

cannot help feeling that there is a slur upon their character; they are made to feel sometimes that there is a slur upon their name, and because there is a slur upon their name, which they have not brought about, that has really the effect of a slur upon their character. I really think that if we pass this Bill its effect will be better than the effect of the present law, because those who are innocent in the matter will be relieved from penalties which are now imposed upon them. For my part I intend to support the Bill. At the same time I thought that I should say what I have said, because I do not wish it to be supposed that I go blindfold into the matter, and support the Bill because it is a good one without seeing what its effects are likely to be. As to the suggestion made by the Hon. Mr. Barlow, I cannot agree with him that the Bill should not be retrospective, because if we acknowledge that it is right that children who are born out of marriage in the future should be legitimised, I do not see why children who have been born out of marriage in the past should not also be legitimised. Of course the hon. gentleman has in view the idea that legitimate children may suffer by such a procedure, but I do not see why one child born out of wedlock and another born in wedlock should be treated differently, when we come to deal with property belonging to the parents.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: They have a vested right.

HON. A. NORTON: One has a vested right, and the other has a vested wrong, and the sooner we remedy the vested wrong the better. I shall very gladly support the Bill.

HON. J. T. SMITH: I very much approve of the action which has been taken by the Hon. Mr. Macpherson in bringing this Bill before the House, and I think he deserves every credit for having taken an independent course in this matter. I am perfectly sure that society generally will be benefited by having one of these shameful idiosyncracies erased from the statute-book; and those who may be legitimised under this Bill will have cause to thank the hon. gentleman, as they will probably be able to fill important positions in society which perhaps they could not have filled under other circumstances. The slur and stain which attach to them often prevent them from occupying positions which they deserve and which they are capable of satisfactorily filling. Therefore I am very much disposed to support the Bill. I think it should have been passed long ago. At any rate, now that it has come it will have my cordial support.

HON. E. J. STEVENS: It is an unpleasant thing to have to speak against a measure which is brought forward in the supposed interests of morality, but this is a measure of such serious moment that I think it ought to be very carefully considered indeed. I give hon. gentlemen who have spoken credit for having considered it. I have thought it over very seriously since I received a copy of the Bill. I acknowledge that there are some disabilities attaching to those who have been born out of wedlock, though not to the same extent that has been said by some hon. members, because if a man has it in him there is hardly any position which he cannot reach, even if he has had the misfortune to be illegitimate. So far as the father's worldly goods are concerned, that may always be dealt with by will, and experience goes to prove that such has been the case. Where the father has had any feeling of regard for his illegitimate offspring he has taken good care to provide for them. I cannot see where this Bill has been brought forward in the interests of morality, except in the one-point raised by the Hon. Dr. Taylor—that is, a man living with a woman, not married, having children, and desiring to legitimise them

afterwards. I grant that is a strong point, but we have to look at the point raised by the Hon. Mr. Morehead, and that is the effect this measure will have in the future upon marriage. There is hardly a case connected with this matter brought into the courts in which the woman has not said, and generally proved, that she was seduced under the promise of marriage, and I feel sure if the Bill becomes law there will be a largely increased number of those cases. It is very easy to imagine that one of the arguments used by a man who attempts to seduce a young girl would be that, in the event of there being issue, as soon as he was in the position to do so he would make her his wife. That would be a very powerful argument in many cases.

HON. W. ALLAN: It is said now.

HON. E. J. STEVENS: That argument will be more often used in the future. It will be used by anyone who wants to seduce an unfortunate female. I freely admit that it is a very hard case for those who are unfortunate enough to be illegitimate, but I think the evil that would accrue would be very much greater if this Bill became law. I give the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill credit for the best intentions. I believe he is thoroughly sincere in his belief and statements. I know him to be a large-hearted man, and probably many instances of hardship have come under his notice that have led him to introduce the measure. I regret to have to oppose him, but I feel sure that a great deal of harm would be done under this Bill.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put; and the Council divided:—

CONTENTS, 12.

HONS. W. H. Wilson, A. Norton, J. T. Smith, W. Allan, P. Macpherson, J. Cowlishaw, H. C. Wood, F. H. Hart, J. McMaster, W. F. Taylor, F. T. Brentnall, and J. Webber.

NOT-CONTENTS, 4.

HONS. B. D. Morehead, W. Forrest, E. J. Stevens, and A. H. Barlow.

Resolved in the affirmative.

CRIMINAL CODE BILL.

SECOND READING.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: I beg to move that this Order of the Day stand an Order of the Day for Tuesday next. I may say that as to-day was proclaimed a holiday, and as the proclamation has been rescinded, a little confusion has been caused. I promised some hon. gentlemen that, under the circumstances, the Bill would not be taken until next Tuesday. I do not think that can do any very great harm, because it will give hon. gentlemen some further time to consider it.

Question put and passed.

ABORIGINALS PROTECTION AND RESTRICTION OF THE SALE OF OPIUM BILL.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

Question stated—That after clause [4.30 p.m.] 9, the following new clause be added:—

Section fourteen of the principal Act is amended by the omission of the words "or suffers or permits an aboriginal or a female half-caste to be in or upon any house or premises in his occupation or under his control."

HON. J. WEBBER said there had evidently been some mistake, because he knew nothing about the printed amendment which had been handed round. The amendment read out by the Chairman was the amendment he wished to be introduced into the Bill, but it had not been circulated, and he wished to make a short explanation in this connection. Clause 14 of the original Act reads—

Any person who, except under the provisions of any Act or regulations thereunder in force in Queensland, employs an aboriginal or a female half-caste, otherwise