

**Record of the
Proceedings of the Queensland Parliament**

...
**Legislative Assembly
2nd July 1862**

...
Extracted from the third party account as published in the
Courier 3rd July 1862

The SPEAKER read prayers, and took the chair at twenty minutes past three.

PETITION.

Mr. HALY, on account of the session being so near to a close, withdrew the following motion:—"That the petition from Edward Chapman, presented by him on the 1st instant, be printed."

AUDITOR-GENERAL.

Mr. WATTS moved—"That the Attorney-General be heard at the bar of this honorable House on Thursday next, at the meeting of the House."

Mr. BLAKENEY seconded the motion, which was put and passed.

EXTENSION OF TELEGRAPH FROM LYTTON TO CAPE MORETON.

Mr. EDMONDSTONE moved—"That this House will, to-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, to consider of an address to the Governor, praying that his Excellency will be pleased to cause to be placed on the supplementary estimates for 1863, a sum not exceeding £2500, to extend the telegraphic line from Lytton to Cape Moreton." The idea of the extension of the telegraphic line in the manner proposed by the motion, was not a new one. Some time since, the sum of £3000 had been granted by the Government of New South Wales for that purpose; but many persons had objected that it would be better that telegraphic communication should be established between the Bay and Ipswich; that objection could not be said to be in existence now, seeing that telegraphic communication was not only established to Ipswich, but also to South Australia and Kangaroo Island. He had been induced to put the motion on the paper from the fact that the other day a sum had been passed for extending the line from Toowoomba to Dalby, and surely if it was necessary to establish telegraphic communication between those two towns how much more necessary was it that communication should be established between the seaboard and the interior. During the past week a vessel had been dodging about, and no one during that time had been able to discover what her name was, nor could the agents for her tell whether or not she might require assistance—they did not know what distress there might be on board the ship. £2500 would be amply sufficient, a considerable portion of the work having already been done, and the submarine cables, which could be laid in a most secure manner, would cost about £50 per mile. It would be a great desideratum to know what the vessels were immediately they arrived upon the coast, and he thought therefore that it was absolutely necessary that the cable should be laid down as speedily as possible. It might be advanced as argument that the small amount of shipping would not warrant the proposed outlay; but, if hon. members would look at the monthly summary of either the Brisbane journals, they would find that no less than three hundred ships went in and out of the Bay during the year—and that merchandise to the value of a million came in and out of the Bay annually. He would conclude by expressing his surprise that the matter had not been mooted long ago.

Mr. LILLEY seconded the motion.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the proper course for the hon. member to have adopted would have been to have communicated with the Government, instead of endeavoring at the end of the session to overload the estimates, and then, perhaps, when those estimates were under discussion to accuse the Government of extravagance. Without questioning the propriety of the proposed extension, the Government would oppose the motion.

Mr. FERRETT could not agree with the hon. member for East Moreton as to the necessity of the proposed extension, and he also considered that in all cases where hon. members wish money to be placed on the estimates the Government should be consulted, and if the Government refused to place the sum required on the estimates, the hon. member could appeal to the House. He (Mr. F.) had been refused a sum of money under somewhat similar circumstances, and he thought the Government would stultify themselves if they supported the vote. The extension to Dalby was in his opinion much more required than the extension proposed. He did not wish to insinuate that the hon. member had any interested motives for placing the motion on the paper, but that hon. member had talked about ships in distress, and perhaps might not object to supply those ships with a little beef, or an odd sheep or two; besides he had not laid before the House the great expense which would be incurred by the appointment of another staff of officers.

Mr. BLAKENEY was of opinion that the sum asked for was quite inadequate for the purpose for which it was required, as he believed that a submarine cable could not be laid for less than £250 a mile. He would suggest that flagstaves should be erected, and then by means of Marryatt's code of signals a system of telegraphing might be devised which would be very cheap, and just as effectual as a submarine wire.

Dr. CHALLINOR did not think the colony could afford to pay for a telegraph line, but believed that the system of flags proposed by the hon. member for North Brisbane (Mr. Blakeney) would be just as effectual.

Mr. EDMONDSTONE, in reply, said that it was possible the motion might have been introduced at a better time; but, considering that they had been allowed so little time for consideration of the additional and supplementary estimates, he did not see how he could have brought the motion in sooner, besides why, if the money could not be obtained from the Revenue, could it not be obtained by a loan? It would be remembered that, but a short while ago, a vessel had become a total wreck; and some time previous a vessel with German immigrants on board, in endeavoring to come in through the Southern passage, had gone ashore, and had it not have been for some aboriginals, every soul on board might have been lost, and no one in Brisbane been any the wiser. The remarks of the hon. member for the Maranoa, of course he (Mr. E.,) treated with contempt. He certainly considered the idea of the hon. member (Mr. Blakeney) to be a very ingenious one, and with reference to what had been stated by the hon. member for West Moreton, he (Mr. E.), would ask, why could the money not be obtained by loan, as was proposed to be done in the case of Toowoomba and Dalby.

The motion was then put and negatived in the following division:—

Ayes, 7.		Noes, 14.	
Mr. Coxen		Mr. Herbert	
O'Sullivan		Mackenzie	
Jones		Challinor	
Richards		B. Cribb	
R. Cribb		Fleming	
Edmondstone	} Tellers	Watts	
Lilley	}	M'Lean	
		Blakeney	
		Raff	
		Ferrett	
		Royds	
		Haly	

Macalister } Tellers
Moffatt }

ROAD AT THREE-MILE SCRUB.

Mr. EDMONDSTONE moved—"That this House will, to-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, to consider of an address to the Governor, praying that his Excellency will be pleased to cause to be placed on the supplementary estimates for 1863, a sum not exceeding £400, to repair the crossing of Breakfast Creek at the Three-mile Scrub, and otherwise improve the road in that locality." He said that hon. members would recollect that he had, during the first week of the session, presented a petition from certain inhabitants of the locality referred to in the motion, praying that the road in question should be repaired; and he must say, that he had been much disappointed on perusing the estimates, to find that no provision had been made for that purpose. Some years since a considerable sum had been paid for a road through the Tree-mile Scrub by the Government of New South Wales, and a very good road had been made. That road had since got very much out of repair, and one of the bridges which had unfortunately not been erected on the plan suggested by the hon. member for the Burnett had been carried away by a flood. There was no necessity for a bridge at that place, and half the money asked for would be sufficient to make a very good crossing place, which was all that was necessary. The other half it was requisite should be expended on another portion of the road, which at the present time was almost impassable. Some time since surveys had been made of paddocks in all directions, and the consequence was that anyone travelling north for some little distance would find that he had to make a sudden turn due west—in fact, he would have to go some considerable distance out of what was originally the direct road. There was also an almost impassable swamp in the road through which it was at present necessary to pass, and the £200 which would remain after the crossing-place had been made, would suffice to render the road in the vicinity of the swamp at least passable.

Mr. LILLEY seconded the motion.

The MINISTER for LANDS would oppose the vote on the same grounds that he had opposed the one asked for by the hon. member for the Eastern Downs on the previous day. He (the Minister for Lands) would ask the hon. member if the Government would be supposed to take up every petition that came into the House. The proper course for the hon. member to have adopted would have been to have applied to the Government whilst the estimates were being made up. The estimates were already much overburdened, and he could therefore not assent to the motion. If the hon. member would withdraw the motion, he (the Minister for Lands) would cause inquiries to be made, and if repairs were absolutely necessary, he would endeavor to apply some portion of the minor sum which had been voted to the purpose of making the repairs.

Mr. RAFF would substantiate the statements made by the hon. member (Mr. Edmondstone) with reference to the state of the road, but considered that it would be wise of the hon. member to withdraw the motion.

Mr. HALY opposed the motion, and Mr. O'SULLIVAN supported it.

Mr. EDMONDSTONE expressed himself as being satisfied by the pledge of the Minister for Lands, and withdrew the motion.

OBSTRUCTIONS IN THE BREMER RIVER.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN moved—"That there be laid upon the table of this House a return shewing—(1.) The specifications submitted for the guidance of persons called upon to remove obstructions in the Bremer River. (2.) The number of tenders received by the Government for such work, specifying the amount of each tender respectively." He said that no doubt the Government would understand his reason for having placed the motion on the paper. The sum of £2000 had been voted towards clearing the obstructions in the river Bremer, and it was very desirable that the steps which had been taken by the Government towards the expenditure of that money should be known.

Mr. EDMONDSTONE seconded the motion.

The MINISTER for LANDS said that there was no objection on the part of the Government to furnish the papers asked for. The hon. member, however, must be aware that the only specifications which could be made relative to the removal of rocks would be the report of a surveyor and that any tenderer was required to state what amount of work he was prepared to do for a certain amount of money. The only tender that had been received was one for £6000, and it had been his intention to carry on the work piece-meal.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN was hardly satisfied by the answer of the hon. the Minister for Lands. It had been advertised that plans and specifications were to be seen, and now it appeared that the only specification was the report of the surveyor, and that the tenderer must work out a specification for himself from that report. The hon. member had forgotten to state whether the tenderer had offered to do £2000 worth of the work. He (Mr. O'Sullivan) could not understand what the hon. member meant by the word piecemeal. There was fifty miles of a navigable river leading into the heart of the country which would only cost £6000 to render clear from all obstructions, and not one shilling had been expended on it, whilst on one mile of the Drayton Road more than £6000 had been expended. It would not be of the slightest use, after what had been stated by the hon. member (the Minister for Lands) that the motion should be pressed, and he (Mr. O'Sullivan) was therefore willing to withdraw it, but he would, if he could get any encouragement certainly move that the £4000 necessary to complete the work be placed on the additional estimates for 1863.

MESSAGE TO THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

On the motion of Mr. McLEAN, a message was transmitted to the Legislative Council, stating that the resolutions with reference to an additional Judge had been agreed to with amendments.

PAPERS.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY laid upon the table of the House the returns of correspondence between the Government and the Hon. Maurice O'Connell.

QUESTION.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN, without previous notice, begged to ask the hon. member at the head of the Government if it was the intention of the Government to return the money which had been received as assessment under the provision of the Pleuro-Pneumonia Act, from those parties who possessed less than one hundred head of cattle.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that it was the intention of the Government to return the money in all the cases referred to.

BRIDGE OVER THE BREMER.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN moved—"That this House will, on Thursday next, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, to consider of an address to the Governor, praying that his Excellency will be pleased to cause to be placed on the Supplementary Estimates for 1863, the sum of £4000, to supplement the £3000 already granted for the erection of a Bridge across the Bremer River at Ipswich." He said that, during the first session of Parliament, the sum of £3000 had been granted for the purpose of building a bridge over the Bremer, which sum it had afterwards been ascertained was not sufficient for the purpose, and the people of Ipswich had began to express some anxiety with reference to the matter. In North Ipswich a town was rapidly springing up, and the Corporation were losing a deal of money on account of the land on the North side of the river not being worth much more than a quarter of what it would be if the bridge were erected. The river was deep and rapid at Ipswich, and the arrangements made for the passage across of women and children were not of a satisfactory nature. As all the arguments in favor of the building of the bridge had been heard before, he would not detain the House, but he must say that Ipswich had never received its fair share of the public revenue of the colony, considering its importance, the number of its population, and the amount accruing to the revenue from it. If the Government

and the Corporation of Ipswich could come to some arrangement, by which the waste lands in the neighborhood could be applied to the purpose of building the bridge, he would consent to withdraw the motion, but it was necessary that it should be done as soon as possible, as it was a work of real necessity.

Mr. BLAKENEY was much surprised at the hon. member who had just sat down bringing forward such a motion. That hon. member had, when it was proposed to grant a certain sum for the erection of a bridge at Brisbane, moved and carried a certain resolution to the effect that one shilling only should be granted; and he (Mr. Blakeney) might just as well come and ask the House to supplement that sum by £25,000. £3000 had been granted for the Ipswich bridge, when threepence was the amount that should have been voted for that purpose. If the hon. member was particularly anxious for a bridge, let him bring in a bill to endow the Corporation with certain lands, the proceeds of the sale of which would be applied to the erection of that bridge.

Mr. JONES was sorry to see that there appeared to be a chance of the old spirit of rivalry between Brisbane and Ipswich being revived. For his own part, he could not see how it was a question between Brisbane and Ipswich at all. If the bridge was required, and £3000 was not sufficient to build it, he should vote for the additional sum; if the bridge was not required, or if £3000 was sufficient to build it, why not say so at once, and not enter into any unnecessary local differences.

The MINISTER for LANDS hoped that when he intimated the intention of the Government to oppose the vote he should not incur the displeasure of the hon. member who proposed it or his constituents. He (the Minister for Lands) was very sorry that he had not been consulted on the matter before the motion had been placed on the paper. As it was, it was possible that the £3000 which had already been voted would be lost, seeing that that £3000 had lapsed—at least so he had been informed by the Attorney-General. He had put down a sum for the purpose of building a bridge at Ipswich, in the rough draft of the estimates; but when he saw the large amount of supplementary estimates, he had felt it his duty to withdraw that sum. However, it was the intention of the Government to place a sum on some future estimates for the purpose. It was his duty to see that the expenditure for his department should not exceed the revenue; and, under the circumstances, unless it were in a case of emergency, he hoped the House would not consent to the motion. In his opinion, it was not a case of emergency, as the communication at present between North and South Ipswich was not so bad but that the matter might remain in *statu quo* for some short time at least.

Mr. B. CRIBB would suggest to his hon. colleague the advisability of withdrawing the motion, at the same time if it were pressed to a division he should vote for it. The hon. members for Brisbane had certainly stolen a march upon the hon. members for Ipswich, by getting nice bits of land granted in the neighborhood, the proceeds of the sale of which were to defray the expense of erecting a bridge. Why did not the hon. member (Mr. Blakeney) who appeared to feel aggrieved that one shilling only had been voted for the Brisbane bridge not move an amendment to the effect that certain pieces of land about Ipswich should be granted for the purpose of defraying the expense of the bridge. He (Mr. Cribb) would have supported such an amendment. When the vote for £7000 was put it was distinctly understood that under no circumstances would the £3000 be lost. He thought it was advisable on the whole to withdraw the motion.

Mr. R. CRIBB said that it was plainly mentioned that the £3000 was included in the £1000 that was refused.

Mr. WATTS would oppose the item. If it were carried, he would ask why a sum of money should not be given to Brisbane for Ipswich; and he himself would come down to the House and demand money for bridges over the Toowoomba swamp.

Dr. CHALLINOR said that it was never understood that the £3000 should lapse. He thought, however, that the motion had been brought in at a most inopportune time, and there could be no doubt but that the estimates were already over-burdened, at the same time, he believed that even if the bridge were to cost £10,000 it would soon repay itself. He would not, in good conscience, vote for the motion on the present occasion, though he trusted that next session they would be in a position to do something in the matter.

Mr. FERRETT considered that the hon. member who brought this motion forward deserved great credit from the people of Ipswich. In a former session that House had sanctioned a vote for £3000 for this work, and subsequently a vote for £7000 was asked for. He (Mr. F.) wished to know whether that first vote of £3000 had lapsed. The Government, on the occasion of the £7000 being asked for, stated that if this demand were not acceded to, the first vote of £3000 would not lapse. They now, however, appeared to represent that that first vote had lapsed. Many hon. members who voted against the motion for the £7000, would have voted in its favor, had they known that the first vote for £3000 had lapsed. He would like to hear an explanation from the head of the Government as to whether that first vote had lapsed or not. He disagreed with these hon. members who had endeavored to represent that Ipswich had received more than its fair share of the public expenditure. If they regarded the situation and population of that town, he argued that it was by right entitled to even more than it had received. A great deal of the money spent nominally in Ipswich benefitted the whole colony as much as it did that town. He (Mr. F.) felt bound, however, to oppose this particular motion on the ground that the hon. member who brought it forward should have consulted the Government, and asked them to place the sum on the estimates before coming down to the House with this motion.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY felt called upon to explain the discrepancies in the statements which had been made concerning this matter by different members of the Government. It was always his distinct impression that the refusal of the ban to which reference had been made, did not cause the sum previously voted to lapse. He had always expressed himself as being of that opinion, but it appeared that he was in error. It appeared that the Colonial Treasurer had explained at the time to the House that the sum of £3000 had been merged in the £7000, and had lapsed by the refusal of the House to vote the latter sum. He (the Colonial Secretary) did not think this just, but the sum, it appeared, was not available, and did not appear upon the books of the Auditor-General, who, of course, had no discretion in the matter. The Colonial Treasurer never stated that in this case the usual practice had been followed, and that the sum referred to had lapsed, and was not available.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN could not see how the fact of the £7000 being refused should cause the vote for the £3000, which the House had already granted, to lapse. If a certain vote for a sum of money were refused, how could this refusal cause a vote for another sum, which had been previously assented to, to lapse. If a sum were voted one year for a certain work, was it necessary to come to the House next year, and ask them to vote it again. The hon. member had talked about the discretionary power of the Attorney-General, who had knocked off the £3000 voted by that House—

The COLONIAL SECRETARY begged to be pardoned for interrupting the hon. member, who evidently had totally misunderstood him. He had said nothing about the Auditor-General having a discretionary power. He had stated that what the Colonial Treasurer had represented as being the fixed principle, had been adhered to in this matter. It appeared that the principle in dealing with these votes, that if a sum voted were merged subsequently into a large sum, and the larger sum were refused, the first sum lapsed.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN thought that the hon. member was not in order in interrupting him. He contended that, after the vote of the House, that £3000 was the property of the people of Ipswich, and it was unjust to deprive them of it. The hon. member for West Moreton (Dr. Challinor) had found fault with the motion because it was brought forward at an inopportune time. He (Mr. O'S.) considered that the motion had been brought forward at a very proper time. The Corporation of Ipswich had been corresponding for months, he might say years, over this very question of the bridge, and it had lately been stated to the Corporation by the Government that they did not wish to ask Parliament for a vote of money for this work. The Estimates for 1863, and Supplementary Estimates for 1862, had been placed before the House, and no money was set down for the work. Under these circumstances he had been asked by the Corporation to bring the matter forward, and he had done so. The hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba had charged him with bringing this motion forward without any plans having been first made to guide the Government in the matter of cost. That hon. member always made a great noise, but there was very little substance in any of his speeches. As it happened, plans had been made, and he (Mr.

O'S.) was prepared to guarantee that not a shilling more than £7000 would be required to complete this bridge. He (Mr. O'S.) is agreed with the slavish doctrine that he ought to have asked the Government to place the sum on the Estimates before he brought forward this motion. He was no back-door member, and did not know his way about the Government offices. The Minister for Lands had said that he (Mr. O'S.) ought to have gone to his office, and given him more information about the matter, but what more information did that minister require than he had at present. In the lobby of that very House, the hon. member had gained from the mayor, and a skilled engineer, all the information he required on the subject, and had actually approved of the plans then submitted to him.

The MINISTER for LANDS said that the hon. member was so much in the habit of making unfounded charges that he (Mr. M.), did not usually care to notice them. He denied that he had approved of any plans, as stated by the hon. member.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN continued—The hon. member had promised at some future time to place a sum of money on the estimates for this work, but “some future time” was a very indefinite period. He (Mr. O'S.) thought that after this motion it would be perhaps better to try some other plan to obtain this bridge, to get a grant of land for instance. (The COLONIAL SECRETARY: “No.”) With reference to the charge of the hon. member for North Brisbane, that he (Mr. O'Sullivan) had voted for only a shilling for a bridge across the Brisbane, he was prepared to give his reasons why he voted for that shilling. The £15,000 then asked for was only *towards* the building of a bridge. There were no plans or specifications to guide the House, and it was the opinion of competent men that to complete that bridge nearly £100,000 would have been required. Was it likely that he and his colleagues were to be tempted by this bait of £7000 to vote money for a work at Brisbane which would eventually have required £100,000 to complete it, more especially when no provision was made for the passage of sea-going vessels through the proposed bridge. He would ask the hon. member from Drayton and Toowoomba if he had ever found him voting against any sums asked for to repair the road through the latter town, although that town was incorporated. He held that the Government ought to grant money for main lines of road, as they had done in the case of Brisbane-street at Ipswich, over which all the traffic of the interior had to pass. On this principle, also, the Government had set down in the estimates the sum of £2000 for the approaches to the boundary. He did not consider this money granted for the main line of road in the colony as any grant to Ipswich. If there was no necessity for this motion, as had been represented by one hon. member, there was certainly still less necessity to place the sum of £300 on the estimates for a photographic artist to walk about the country like a lamplighter. That hon. member was not ashamed to put £300 on the estimates for a photographer to follow the surveyors about like an evil spirit. (Laughter.)

The question was then put, and the motion negatived on the following division:—

Ayes, 6.		Noes, 14.	
Mr. Fleming		Mr. Herbert	
M'Lean		Mackenzie	
Coxen		Macalister	
O'Sullivan		Dr. Challinor	
Jones	} Tellers.	Mr. Lilley	
B. Cribb	}	Raff	
		Blakeney	
		Richards	
		Ferrett	
		Royds	
		Watts	
		Haly	
		Moffatt	} Tellers.
		R. Cribb	}

PASTORAL OCCUPATION BILL.

This bill was transmitted from the Legislative Council with amendments.

On the motion of the MINISTER for LANDS, the committal of the bill for the consideration of the Council's amendments was set down as an order of the day for to-morrow.

COMMON LAW PROCEDURE BILL.

On the motion of the MINISTER for LANDS, the House resolved itself into a committee for the consideration of the Council's amendments in this measure, which were assented to without discussion.

The CHAIRMAN having reported progress, the House resumed.

COOLIE LABOR BILL.

On the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, the House went into committee to consider the Legislative Council's amendments on this measure.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved the adoption of the amendments made by the Council. They were only two in number. In the preamble, the words "direct legislative sanction" were substituted for "*more* direct legislative sanction," the word "more" being expunged. In the title of the bill, also, the word "Coolie" was omitted, and the words "from British India" were inserted after the words "laborers."

The amendments having been put,

Mr. O'SULLIVAN now desired that the regulations should be shown to the House.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that he was not in a position to show the regulations, as the hon. member no doubt well knew.

The amendments were then passed without further debate, and the House resumed.

WAYS AND MEANS.

The report from the Committee of Ways and Means of the previous evening was brought up by the Chairman, and adopted.

APPROPRIATION ACT.

The COLONIAL TREASURER, pursuant to notice, moved for and obtained leave to bring in a bill to authorize the Appropriation out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of certain sums to make good the supplies granted for the service of the years 1861, 1862, and 1863.

On the motion of the COLONIAL TREASURER that the bill be read a second time to-morrow,

Mr. O'SULLIVAN moved, as an amendment, that the second reading stand an order of the day for that day three weeks. Other bills of an important character had been postponed for a fortnight, and if this act were once passed, those important bills might be left to their fate. (Hear, hear, and "Question.") He did not believe it right to rush bills through that House as though they were rushing sheep through a waterhole. He had not time to make himself acquainted with the provisions of these bills. ("Question.")

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that if this act were not passed this week, the probability was that there would not be a quorum afterwards, and this act not being passed would lead to a state of great confusion. This haste was not the fault of the Government, but of those hon. members who had expressed their intention of going away next week, and not coming back again. ("Question.")

Mr. R. CRIBB agreed that the Insolvency Bill and the Publicans' Bill were very important measures, and it was more than doubtful whether the House would get through them that evening. It would be an advantage, however, to have had those Bills before the House, as, before

next session commenced, the members would have had ample time to make themselves acquainted with the provisions of the measures. (Cries of "question.")

Mr. RAFF must object to the great haste displayed by the Treasurer. Hon. members ought at least to have the bill in their hands for two or three days. (Cries of "question.")

The amendment was then put and negatived in the following division:—

Ayes, 4.	Noes, 17.
Mr. Edmondstone	The Colonial Secretary
Raff	The Colonial Treasurer
O'Sullivan } Tellers.	The Minister for Lands
Jones }	Mr. Maclean
	Moffat
	Coxen
	R. Cribb
	Lilley
	B. Cribb
	Blakeney
	Richards
	Haly
	Challinor
	Fleming
	Watts
	Ferrett } Tellers.
	Royd }

The original motion was then put and passed,

On the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, the House adjourned at ten minutes past six until three to-morrow (this day.)