act of 1881 a penalty of six months' imprisonment for gaming-table ; gambling with instruments was also prohibited, with a penalty of three months ; and, as to Chinese fan-tan, we know that the police have made raids upon places with the object of suppressing it. There is a penalty of three months' hard labour for any one caught playing fan-tan. Then, we have also prohibited lotteries and sweepstakes. We have restricted the number of art unions. We have given the police power to enter billiard-saloons for the purpose of detecting and preventing any gambling that may be going on there. Then, it has been determined that wagers shall not be recoverable at law; and the penalty for keeping a gaming house is a fine of \$500 or twelve months' imprisonment with hard labour. Our laws thus show pretty clearly in what estimate members of this House have at different times held gambling. Then, the Gaming Act of 1885 provides that a newspaper may not advertise any lottery or sweepstake, and the maximum penalty for this is \$50 or six months' imprisonment. Money-orders may not be issued to the conductors of lotteries and consultations. There is a penalty of \$10 for any one taking part in a lottery, and, according to the Act of 1894 a person making a bet with an infant may be fined \$20 or sentenced to three months' imprisonment ; and a man who sends a gaming circular to an infant, or who sends out a gaming circular to incite an infant to play, is under a penalty for doing so. And in 1899 the

representative of the Government in another place introduced a Gaming and Lotteries Act Amendment Bill, of which clause 2 provided :- " If any person is found loitering, or if two or more persons are found assembled together in any road, street, foot-way, court, alley, or public thoroughfare of any kind, for the purpose of betting or wagering, each of them commits an offence, and is liable to a penalty not exceeding ten pounds." So, Sir, we have the condemnation of the evil in very strong terms as expressed in the laws passed by the Legislature in different Acts on our statute-book ; and we have the opinion of our Judges; and then we have this further opinion of the Government of the country, that further repressive measures are necessary on account of the growing evil among our people. Now, Sir, it was contended at the time the totalisator was established that it would decrease gambling. It has tended to increase it, as I will presently show. But, Sir, if I may give further illustrations as to what public opinion thinks of gambling, and the need to repress it in every possible way and check its growth amongst our people, I might point out that the City of Dunedin has provided very strong by-laws against street betting, that the City of Wellington has done likewise, and that the City of Christchurch has also passed by-laws with that object in view; and the police have been authorised by law to back up and assist our local authorities by every means in their power to check street betting and street gambling - a very right and proper thing. Now, Sir,

<page>699</page>

evil, as also does this Legislature, by inflicting heavy fines, and by inflicting as a maximum penalty twelve months' imprisonment. Such is the opinion of our Legislature. But, Sir, to return to the question of the totalisator: If honourable gentlemen will turn to our Year-book they will find that the total amount put through the totalisator in 1892 was \$506,078; in 1893, \$720,020; in 1894, \$691,673, a slight decrease in that year compared with the preceding year ; in 1895, \$696,456 ; in 1896, £743,763; in 1897, 4704.096; in 1898, \$886,567; in 1899, 9912.969 ; in 1900, €1,065,580. Now, Sir, while the amount put through the totalisator has considerably increased, I will ask honourable gentlemen to note this: that it is not on account of the increase of population, because the increase of our population for the last five years, comprising the last census period, was only about 8 per cent. ; whereas the increase in gambling through the totalisator for the same period was a little over 43 per cent., that is, over five times the increase in gambling to what there was in population. So, Sir, we see that, instead of the totalisator checking the evil, it has rather added to it, and the test is the amount of money that has been put through. Now, seeing that the Legislature has laid down the principle that it is the duty of the State to check the evil as far as it possibly can, and seeing that the totalisator was created with the idea that it would check the evil, and it has not checked the evil, then, Sir, it is the duty now of the Legislature, seeing that they have increased the gambling evil by legalising the totalisator, to sweep away the cause of temptation to increased gambling. We drive the bookmakers from one end of the colony to the other. We treat them as blackguards ; we treat them as the very worst class of society practically ; we drive them off the streets and we drive them out of offices ; we say that they are not worthy people ; we say that they are a source of temptation to other people, and that they are doing nothing else but spreading evil amongst our people. Such is the opinion of the Legislature as shown in our statutes. Now, if it is absolutely wrong according to our laws to make a bet, to be logical and consistent we must not carry out the gambling evil through the totalisator as we have been doing. There is no need for me to dwell at any great length upon this question. I think every honourable member has made up his mind on this question. Petition after petition has been sent to this House - in fact, scores of them. This Bill simply provides for the abolition of the totalisator. Every member who is in favour of the abolition of the totalisator will vote for the second reading of this Bill, and every one who is not in favour of the abolition of the totalisator will vote against it. Mr. LAWRY (Parnell) .- Sir, I scarcely think it would be fair to the honourable gentleman, and it would be scarcely fair to the House or to the country, to allow this Bill to go to its second reading without some

discussion. The honourable member has been just about as have introduced questions about which they know nothing at all. He quoted figures showing from his point of view that the existence of the totalisator has increased gambling year by year. If the honourable member had studied the history of this question he would have realised that the suppression of the totalisator had been responsible for increasing gambling. Did the honourable member ever read an Act passed by this House, through the instrumentality of Sir Robert Stout, to limit the issue of totalisator permits. That was in 1894. Ever since that limitation has been made by statute the amount of money that has been passed through the totalisator has increased as years have rolled on. The honourable member stated the amount of money passed through the totalisator in different years. The honourable member knows nothing whatever about the subject. He wishes the House and the country to believe that those were the amounts of money put in by individuals, whereas on a racecourse—for instance, we in Auckland sometimes put £10,000 through the totalisator; but that probably represents not more than \$1,000, because the money goes through and through again. Of course, in the end the machine is bound to get the lot, but the money is redistributed amongst labourers, producers, and others by the racing-clubs. And the honourable gentleman does not realise this: that he ought to support it, because it is about the only ready-money business in the whole colony. Now, Sir, I would like to give the honourable gentleman a warning. There was once an honourable gentleman in this House who was imbued with the same great moral ideas as the honourable member for Christchurch City, to purify the whole country by wiping out gambling. I refer to a gentleman who represented Napier. He thought he was going to carry the whole country with him in abolishing the totalisator. He thought the goody-goodies of Napier would rush forward to embrace him when he got back there. He stood at the next general election and made this one of the planks in his platform, and what was the result? He was defeated at the poll by one of the straightest and best racing-men that ever owned a horse in New Zealand. Mr. ELL. They did not do that to me. Mr. LAWRY. — Yes; but they did not know you then. You make it a plank in your platform at the next general election and you will go down never to rise again. Sir, the honourable gentleman has referred to the suppression of bookmakers on the street. What has caused the Legislature, by enactment, to prevent the bookmakers from plying their trade in the streets? It was not to keep the totalisator out, but to prevent crowds from assembling at the corners of the streets. There is this in favour of the totalisator: I have never known one single person to have been brought up in our Courts of law charged with embezzling the money of his employer in consequence of betting on the totalisator, because if a man goes out to invest on the totalisator and makes a loss he

<page>700</page>  
 scores of young fellows who have been ruined in consequence of making bets with bookmakers and embezzling the moneys of their employers to meet their engagements. An. Hon. MEMBER. — It is just the same with the totalisator. Mr. LAWRY. — I have never known of one such case, and I challenge the honourable gentleman to cite an instance. Then, Sir, take the extent of gambling as it exists and obtains in this colony and compare our gambling with what it is in Australia, where there is no totalisator. If the honourable gentleman knew anything at all about the question he ought to realise this: If we have a horse in New Zealand that can win a classical race what do we do with him? We send him across to Australia; and why? Because where the owner can make \$1 by racing the horse here, by putting money on the totalisator, he can make thousands of pounds in Australia, where there is no totalisator. How will the honourable gentleman meet that argument? I say it is a pity that the shoemaker would not stick to his last. It is a pity the honourable gentleman did not undertake to introduce a question to this House about which he knows something. I remember, Sir, some little time ago, when there was a question of regulating the taxation of this country, the honourable member for Ashley said, "I would raise the taxes of this country by putting 3d. a gallon duty on beer." The honourable member for Ashburton, with his usual acumen, said, "How much of that money will you pay?" Now, the honourable gentleman in speaking

about the totalisator, it appears to me, is interfering altogether with the liberty of the subject. I would ask the honourable gentleman what does he know practically about the totalisator. Did the honourable gentleman ever put £1 on the totalisator ? Mr. ELL .- No ; have you ? Mr. LAWRY .- Yes, and have seen the good of it too. I have seen the good of it in this way: I have seen the good of the totalisator when our young thoroughbreds in Auckland have been sold. I say, Sir, that I would to-morrow vote with the honourable member to abolish the totalisator if by doing so I could stop gambling. I look upon gambling as a national evil, and I look upon faddists as a national evil also : and there never was a fad-dist in this House who did not come from Canterbury. Mr. FISHER .-- Excepting Sir Robert Stout. Mr. LAWRY .- Yes, excepting Sir Robert Stout. We have in Auckland establishments where we breed thoroughbreds-sires and mares which would be a credit to any nation in the world. Abolish the totalisator, and you would reduce the value of those by 75 per cent. What does the honourable gentleman care as to whom he ruins so long as he carries his fad through this House. We talk about the referendum, and the honourable gentleman has advanced one of the strongest arguments in favour of it when he talked about the vast amount of money passed through the totalisator ? Does he not realise that there must be a vast number of people in favour of that machine, who put their money through it ? Is he prepared to drop his Bill and refer the 1 question to the referendum ? If we had a referendum of this House a majority would be found in favour of the retention of the totalisator, under proper conditions and regulations. But, Sir, when we hear men who do not invest on the totalisator speaking on matters they know as little about as the spoilt child knows about a whipping which his mother will not give him, or allow any one else to inflict upon him, it is very amusing. Then, Sir, the honourable gentleman said that we are hunting the book-makers from pillar to post, and making them pariahs or outcasts. Has the honourable gentleman ever seen the class of bookmakers we have in Auckland? Has the honourable gentleman ever made a bet with one of them? Let him go to our racecourses at Auckland. where we treat our bookmakers fairly as gentlemen, where we give them a license to ply their trade on the racecourse, and he will see men abandoning the totalisator and investing their money with those book-makers. If, Sir, you were to abolish the totalisator to-morrow you would intensify gambling, instead of lessening it. The evil would be intensified as it has been in Australia. There is another aspect of the question, and that is the question of revenue. This House passed an enactment under which the State took a percentage from the machines. If the honourable gentleman wants to become a reformer, let him move in this House that a !! the money derived from the totalisator is to be devoted to charitable purposes only. Sir. if the honourable gentlemen wants to suppress gambling in the country, why does he not apply himself to the removal of one of the greatest evils that ever existed on the face of the earth. and that is gambling in land by land agents. Look at the advertisements in our Auckland papers. Read the advertisements setting forth the land sales. I know a man in Auckland who put an estate into the hands of an agent, and when he saw the advertisement in the paper he did not recognise it. He bought the property. and he then discovered he had actually bought his own property. The honourable gentleman's action in this House at the present time savours very much of that of the new-chum. Politically speaking, every statement he has made in this House has been verdant with political limejuice. I dare say as the honourable gentleman gets older he will get more wisdom. In the meantime I would ask him to devote his energies and his honesty of purpose - no one can question his honesty of purpose - to dealing with matters he knows something about. When we have men engaged in racing like the honourable member for Hawke's Bay, whom no man has ever dared to say a word against for the way he races his horses ; when we have a gentleman like the Hon. Mr. Ormond. who occupies a seat in another part of this Legislature, and who has always been above reproach-I say that when men like those two honourable gentlemen support the totalisator.

<page>701</page>  
then the honourable member for Christchurch | quoted. He must bear in mind that, although City must

bow his head and admit his ignorance of the whole question, and never bring it up again. Mr. CARNCROSS (Taieri) .- Sir, I am quite willing to give the honourable gentleman who introduced this Bill every credit for being desirous of bringing about what he deems to be a needful reform, but I am very strongly of opinion that he has not yet made much investigation into the subject he is now dealing with, and which he is asking the House to deal with this evening. From want of knowledge on the matter he would willingly fly to evils he knows not of, rather than bear the ills from which we at present suffer. No doubt he thinks that if this Bill were carried the effect would be to altogether do away with gambling; at all events, he certainly must believe it would greatly minimise it. Sir, I contend that is absolutely wrong. The honourable gentleman has not studied the question. He knows nothing about it, or he would not hold the opinion that to abolish the totalisator means a reduction in the amount of gambling. What has been the experience over in South Australia ? The totalisator was once legalised there, with the idea the honourable gentleman is possessed of—namely, that it would abolish betting. After a little experience there was a howl raised against the totalisator, and it was repealed. Then the people began to recognise that the totalisator was the lesser evil of the two, and it was relegalised. It was found that the betting that went on under the patronage of the bookmakers was greater and of an infinitely worse kind than the betting conducted under the regulation of the totalisator. Sir, that is exactly the experience we should have in this country if the honourable gentleman succeeded in placing his measure on the statute-book. One of the principal arguments to-night in favour of the repeal of the totalisator was the fact that the amount of money annually put through the totalisator is on the increase. I admit it is quite true it has been on the increase; but the honourable gentleman knows perfectly well, as we all do, that during the last ten years there has been a steady increase of prosperity in this colony, and people have had more money to spend, and a larger proportion has been put on the totalisator than formerly. If we reverse the position, and we have prosperity steadily receding from us, then we shall find a reverse set of figures in connection with the totalisator ; we shall find the expenditure, as indicated by the returns from the machine, will greatly decrease as times get dull. Unfortunately, one of the signs of prosperity also is an increase in drunkenness ; that follows with an increase of good times, simply because people have a larger spending power. We have it indicated in the Court returns as plainly as in the returns from the totalisator. Then, again, one has to bear in mind that all this gambling recorded on the totalisator does not represent such an enormous amount of money as the honourable gentleman imagines from the figures he has €7,000, or \$8,000, or £10,000 may be what is termed "put through " the totalisator in one day, it does not mean that ten thousand separate individual sovereigns are invested ; it means perhaps \$1,000 or €2,000 going through over and over again, so that it is nothing so very great after all. Judging from the honourable gentleman's arguments, he is plainly of opinion that if we stopped the totalisator we should increase the number of race-meetings, and gambling would decrease in consequence. Well, Sir, that is the greatest fallacy he could give utterance to. As a matter of fact, the existence of the totalisator under the control of our legislation, as it is controlled now, has been a wonderful factor in reducing the number of race-meetings throughout the country. An Hon. MEMBER .- Oh ! Mr. CARNCROSS .- The honourable gentleman says "Oh." He is absolutely ignorant of the subject, otherwise he would not cast any The honourable doubt upon my statement. gentlemen who are supporting this measure I will tell have never been behind the scenes. you what would be the effect of abolishing the totalisator. The effect would be that we should have small race-meetings springing up throughout the whole country every Saturday afternoon. Mr. T. MACKENZIE .- Why, that is what the totalisator has done. Mr. CARNCROSS. - The honourable gentleman evidently knows nothing about it. Totalisator privileges are only issued under certain conditions, and part of those conditions is that no totalisator permit shall be issued unless a certain amount of money is given in stakes. The effect has been to crush out of existence many racing-clubs that formerly existed, the reason being that they could not raise sufficient to get a permit. An



Hon. MEMBER .- They get it out of the machine. Mr. CARNCROSS .- The honourable gentleman knows nothing about it. The statute-book limits the number of permits to be issued, and we cannot increase this. By our 9.0. legislation and the totalisator regulations a number of clubs have absolutely been wiped out of existence, and they cannot establish themselves again because they cannot get the totalisator permits ; but if you abolish the totalisator altogether, and have no longer the supervision that is exercised by the Jockey Clubs Conference, the result will be no limit as to the number of meetings to be held. And if you had no limit as to the amount to be offered for a race, the result would be that £60 or 570 would be sufficient to have a day's racing, and people could have their racing, and no one could prevent them. And if they could race for this small sum of money the result would be that the local publicans in every small country district could go round with the hat and very quickly raise enough to have an afternoon's racing, as was the case before the totalisator was in exist-

<page>702</page>

ence. Look at the experience on the "other | in numberless cases had no possible chance of side." In Victoria and New South Wales they have no totalisator; and is there less betting there than here ? Why, for \$100 put through in this country there are thousands spent over there in betting, and not with the machine, but with the bookmakers. There you have racing in the worst possible phase. There is scarcely any control over it. They actually hold races on a Saturday night in some places by electric light, and, generally speaking, racing has an infinitely greater hold on the people there, where there is no totalisator, than it has in this country. Let me tell honourable members that the people in Victoria, members of Parliament and others, are doing their best to try to purify racing in that colony, and to bring about a better state of things, and they say that the only way to do so is to legalise the totalisator and give them the same control that we have in this country. But the bookmaker influence is strong against the totalisator, and therefore prevents its introduction. I assure honourable members that it is an absolute and positive fact -- and every one who knows anything at all about the matter must agree with me--that to abolish the totalisator to-morrow means that you must of necessity increase the number of race-meetings held, and, if you increase the number of race-meetings, of course you must necessarily increase the amount of betting. I know this is an unpopular stand to take up, and those who do not look beneath the surface think they see a member standing up in the House and advocating gambling, but such is not the case. If the Bill introduced by the honourable gentleman meant the absolute abolition of gambling I would vote for it and support it heartily, but I have no more belief in the abolition of the totalisator prohibiting betting than I have that local prohibition prohibits the alcoholic trade in New Zealand. Neither will be effectual, and the honourable gentleman, if he carried this measure, would only bring us back to the old state of affairs prevailing before the machine was legalised, and to that class of betting which was in vogue in the days before the institution of the totalisator. I know of such cases as this occurring : On a Saturday afternoon, when the employés of a factory were just about leaving their work, you would see the bookmakers walking up and down in front of the factory waiting to pounce upon the lads and boys, so that they could get their wages as part instalments of the amount owing to them. That was the result of a class of betting which was infinitely worse than the betting now going on on the course, because now the young lad knows that if he goes on the course to bet he has to take his sovereign with him, and if he has not got the cash he cannot make his bet on the machine ; whereas if they bet with the bookmakers they can get credit, and are tempted by the long odds offered them to bet on credit. In the days prior to the totalisator all the swindles imaginable were perpetrated through that class of betting. The betting that went on in those days was of such a nature that the poor unfortunate creature who betted with the bookmaker winning, because in many cases the horses were run only in the interests of the bookmakers, and they took precious fine care that these bets were not won from them while they had control of the horses. I do not say that state of affairs has been absolutely abolished by the totalisator, but I say it does not exist to

the great extent now that it did before the machine came into vogue. Now, the honour- able gentleman spoke a little while ago about street betting-" walking totes " I think they are called-and it is quite true this evil does exist, and that many attempts have been made to cope with it. But I believe the machine itself within the last two or three weeks has absolutely dealt almost the death-blow to the - class of betting the honourable gentleman re- ferred to, and that is by the clubs agreeing that the dividends should be paid out upon two horses. The "walking totalisators." as they are termed, cannot afford to pay out on two horses, and the result will be that the totalisator itself will do more than we have been able to do with all our legislation, and more than the police have been able to do, in suppressing the street betting that so many regret to see. We have heard about young men being ruined through betting on the totalisator. Well, Sir, I believe there have been cases in which some young fellows may possibly have been brought to ruin by the totalisator, although personally I have not known of such cases, but I admit : it is possible, because there are some people who are extreme in everything -- they can touch nothing without going to some violent extreme. But, for every man who has been ruined by totalisator betting, I say hundreds and thousands have been ruined by card-playing in the clubs and elsewhere ; though, of course, this is no argument in favour of the totalisator. Sir, there is infinitely more ruin done there than has ever been done by the totalisator. But if members want to talk about ruin I will go further, and will say that there have been more .. men ruined and more young fellows ruined in the last twelve months by speculating in dredging shares than have been ruined in the last ten years by the totalisator. If the honourable gentleman wants to do anything in the way of reform, let him try to abolish gambling in shares. But that would not be so popular, because there are clergymen and very virtuous people who declaim about the total- isator, though they are not afraid to speculate their "little bit " on dredging shares. We are all willing to condemn the things we are not inclined to. The honourable gentleman and many with him are not inclined to the totalisa- tor, and therefore think it ought to be abolished : and those who are inclined to dredging share- say, " Well, do what you like against the total- sator, but do not interfere with our gambling in dredging." And it is the same in gambling in land. Sir, nearly everything is a gamble right through the world ; but we are not going to put an end to gambling on horse-racing by abolish- ing the totalisator. Personally, I do not care twopence how this Bill goes to-night, or whether

<page>703</page>

this Bill is carried or rejected ; but I have had a little experience in the matter, and I know what I am talking about, and I say the honour- able member is labouring under the very gravest delusion if he imagines for one moment that the passing of this Bill is going to abolish horse-racing or is going to abolish betting. I say, Sir, it will have absolutely the contrary effect to what the honourable member imagines it will have. If this Bill passes to-night and becomes part of our statute-law, undoubtedly the result will be that there must be an increase of horse-racing, and a consequent increase of gambling attendant thereto, and I am sure that is not what the honourable gentleman wishes to see brought about. Mr. LAURENSEN (Lyttelton) .- I am not going into a disquisition upon the ethics of gambling and as to whether it is increasing or decreasing. I think the question we have got to face to-night is this: Is this country as a nation going any longer to recognise and license gambling, and make money out of gambling, or is it not ? That is the question for us to face. The honourable member for Parnell tells us that there is more racing in Auckland than in any other province in the colony. The real fact is that there is more racing, I am sorry to say, in Canterbury than in any of the other provinces. An Hon. MEMBER. - No; Auckland. . Mr. LAURENSEN .- Why, at the last November meeting in Christchurch some \$50,000 went through the machines in the three days, and I do not think Auckland can equal that, or come within £10,000 of it. Now, one argument that has been adduced in favour of allowing the totalisator to continue is that, although \$50,000 went through, that was not the real amount, it was only a sixth of that sum, and that in reality the money goes through the machine half a dozen times. I say all the worse, because the greater number of

times the money goes through the machine the more of that money the machine gets and the less the public get. Any fool knows very well that if £1 goes through the machine ten times the machine has got the \$1, and therefore the oftener the money goes through the machine the more the people lose. It has also been adduced as an argument against our voting for this measure that on a former occasion when a previous member for Napier introduced a similar Bill he was defeated at the hustings at the following election. Can you, Sir, imagine a more degrading argument to adduce to members of this House—that the main question is not does he believe a thing to be right or wrong, but is he going to retain his seat or not? As to my honourable friend the junior member for Christ-church City, I am certain he conscientiously believes he is doing a right and proper thing in attempting to abolish what is an undoubted evil in our midst, and I am quite certain the question of whether he is going to lose his seat at the next general election does not weigh with him a pennyweight, and I would think very little of him if it did. The honourable gentleman also referred to the faddists of Canterbury, and he further went on to say, in the course of his speech, that one Auckland gentleman had been so led away by the advertisement of a land agent that he bought his own house back again. Well, we may be faddists in Canterbury, but we never produced a being capable of that sort of thing there yet—that has been left to Auckland to do. He also attempts to justify racing by giving the names of some of the men who patronise racing, and he says, that we ought to "bow our heads" to a sport patronised by such honourable gentlemen. I give his own words. Sir, I cannot understand how any member can use so degrading an argument as that we should bow our heads to an evil because it is supported by men who have titles in front or letters after their names. I do not care a cent whether this evil is supported by the King on his throne or by the beggar in the ditch, I am against it, and I think any honourable member of this House who has the welfare of this country at heart would not hesitate for a moment to condemn it. I do not care a cent who supports it. I say if honourable gentlemen in this House or men who have been famous in the country are supporting racing, so much the worse for them or for a country whose leading men act so. I say that we, as representatives of the people in this House, ought to set our faces against it whether it is supported by the high in the land or by the low. Now let me come to some of the arguments which have been adduced by my honourable friend the member for the Taieri. I really should have expected that he would be one of the very first in the House to support such a measure as this. He alluded to the number of book-makers that existed before the totalisator was brought into operation. Sir, what about the "tote-shops" that have been started since the totalisator has come into force? Where there was one bookmaker before there are a half-dozen "tote-shops" in full blast now. And this must be remembered: that, while the bookmakers betted with men, the "tote-shops" take the half-crowns of every apprentice boy and servant-girl they can get to bet with them. In the principal town of the district I represent the population has been pretty well stationary for the past ten years, and yet where one man or woman went to the racecourse ten years ago twenty and thirty go now. The totalisator has enabled the jockey club to make the racecourse the most attractive place in the district. I do not hesitate for an instant to say that a horse-race is an inspiring and ennobling sight. I do not condemn horse-racing itself. I believe it is one of the most exciting, entertaining, and beautiful spectacles one can witness. A beautiful green field, a well-cultivated and well-kept lawn covered with well-dressed ladies; a number of jockeys on splendidly trained horses, and every animal straining to come in first. A nobler sight could not be imagined: but we have to look deeper, and to see the evils that are behind. I ask every man who is loyal to what is right, every man who has the interests of the rising generation at heart, to vote in the direction desired by my honourable

<page>704</page>

with tape machines on events which are decided at a racecourse at some far-distant place, and money changes hands there between people who never see the racecourse. You have only got to go to Australia and any one will see that betting is on the increase there. You see more betting going on than you do

here, and there is no totalisator there except in South Australia. I believe that "Tattersall's" sweeps have increased from very small beginnings, until now they have developed into gigantic concerns. I think the honourable gentleman must admit that the evil of gambling is increasing all over the world, and it should not therefore be said that the increase is due to the totalisator. It is unfortunate that gambling should increase as it does, but the totalisator must not be blamed for that increase of gambling. It is, as I have said, a gambling age, and the totalisator is only one of its phases. The unfortunate thing about the totalisator is this: that the returns are all published, and its enemies can go and inspect the figures and see what amounts have gone through it. But you cannot go to the bookmaker and show what money has gone through his books, and therefore the totalisator is an easy prey to the people who want to try and purify the world in general. They say, "Let us get rid of this thing." At the same time, if you get rid of the totalisator you will find that the gambling will go on just the same. I could understand the honourable member if he went for abolishing horse-racing, though I should be very sorry to see it done. If the totalisator were abolished horse-racing would go on; but the stakes would be less, because the totalisator money would not go into them. This would lead to increased betting, as owners, if the stakes were less, would have to resort to betting in order to recoup their expenses of breeding, training, et cetera. That was the case before the totalisator was introduced. It would be difficult for an owner to back his horse for \$10,000 on the machine, but in the old days you could do so. If a bookmaker is prepared to lay £10,000 against a horse it must be because he has a large army of small clients to make this up if the horse wins. It is well known that under the bookmaking system you can win more money on bets than on the totalisator. This proves that the bookmakers must have a large number of small men to bet with them, otherwise they could not afford to make such large wagers. Looking at the past, I think it is fair to assume that if we do away with the totalisator gambling on horse-racing will increase, because now, under the present system, according to the report of the Chairman of the Racing Conference, 623 per cent. of the totalisator receipts go to the stakes. Supposing that sum were not given to the stakes, as it could not be if the totalisator were abolished, the owner would have to recoup himself, and could only do so by wagering with the bookmaker, who in turn would have to extract the amount from the general public. I am not saying it is a good thing to gamble, but as long as you have people willing to lay odds against you I suppose betting will go on. It seems to me that this system of the totalisator is the best, and a system that you can keep control of -- much more easily than any other. I do not think the honourable member will deny that during the last ten years there has been a great improvement in the conduct of horse-racing in this colony. I do not think he will deny that. A great improvement has taken place in the meetings -- not only in the general arrangements, but the running is straighter, and a better class of people is found on the courses. I attribute that largely to the totalisator. You find better courses, larger stakes, and a better class of people go in for the pursuit, and the meetings are better conducted. Of course, the argument of some honourable gentlemen is in the direction of doing away with horse-racing altogether; but I am only speaking of the totalisator. If you were to do away with horse-racing altogether that would have a very drastic effect, and it would result in the people breaking out in another direction, such as a mining boom. There is another fact that I think escaped the honourable gentleman's notice. According to our racing rules, every club that gets a totalisator permit has to make improvements to the extent of \$250 on courses before they can get their permit. There is another necessary rule, and that is that the money clubs get out of the totalisator must either be spent in stakes or in improving their courses, and erecting a better class of buildings. Now, Sir, if this Bill is passed and the totalisator is abolished, you immediately say to these people, "All this money you have spent is wasted." An Hon. MEMBER. - No. Mr. HERRIES. - Yes, because in some instances they would not be able to have race-meetings at all without the totalisator. In other instances they have borrowed money on the expectation of receiving revenue from the totalisator, and the stewards have become security for it. Well, it is not fair to put

gentlemen in a position like that. A warning should be given to them, and if the honourable member sees the justice of what I say he will put into his Bill a clause providing that after a certain time—three years or five years, or some other term—the totalisator permits could not be granted. There would be some reason in a clause of the kind. Otherwise I can assure the honourable gentleman he would be doing an injustice to people who have spent and borrowed money on the strength of the totalisator permits. Now, Sir, I should like to ask whether, in an important matter like this, that affects the revenue of the country, we are to have no word from the Government? I think it would be a proper thing if one of the Ministers would tell us whether the Government agree with this Bill or not. Mr. O'MEARA.—How much do the Government get from it? Mr. HERRIES.—About £14,000. It would build the Gorge Bridge that the honourable gentleman is so anxious about. I would like to know if the Government wish the Bill to go

<page>705</page>

through or whether they do not. It seems to me I regret that it must be obvious to every one the colony ought not to lose the £14,000 which comes from the machine, and the Government ought to express an opinion as to whether they consider the Bill is necessary or not. Mr. ELL.—In other words, you want them to come to your assistance to block the Bill. Mr. HERRIES.—Oh, no: I am quite ready to take a division. All I want to know is whether the Government are in favour of the Bill or not. I want to know whether the Colonial Secretary is prepared to give up £14,000 of revenue or whether he is not. Sir J. G. WARD.—I thought you were indifferent as to the views of the Government on anything. Mr. HERRIES.—Not at all. I generally watch the Government very carefully in all their actions; and I cannot understand, if they are going to assent to this Bill, why they should throw away £14,000 of revenue when it is there really for the picking up. It is the easiest collected tax in the colony. The racing-clubs are responsible for it; in fact, the stewards have to go security for it before they can get their permits. I trust the honourable member who moved the Bill will consider the question, if the Bill gets into Committee, of putting in a clause to give clubs some time to get out of their engagements. For instance, there are produce stakes and classic races arranged for three years ahead—arranged on the strength of these permits; and it is unfair for a private member to bring down a Bill to abolish the totalisator, which might be passed, and so prevent these clubs from fulfilling their engagements. Mr. FLATMAN.—You can amend the Bill in Committee. Mr. HERRIES.—Yes; I shall endeavour to do so. I think that is all I have to say with regard to the Bill. As far as I can see, no good cause has been shown why the totalisator should be abolished. Of course, we all admit that gambling is on the increase and is a bad thing, in a general way; but I say, without fear of contradiction, that if you do away with the totalisator a greater evil will come in its place, and I am sure the honourable gentleman would not agree to that. Mr. MEREDITH (Ashley).—I understand that the Colonial Secretary, Sir Joseph Ward, has now control of the department for the issue of permits to the various racing-clubs. I should like to have an expression of opinion from him as to what is the view of the Government on the question of the abolition of the totalisator as a source of revenue to the colony. We all know the ability of that honourable gentleman to deal with questions of importance, and I hope he will give the House a lead on the question. The honourable member for the Bay of Plenty stated, in his opinion, racing was becoming more popular in the Old Country. I look upon racing as inseparably connected with gambling. Unfortunately, that is so. I like a good horse, which I admire as much as any honourable gentleman who is in favour of horse-racing; but at the same time honourable member that gambling is inseparably connected with racing. It must be obvious that a very serious change has come over public opinion in the Old Country respecting racing and the use of the totalisator. At one time that distinguished statesman in England, Lord Rosebery, had a stud of his own and took a great interest in the subject of horse-racing. But on account of his prominence in racing matters he wounded the public conscience and as a leader of the Liberal party he lost ground, and had to take a back seat. He has since parted with his stud, and is now one of the coming men in the Old Country. Then, coming to New Zealand, what do we find as to the

question of gambling? That public feeling has asserted itself in every district throughout the colony. From Auckland to the Bluff petitions are reaching this House against the use of the totalisator, and calling on the Government to abolish the use of same. We have the opinion of our Judges, who frequently point out from the numerous cases that come before them the bad effect of gambling. Our Magistrates also are constantly directing the attention of the public to the same thing. I have noticed time and again, in the Court business in Christ- church, how Mr. Beetham, Stipendiary Magis- trate, draws public attention to the bad effects of gambling. I have on previous occasions in this House read the remarks made by Mr. Bee- tham on gambling. Taking all these things into consideration, I am of opinion there is a revolt of the public mind against gambling, and the sooner this House faces the question the better. The honourable member for Taieri should not despise the efforts of the honourable member for Christchurch City, who introduced this Bill. He is the exponent of the views of a very large number of people in the colony ; he belongs to the reform party in the House and the country, and I venture to assert that that party will within measurable distance assert itself in the country, and those who hold similar opinions to the honourable member for Christchurch City will find themselves in the front amongst states- men in this colony, while those who advocate the non-progressive, the fossilised, ideas ad- vanced by the member for the Taieri will find themselves in the background, unwept, un- mourned, and unsung. The honourable mem- ber, when defending the totalisator, said that a young man went on the racecourse with a sovereign in his pocket, but he did not tell this House that he came away without that sove- reign. He might also have stated that the sovereign in his pocket was not always his own, but that he had tampered with his employer's money, as has frequently been the case. And those are the young men who find themselves in the course of time before our Courts in a very humiliating and degraded position. I look upon gambling as an evil not to be tolerated by the State. That which is morally wrong can- not be politically right. Gambling is sapping the very vitals of this young colony, and I hope the Government will set an example, and that the Minister representing the Government, if

<page>706</page>

he speaks, will inform the House that the Go- vernment has had this question under their serious consideration, and will introduce a Bill, if not during the present session, next session, dealing with the abolition of the totalisator. I have always spoken in favour of the abolition of the totalisator, and on every occasion I have voted accordingly, and I shall do so on the pre- sent occasion. Mr. WILLIS (Wanganui) .- I would like to say a few words on this question. I have been opposed for a considerable time to the total- isator, on the ground that the system is incon- sistent with the laws in force in this colony. If it is illegal to have sweeps, I say also it should be illegal to retain the present system of the totalisator, because they are both matters of gambling. Why, Sir, I think, myself, that the money that is derived by the Government as a profit on gambling should not be en- couraged. I know cases of boys and girls who have saved up their money for the purpose of getting enough to put on the totalisator -to make up the necessary pound-and I know that this money has sometimes been got in a very questionable way. We find now that the total- isator is becoming quite a fashionable institu- tion, the consequence being that while otherwise money would not have been invested upon the machine, now that it has been legalised by the State, gambling through its medium has become the correct thing, and it is considered by some quite right for boys and girls to put their small mite into the machine. The totalisator is greatly assisting . racing in this colony-so we hear ; but I say what is the racecourse of to-day as compared with the racecourse of some twenty or thirty years ago, when horses were raced on their merits, and when we knew something about the horses? But circumstances have greatly altered, and we find now that people go to racecourses in order to see what money they can make out of the game. True sporting in- stinets are often wanting; but there is the instinct of money-making, and perhaps I can say truthfully that the majority of those who go to a racecourse now come away greatly dis- appointed as far as money-making is concerned. But, Sir, it has

not the effect of preventing these people from going again ; and I certainly think that if the Government are consistent they will assist to put down the totalisator. the totalisator is to exist, and money is to be put on the machine, and the Government are to take their fair share of the profits, then I say at once that the Government ought to allow gambling in respect to the system of sweepstakes. Money is sent away from this colony in very large amounts because the system is not allowed here, and so strict is the law to-day in regard to these sweepstakes that it is a punishable offence even if a newspaper has an advertisement to the effect that sweeps are being held in other colonies. Well, if the Government are so sweeping in their denunciations of gambling of this kind, in the name of consistency, why is it that the Government at the present time have done nothing towards putting down the totalisator evil ? Sir, I have made no secret of my opinions on the platform in my electorate. I have stated there distinctly that if this measure came before the House I would support it. I am doing it although I may have lost votes ; but that should make no difference. because I believe if a man is to be consistent it is not a question of how many votes he is going to receive. Therefore I consider I am perfectly right in speaking on this matter to-night. and I trust that honourable members will seriously consider all the aspects of this case, and that they will look at it from the true position - that while they are encouraging the totalisator system they are encouraging a system of gambling. On these grounds I shall certainly support the Bill, and I can only appeal to honourable members, who have been so ready to support measures which have been brought before this House to put down gambling, to be consistent and assist to put down this totalisator as they would put down other gambling transactions. I am aware that this matter has been discussed at some length, and I will not keep the House any further, beyond saying that I sincerely hope this Bill will be carried. Mr. CARROLL (Native Minister). - Sir. I will just say a few words before this question is put to a vote. It is pretty well known, I think. in this House what my opinion is in respect to the totalisator. I have always opposed every effort in the direction of its abolition, because I never could see how in any possible way those who are endeavouring to obtain the reform they seek could so far improve or alter human nature as to free it entirely from the gambling instincts, which seem to me to find expression in some way or other, no matter what deterrents or preventatives are brought into play. There is always a danger in absolute extirpation. whereas some good might be reached through a prudent control of our speculative privilege in association with our higher forms of sport. Sir, we all know very well that the element of gambling permeates all human concerns and transactions; and, though we must give credit to those who take every opportunity of introducing measures for the purpose of bettering, according to them. our moral life and doing away with what they call the terrible evils of gambling, we must recognise by the experience we have had that absolute. If virtue and sinless conditions cannot be attained through the medium of legislation. I think: we must admit that gambling will exist in some shape, modified or irritant. If you close the door to gambling in the one street, it will force itself into action through another avenue. and so it goes on. To be on the right track, all we can do is to take hold of it and keep it within rational bounds, and in sight of the public eye ; hence the need of the totalisator. Now, the condition of things in respect to sport and gambling in this country were in a very bad state some years ago. There was indiscriminate and vicious gambling. There was betting in all its undesirable forms, and a type of being-the-spieler-called into creation that hung like a fester round the body politic. Why? Because there were no legal restrictions

<page>707</page>

against the movements of that class in the carrying-out of their nefarious practices, and the public, on the other hand, had no way of investing their money openly. But since an Act was passed legalising the totalisator, and putting the conduct of sport under proper control, betting has become centralised and placed immediately under the scrutiny of the public. The heavy gambling that used to obtain in hotels and clubs has been considerably diminished. An Hon. MEMBER. - Has it ? Mr. CARROLL. - Yes, compared with what things used to be. You do not hear the rattle of the dice now, the expert shuffle of the cards is

less frequent : and even horse-racing, though we have legalised the totalisator as a public form of betting, has decreased in number of meetings compared with what existed before the Totalisator Act came into force. Hon. MEMBERS .- Oh ! Mr. CARROLL .- That is so. At one time every little district in the colony had its race- meeting, and in some cases two or three, and every little course was infested by all the scum of the community, and the same invariably be- came the scene of the worst cases of corrupt and indecent practices. The class of people who went there went not only to bet, but to relieve their fellow-creatures of whatever they pos- sessed by every low-down mode of swindle. There was no control, there was no superin- tendence by any body whose duty it was to see that racing was properly regulated and adminis- tered. Surely if members would only view pro- perly what was and what is they must appreciate the change. Under the Act which legalised the totalisator it was laid down that you could not issue more than so many totalisator permits for the year; that there could be only a certain number of clubs to whom permits could be issued, and those only according to a standard of good character. The result was that many clubs had to be wiped off the slate. No clubs without permits could exist alongside those which were granted permits, and that brought about the gradual decease of all the surplus clubs outside the limit recognised by law. By these means racing was lifted to a higher grade. An Hon. MEMBER .- A higher grade of gam- bling. Mr. CARROLL .- No, to a more public form of gambling. I admit, but which has led to the extinction of that secret. surreptitious. under- hand gambling, the sitting up to all hours of the night, and the moral undoing of those drawn into such circles. An Hon. MEMBER .-- There is plenty of it now. Mr. CARROLL .- No. The gambling that takes place to-day is carried on by those who can afford to gamble, because if they had not the money in their pockets they could not do so. An Hon. MEMBER .- That does not say they can afford it. Mr. CARROLL .- It is presumptive evidence, at any rate. that they can. If a man has #1 in his pocket he can put it on the machine, but hardly otherwise. An Hon. MEMBER .- He may not have paid his debts. Mr. CARROLL .- Well, if you go into that question, how many of those who do not bet on races are in a position to say they are clear of their liabilities ? Has the honourable gentle- man in charge of this Bill ever tried to put down gambling in mining shares, or on the Stock Exchange, or any other form to which the public have become accustomed, and which have become part of their several callings. Not at all. Why, members even gamble to get into this House. There are various kinds of speculations indulged in by people to their heart's desire, and the same exists in every course of life. You cannot be without it, and there it will always be, in spite of any mar- vellous reformer. But coming back to the totalisator, are gentlemen in this House going to say that five or six thousand people, well- dressed people, and most respectable, shall not go out to the Hutt, we will say, and have their holiday and their picnic on the racecourse, and there indulge in the sport they like, and see the thoroughbred animals and well- contested races, and at the same time also have that monetary interest in each com- petition which is afforded them by the total- isator ? Are you going to stop that ? Is it your place to say that none of those people should go out there and spend their £5 or their \$1, as the case may be? What claim have you on the #1 or the £5 which they choose to invest on a race? Has a man not as much right to spend his pound in that way as you have to spend yours in another -- say, to buy shares in bogus companies, or to gamble on the Stock Exchange ? An Hon. MEMBER. - Why interfere with the Chinamen for playing fan-tan ? Mr. CARROLL. - Because that is carried on secretly and in the dark ; because it is a kind of gambling that develops the worst traits of human nature. People go into by-ways and into dark places, where the surroundings smell of vice and everything is impure Is it because we war against that form of vice you would use it as an argument against the freedom allowed to a respectable person on the racecourse, where everything is open and above-board ? Why. the two things are as wide apart as the poles. Mr. ATKINSON .- It would be as illegal to play fan-tan in the street as in a Chinese den. Mr. CARROLL .- If the honourable gentle- man wants to do away with gambling on the machine or the racecourse, let him bring in a Bill and say that there shall be no more horse- racing in



the colony. Get to the bottom of it. and then see what will happen. People would give up breeding horses. How will that affect the farmer and many employés at the present time, whose honest livelihood is earned in occupations more or less connected with the farm and the thoroughbred ? An Hon. MEMBER. - People would want good horses for hunting. Mr. CARROLL. - There would be very little hunting : there would be no incentive to breed thoroughbreds, and you cannot get your hunter

<page>708</page>

otherwise. It may not be the opinion of some, ' than to see a thoroughbred showing his paces but I think if any community became entirely bereft of the sentiment of sport that community would be no good whatever. If the world was full of perfect men, men who knew no vice, cruel and ungenerous on the part of the honourable men like the honourable member for Ashley, a able member for Ashley to make a sweeping above purity itself, men who denounce every : condemnation to the effect that those who form of what they deem to be evil-if you had a world composed of such men, what a world ! What a nice place to live in ! It is all a question of degree -- how much good we can , case. secure, and how little we can reduce. evil to. I believe that where an evil is rampant, and where it injures the masses as well as the i can tell us of any particular case within his own individual, we should put it down with a strong hand ; or, if we cannot altogether eradicate it, we ought to take it in hand and try to. minimise its evil results. Sport is inherent in the British race, and has added a good deal of ; takes one or two cases that have been com- lustre and fame to the nation. It is with the people ; it moves with and lives with them. Whenever people have emigrated from the Old Country and founded new colonies and built up new nations they have always carried the [ cover the whole of the people, or the majority sentiment of sport with them, and sown the l of those who attend racecourses. Why. those seeds thereof in the new soil of their adop- ! tion. This affection for their national sports has always made the British people wherever . they have gone. If you deprive the British people of that sentiment -- love of foot- ball, field sports, racing, and fighting -- you make them a cold, soulless nation without any warm impulses; you weaken them as in. dividuals and as a community, and must neces- sarily weaken them as a nation. I do not see that any particular harm will arise if you fail to do away with the totalisator. At all events, there is no need for urgent action. The racing community for the last few years have been handling their affairs in a most meritorious use#cc-zero way. They have a conference every year, at which every club in New Zealand that enjoys the use of the totalisator is represented by delegates-just as the members of this House, representing the people of New Zealand, meet here in session every year to discuss the general affairs of the country and of the people -- in the effort to improve and place upon a better basis all affairs connected with racing. These men are at work - just the same as we are at work here-to better things and improve those matters which come under their administration. If honourable members will look over the list and judge for themselves the character and status of the men who are representing the various racing bodies who meet here every year. they will agree with me that they are the best men that could be possibly got to have charge of racing. They are not men who are likely to encourage gambling for the sake of gambling ; they are not likely to .promote the selfish ends of humanity purely for that purpose. They have no interest in sport as a special means of living. They are on the broader plane of trying to raise it up, and making it creditable to have anything to do with. They are those who like to breed or see a good horse, and a laudable pride it is to look upon equine nobility. There is nothing more inspiring as he proudly discloses himself in a preliminary before the contest. My friends opposite should witness a sigh such as that and live. It was attend race-meetings ease or remove the cash- boxes of their employers. Mr. MEREDITH. - That is very often the Mr. CARROLL. - The honourable member says that is very often the case. I wonder if he knowledge. Mr. MEREDITH. - Look at the reports of the Court. Mr. CARROLL. - The honourable gentleman mented upon in our law-courts, where gambling. has been attributed as a cause, but which may i have had no direct reference to horse-rach :... and that has been distorted by him so a- to very same gentlemen that the

honourable member refers to that were found out and taken before the Court might have been chance- , goers-men who put their sixpence in the pie' .. You might as well argue that that had something to do with their fall. An Hon. MEMBER .- There was no dividend. Mr. CARROLL .-- No; but still there was the investment on behalf of conscience, with the hope of a dividend in the future. The honour- able gentleman cannot give a dozen instances such as he would have us believe existed. We should not too lightly condemn people " . have their own way of enjoying themselves. and who are fond of horse-racing as a sport. The honourable member seems to see nothing bad in those who attend races, or who view life through different spectacles to those he You will find dark sheep in all places we see. and in all walks of life-aye, and in the various vocations that have for their avowed object the betterment of mankind. The totalisator may be said to have sounded the death-knell of the " spielers." because he is not allowed on to the racecourse. The "bookie " is also kept under restraint. The profits of racing go to im- prove the ground, enlarge the stakes, and add to the conveniences for the public. Surely that is something. If I thought the honour- able member by passing this Bill would succeed in doing the good he wishes to do. and for ever put a stop to gambling. I would be one of those to follow him in passing the measure. But I am certain that his efforts in that direction will be barren of results, and that he will be a sadly disappointed man. We might get rid of one form of gambling only to introduce that which might be more odious- and pernicious in effect. I think if the honourable member would only attend a race-meeting or two, and put a nimble sovereign on the totalisator now and then, and if the honourable member happened to get a fair dividend. I am sure his feelings would change as to the evils atten-

<page>709</page>

dant upon such a proceeding: At any rate, he would see that the horrors of racing which he would picture to us do not exist at all. The honourable member for Christchurch City in introducing the Bill 'did not tell us his race- course experiences. I am sure he must have seen a lot of nice people there ; and I am sure he must have seen a lot of nice horses- perfect equine pictures; he must have seen some very keen contests : he must have seen great public interest taken in those competitions by people present, and he must have seen that those in attendance were well dressed and re- spectable. Then. where the fear that evil might come to pass ? Did he see any crime perpetrated on the racecourse through the use of the totalisator ? I am sure he could not have, or else he would have enlightened us as to what he is forward to this time for their holiday, and, if really did see, and afforded us proof of the evils of horse-racing as carried on now. I would recommend the honourable gentleman to visit some of the principal racing and breeding studs in the colony, and once he became ac- quainted with some of our thoroughbreds I am sure he would foster such an affection for the horse as would never flag. Out of this I honourable gentleman will see that this gives would grow a strong desire within him to see a few of the horses bred in this colony; competing in races not only on their own soil, but visiting Australia and England and other parts of the world and wresting laurels therefrom. Nothing would please the honourable gentleman more, once he understood a horse and appreciated that healthy rivalry which is generated on the turf, than to give his patronage to true sport, and to encourage and promote it on honest and legitimate lines -- with the totalisator -- as a way of satisfying a public spirit, and as a means of eliminating from betting its worst features. Mr. BENNET (Tuapeka). -- Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks on this Bill. could not allow a measure that proposes the abolition of the totalisator to pass without entering my strong protest against it, because the honourable gentleman will find he can never put down gambling by Act of Parliament. I have no doubt he does not understand the enjoyment which people take in horse- .racing ; or probably he has himself backed the wrong horse, and this has caused all his feeling on the matter. I can tell the honourable gentleman that the gambling connected with dredging has been a hundred times worse than horse-racing. At the present time thousands and thousands of pounds have been invested in dredging, and very many people have been ruined by it, and I do not know one who has been ruined by

betting on the totalisator. END OF ONE-HUNDRED-AND-SIXTEENTH VOLUME. By Authority : JOHN MACKAY. Government Printer, Wellington. Down in the district I have the honour to represent, at the present time, gambling is carried on to such an extent that the business people cannot get their money; and there are young men in these places that hold thousands of shares in dredging companies, and some of them are leaving their employment thinking that they can make money out of their shares. Many have lost their money and their occupations as well. As for the money that goes on the totalisator, it simply passes round from one to the other ; the money passes round and round ; and at the same time the racing improves the blood of the horses raised in these districts. More than that, the race-day is the only real holiday that the people in some of these districts have in the year. They look they are deprived of that, what are they going to get in its place? Of the totalisator proceeds 10 per cent. is taken; 2 per cent. goes to the Government, I think, and the totalisator gets } per cent. Then, the money is generally spent in improving the racecourses. Before a permit can be got #250 has to be spent. The a certain amount of employment, and a good deal of money is kept in the districts. New Zealand is not the only place where gambling is done. Look at "Tattersall's" sweeps in Tas- mania. Two young men in my district won .£13,000 between them in "Tattersall's," and I think that if the honourable member in charge of the Bill thought he would win a sum like that he would be induced to invest a pound in that way himself. In Victoria they have no totalisator, yet on almost every day there is a race-meeting. I maintain that the totalisator is not responsible for the increase in racing. The totalisator is only a modified form of gambling, and it is preferable to dealing with bookmakers. I am a member of a racing-club myself, and I know that if there is anything that is not straight it is brought before the stewards, who inquire into the charge, and, if it is proved, disqualification for a long period follows. Mr. GILFEDDER (Wallace) .- Sir, I regret that so many members were so strongly in- clined to speak on this matter that I had not the opportunity of addressing myself to the House earlier in the evening. I must con- gratulate the honourable member in charge of the Bill on the very moderate speech made by him in introducing it to the House. Debate interrupted. The House adjourned at half-past ten o'clock p.m.