

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 11 AUGUST 1869

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 11 August, 1869.

Premiums upon Cotton.—Additional Representation Bill.

PREMIUMS UPON COTTON.

Upon the Order of the Day being read, that the House do resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the amendments made by the Legislative Council on the resolutions agreed to by the Legislative Assembly,

Mr. PALMER said he wished to ask for the ruling of the honorable the Speaker, as to whether the amendments made by the Legislative Council could be entertained by that House. It had been stated, in the report, that land orders were treated as part of the revenue, and had been received, as such, to the extent of £55,000 last year. He wished to know whether it was within the province of the other branch of the Legislature to interfere with resolutions in such a manner as to throw increased burdens on the people of the country?

Mr. THOMPSON said, that before the honorable the Speaker gave his ruling, he would like to know whether it was a point upon which such ruling could be given, as it was not a question of practice of that House, but one of its privileges. He found on referring to the practice of the House of Commons, that matters like the present were dealt with by resolutions of the House, and not by the ruling of the honorable the Speaker. He found on reference to the English "Hansard" of July 5th, 1860, that any objections were in the shape of resolutions; and on referring to the subject, it was not as to the effect of the question, but as to the conduct of the House. He presumed that when objecting to the honorable the Speaker deciding the question as a point of order, that he would not be allowed to go into the general question, and he would merely address himself to the point of order. On the 5th of July, 1860, Lord Palmerston said—

"Taxation is no part of the governing or legislative power. The taxes are a voluntary gift and grant of the Commons alone."

Thus it would be seen that the honorable gentleman treated it entirely as a question of the privileges of the House. He could refer to Cushing's definition of what was a point of order. It had been defined by him, that the present effect of a motion as to its subject matter, was not a point of order, but that the aspect it presented with regard to the business of the House, was. He (Mr. Thompson) contended that the present was not a point of order, as no technical point was raised; but presuming that it was, he contended that the resolutions were in order; and for the following reasons:—That in the first place, the old constitutional practice of England had nothing whatever to do with it, as that arose from a series of contests, and the circumstances of the times. The reason why the power of taxation was vested in the Commons, was laid down by Lord Chatham in his speech on the subject of American taxation, and was referred to by Lord Palmerston in the House of Commons, on July 5th, 1860. The reason why the power of granting supplies came from the Commons, was, that the Commons had got hold of the lands of the country; but it was different in the earlier days, when the lands were all in the hands of the Barons and the clergy. With the change, the Commons became possessed of the revenue, and it ultimately became their privilege to vote the supplies. Now, he thought they were in the position referred to by Lord Palmerston—

"Taxation is no part of the governing or legislative power. The taxes are a voluntary gift and grant of the Commons alone."

Further on Lord Palmerston remarked—

"In ancient days, the Crown, the Barons, and the clergy possessed the lands. In those days the Barons and the clergy gave and granted to the Crown. The property of the Lords as compared

with that of the Commons, is as a drop of water in the ocean, and this House represents these Commons the proprietors of the land."

It was the Legislature of the country which represented the land, not the Commons of the common as represented by that branch of the Legislature, as they were in the earlier position referred to, as the Constitution Act gave the control of the lands to the Parliament, and not to one branch of it only. He would remark before referring to the particular sections of the Act, that it was useless for them to go outside the four corners of it. There was nothing in the Act to say that they must go to any Act of England; they must go by that Act alone, and must act under it as well as they could. That had been the opinion of the highest legal authorities in the neighboring colony of Victoria, on the occasion of the recent dispute between the two branches of the Legislature there, as to the powers of the Upper House. The 30th section of the Constitution Act of this colony said—

"It shall be lawful for the Legislature of this colony to make laws for regulating the sale, letting, disposal, and occupation of the waste lands of the Crown within the said colony."

Now, he would ask, whether there could be anything more concise than that, as they were now dealing with the Crown lands of the colony; and the simple question was, whether so much land should be given for certain purposes? Again, by the 40th section of the Act, the entire management and control of the waste lands of the colony was vested in the Legislature, and they could not step outside of that Act. By it, one branch of the Legislature had no more power over the lands than the other possessed. That was one point he had to raise; and if honorable members would study the Act, it would be quite clear to them that he was reading it properly. He thought it would be injudicious, in view of the provisions of the Act, to fall out with the other branch of the Legislature, as to the question of privileges. It was very likely that some of the privileges claimed by that chamber were not possessed by the Assembly. Supposing it was contended that the present question was one of revenue; if it was, then under the 18th section of the Act, it should have been introduced by message from His Excellency the Governor. It had not, however, been treated as such; and now, it was impossible for any honorable members to turn round and say that it was a revenue question. Again, in regard to the powers possessed by that House, he would take it by way of argument that it was a revenue question: the Constitution Act laid it down distinctly, that no new tax should originate in the Legislative Council, but in the Assembly only. It merely referred to originating, and said nothing which could be so interpreted as to prevent the other branch of the Legislature from making alterations or amendments.

That chamber might claim the right to increase or reduce amounts or rates, but they could not originate them.

The *SPEAKER* reminded the honorable member that it was a question of practice.

Mr. THOMPSON contended with all deference to the honorable the *Speaker*, that it was a question of privilege. He would next proceed to the resolutions themselves, and supposed they stood by themselves, as he believed there was no Act in force. It was, therefore, merely an expression of opinion, as he presumed the Act had not received the royal assent.

The *ATTORNEY-GENERAL* said that the Act had not yet received the royal assent.

Mr. THOMPSON: Then the resolutions could have no practical effect, at present. And under what Act were they to have effect? Why, under the *Industries Bill*; and he saw nothing in that which could prevent effect being given to resolutions from either branch of the Legislature. He considered it was perfectly useless to go back to English precedents, as he could not see anything in them which would affect them at all. The conclusions he had arrived at, on reading the extract from Lord Palmerston's speech was, that it was not advisable for the House of Lords to interfere with questions of finance, as it would have the effect of upsetting arrangements with regard to taxation. But the present resolutions could not interfere with the budget of the honorable the *Treasurer*, and therefore, the questions were not analagous. Referring again to *Cushing's* report, he would point out, that dealing with the lands was a gift to three estates—to the Crown, the *Legislative Council*, and the *Legislative Assembly*, so that the precedents in England were not applicable, so far as he could see, to the present objection. Again, it had been said to be a maxim that representation and taxation went together, and that very probably would be used as an argument that day; but it did appear to him that that question did not arise out of the present matter at all. They were dealing with land given to them by the Crown, and not with revenue, nor were they proposing to tax the people. They were merely dealing with land which was given to the people, and to them alone. On those grounds, he contended that the present was not a point of order, but one affecting the privileges of Parliament. He was sorry to differ from the honorable the *Speaker*, when he said that it was a matter which could only be dealt with by a resolution of that House, according to the practice of the House of Commons. He would, in conclusion, quote *Cushing* on his definition of a point of order. It was—

"The present effect of a motion as to its subject matter is not a point of order."

Mr. THORN said that, after the clear statement that had just been made by the honorable and learned member for Ipswich, it was not necessary, on his part, to make any length-

ened remarks; yet, at the same time, he was at a loss to understand why the honorable member for Port Curtis should raise the point of order, unless he was, by his conduct, carrying out the old maxim that "coming events cast their shadows before them," and that he would be seen on the benches opposite to where he now was. With regard to the question as to whether the amendments were legal, he was of the same opinion as the honorable member for Ipswich. He had made inquiries in different places, and in not one instance did he get any assurance from gentlemen learned in the law, to make that House look upon the amendments with disfavor; but that, on the contrary, they were perfectly in accordance with the second clause of the *Constitution Act*. He would point out that that clause said that certain measures should originate in the Assembly, and that had been the case throughout. He need only call the attention of honorable members to the time when the *Land Bill* was before the *Legislative Council*, and when they increased the area of the homestead selections. If they had that power, he contended that they possessed it equally in regard to the present resolutions. Although the honorable the *Attorney-General* had put it down amongst the receipts, there was no reason whatever why the House should look upon it as a point of revenue. Now what, after all, was a land order? It was merely an imaginary sum, which, perhaps, would not be required for the purpose intended, owing to bad seasons, and which was not raised at the present time. Then, again, he might state that he had looked through "*May's Practice*," and could not find a case bearing upon the point, such as the resolutions before them. He could not find a case where the *Legislative Council* could not increase the burden of a Bill similar to the resolutions. The present were merely resolutions, and he could see nothing to the effect that the *Legislative Council* should not interfere with a resolution of the Assembly; for although there certainly was something in "*May*" about their interfering with a Bill, there was no reference to a resolution. He was quite sure that the House, in its wisdom, would agree with the observations of the honorable member for Ipswich; and he was sure that the honorable member at the head of the Government was of opinion that the arguments used by the honorable member for Ipswich were quite sound, and that he would agree to them.

Mr. GROOM (who was indistinctly heard) took exception to the part of the speech of the honorable member for Ipswich, which stated that land orders were not money. He would refer to certain extracts from "*Hatsell's Precedents*," which he considered analogous to the view he took of the present case. Hatsell said—

"On the 28th November, 1696, the Lords amend a Bill for remedying the ill state of the

coin, to which the Commons disagree, and give for their reasons, on December 2, 'That the amendments being of a nature which will bring a charge upon the people, the Commons can by no means admit that the Lords can make such an amendment.' On April 13, 1671, the Lords having altered the impositions on white sugars from one penny per pound to a halfpenny half-farthing, it was resolved *nem. con.*, 'That in all aids given to the King by the Commons, the vote or tax ought not to be altered by the Lords.'"

Mr. THORN reminded the honorable member that that was two hundred years ago.

Mr. GROOM was perfectly aware of that, but still it held good. At any rate, he thought the question should be dealt with by resolution, returning the amendment to the Council with a message explaining the reason for so doing.

Mr. WALSH suggested that the resolutions and the amendments made on them by the Legislative Council, be read by the Clerk.

The honorable member's suggestion was complied with, and the resolutions, with the amendments, were read.

The SPEAKER said that, from the remarks which fell from the honorable member for Maryborough, when the question was last before the House, he anticipated that his ruling would be called for, as it had been, and he had, therefore, prepared it, in order that he might not be misunderstood or misrepresented. He said:—Although it is my duty, as Speaker, to direct this House in all points of order and practice, to the best of my ability, and as far as I am in a position to do so, it is, nevertheless, the undoubted right of honorable members to question my ruling, if they should think fit. The question on which I have to rule appears to me to be, whether or not the amendments made by the Legislative Council can be taken into consideration by this House, in consequence, as it is alleged, of the Council having exceeded its power, in altering the value of land orders, fixed by this House, for cotton bonuses, by increase from £2 10s. to £4. Having given the question the most anxious and careful consideration, and having looked into all the authorities to which I had access, bearing on the subject, I can only come to this conclusion, viz., that the Legislative Council has gone beyond its constitutional power, by increasing a charge on the people which had been fixed by this House. I am, therefore, of opinion that it would not be in order, and would be against the rules of parliamentary practice, for this House to entertain the amendments of the Legislative Council; and I feel assured that when honorable members hear some of the authorities which I shall read, they will be inclined to agree with me, that this House cannot entertain those amendments. I will now quote several authorities in support of my ruling. Todd, in his work on Parliamentary Government in

England, when referring to the control of Parliament over supplies, says—

"In proceedings in Parliament upon matters of supply and taxation, the two Houses do not stand on precisely the same footing. Although the consent of both Houses is indispensable to give legal effect and validity thereto; yet, from a very early period, the Commons have succeeded in maintaining their exclusive right to originate all measures of this description. They have gone further, and have claimed that such measures should be simply affirmed or rejected by the Lords, and should not be amended by that House in the slightest particular. The Lords have practically acquiesced in this restriction; and, suffice it to say, that the proceedings between the two Houses on this subject, are now in strict conformity with the resolution of the Commons of July 3, 1678."

May, in speaking of the functions of the Lords, says—

"The legal right of the Commons to originate grants, cannot be more distinctly recognised than by these various proceedings; and to this right alone, their claim appears to have been confined for nearly three hundred years. The Lords were not, originally, precluded from amending Bills of Supply; for there are numerous cases in the journals in which Lords' amendments to such Bills were agreed to; but, in 1671, the Commons advanced their claim somewhat further, by resolving, *nem. con.*:—'That, in all aids given to the King by the Commons, the rate or tax ought not to be altered;' and in 1678 their claim was urged so far as to exclude the Lords from all power of amending bills of supply. On the 3rd of July of that year they resolved,—'That all aids and supplies and aids to His Majesty in Parliament are the sole gift of the Commons; and all Bills for the granting of any such aids and supplies ought to begin with the Commons; and that it is the undoubted and sole right of the Commons to direct, limit, and appoint in such Bills the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations, and qualifications of such grants, which ought not to be changed or altered by the House of Lords. It is upon this latter resolution that all proceedings between the two Houses in matters of supply are now founded. The principle is acquiesced in by the Lords, and except in cases where it is difficult to determine whether a matter be strictly one of supply or not, no serious difficulty can well arise. The Lords rarely attempt to make any but verbal alterations, in which the sense or intention is not affected; and even in regard to these, when the Commons have accepted them, they have made special entries in their journal, recording the character and object of the amendments and their reasons for agreeing to them. So strictly is the principle observed in all matters affecting the public revenues, that where certain payments have been directed by a Bill to be made into and out of the Consolidated Fund, the Commons have refused to permit the Lords to insert a clause providing that such payments should be made under the same regulations as were applicable by law to other similar payments. In Bills not confined to matters of aid or taxation, but in which pecuniary burthens are imposed upon the people, the Lords may make

any amendment, providing they do not alter the intention of the Commons with regard to the amount of the rate or charge, whether by increase or reduction, its duration, its mode of assessment, levy, collection, appropriation, or management, or the persons who shall pay, manage, or control it, or the limits within which it is proposed to be levied."

Dr. HEARN thus refers to revenues of the Crown—

"Although Parliament grants supplies to the Crown, and provides the ways and means for raising these supplies, the functions of the two Houses of Parliament are not in this respect alike. The House of Commons has acquired in this matter peculiar powers. It claims as within its exclusive jurisdiction all questions of finance. With the initiation of all such questions, and with all their details, this House exclusively deals. The House of Lords on these Bills, like the Crown on these and all other Bills, retains the general power of assent or rejection only, but not of amendment. The functions then of the several powers of the State in matters of finance may be thus briefly stated: The Crown makes requisition to the Commons for the supplies which the public service demands. The Commons grant the supplies, and provide the ways and means for raising them. The Lords assent to these grants and these financial arrangements. The Crown accepts the grants, and assents to the legislation which they involve."

With regard to what had fallen from the honorable member for Ipswich respecting Crown lands being vested in the Legislature, he would remark that each branch of the Legislature had its respective functions, to the exercise of which it was confined. Respecting the remark that they should keep within the four corners of the Constitution Act, he would remind the honorable member that their conduct was regulated by standing orders, and they should abide by the practice of Parliament, and upon these he maintained most decidedly that the House could not entertain the amendments of the Council.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that as it had been decided that it was not competent for any honorable member to comment upon the ruling of the honorable the Speaker, the House could not entertain the amendment. He thought the proper course would be to move that the resolutions be returned to the Council with a message to the effect that the amendment being of a nature which would bring a charge upon the people, that the Council could not make such an amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON said, that before the question was put, he begged, with great deference, to appeal against the ruling of the Speaker. The question was of such great importance, that although he had always evinced the greatest respect for the Speaker, he must now beg to differ from his ruling.

The SPEAKER informed the honorable member that it was clearly laid down that there could be no reply on his ruling. The practice in such cases was—

"When the Speaker's opinion is thus pro-

nounced, it is deemed to be acquiesced in, and to make an end of the question, as a matter of course, unless something is done to overrule it. The Speaker cannot be called upon to revise it, nor can it be called into question by any member, nor is any member at liberty to argue against it; but if any member doubts its authority or correctness, the only course is to take the sense of the House upon it by a question. This is a most uncommon proceeding, of which there are but few examples in all recorded experience of Parliament."

Mr. THOMPSON said he was simply excusing himself, as he should never think of replying on the ruling of the Speaker. He was simply—

Mr. WALSH rose to order. He understood that the honorable the Premier was in possession of the House to make a motion; and until that was disposed of, it was not competent for the honorable member for Ipswich to move some other resolution.

The SPEAKER ruled the honorable member to be wrong in his point of order, as the honorable member for Ipswich had a right to say whether he intended to appeal.

Mr. THOMPSON said he begged leave to say that he appealed against the ruling of the Speaker. He thought that it was not necessary for him to say more.

The SPEAKER informed the honorable member that he could make a motion to that effect, in any form he chose.

Mr. THOMPSON then moved—

That the amendments are in order, and can be put.

The question was then put, and the House divided with the following result:—

Ayes, 6.	Noes, 17.
Mr. Thorne	Mr. Palmer
" S. Hodgson	" Walsh
" Forbes	" Miles
" Williams	" Stephens
" Murphy	" A. Hodgson
" Thompson.	" Lilley
	" Archer
	" Bell
	Dr. O'Doherty
	Mr. Jordan
	" Taylor
	" Macalister
	" Francis
	" Groom
	" Edmondstone
	" Italy
	" Royds.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL then moved—

That the resolutions be returned to the Legislative Council, with the following message, viz. :—

"MR. PRESIDENT,

"The Legislative Assembly having had under consideration the Legislative Council's message of date 23rd June last, with the cotton premium resolutions, adhere to the said resolutions, in the form originally conveyed to the Council. The amendments of the Council, being of a nature which, in their consequences, will bring a charge upon the people, the Assembly can by no means admit that the Council can make such amendments."

Mr. FORBES considered that the question, as it was now placed before the House, was, whether the Upper House had a right to

interfere with the privileges of that House? He had been at a loss to find anything in the Constitution Act which could lead him to object to the resolutions. Taking it for granted that the lands were the property of the people, the Act, in granting those lands, granted them for the Parliament to make use of in a way beneficial to the public. Now, looking at the Parliament as the trustees of the people, he could not see that one branch only should possess the power of dealing with the lands, as both branches were equally the trustees for the people. He looked upon the Speaker's ruling with all due deference, but he thought that no precedents were required when the Constitution Act was so plainly written on the subject. He thought that, so long as the lands were granted for purposes beneficial to the colony, they were not stepping outside the Constitution Act. He contended that the constitution, whilst it provided that the whole of the Parliament should have charge of the public lands, meant that both Houses, in fact, had equal privileges. In the Constitution Act of the colony of Victoria it was laid down that no tax for the taxation of the people should emanate from the Upper House. But the present question was not one of revenue; and it was clearly defined in the Constitution Act that so far as the granting of the public lands was concerned, that power was vested in the Legislature generally. It was not a charge on the people, as the money derived from the proceeds of land was not revenue until it came into the Treasury in such a manner that it could be treated as revenue. After the manner in which the honorable member for Ipswich, Mr. Thompson, had stated the matter, he must state it only showed the necessity there was that the House should amend the Constitution Act, so that the powers of the Houses should be put in a proper form, and be more clearly defined, and that every person from the highest to the lowest should understand the constitution under which they lived. He trusted that after the resolutions proposed by the Premier, that the other House would ask for a conference, and that they would come to a decision upon the question, and that the wisdom of the Legislature would not be led astray by the fantasies of one House or other. He trusted that the other House would grant a conference, and that the conclusion arrived at would be for the benefit of the cotton-growers in particular, and the colony generally.

Mr. THORN said that a little while ago, when the question of this cotton bonus cropped up, he made a motion that the bonus should be treated as revenue; but the Colonial Treasurer poolpoohed him, and said the cotton bonus could not be treated as revenue. What, he would ask, was to be thought now of the honorable gentleman's consistency after the decision just arrived at? Why this change of opinion, and this determination that the cotton bonus was revenue? The only resource

they had now, was to accept the decision of the Government, else the cotton bonus would be shelved altogether. He was certain that the other chamber had acted wisely when they increased the bonus, and that they would stand by their dignity. He trusted a conference would be asked for; and that they would arrive at the happy issue of granting the bonus in a yearly decrease from threepence, twopenny, to one penny, per pound.

Mr. WALSH said that, even if any such unhappy arrangement should be made as a conference with the Upper House, he sincerely trusted it would not lead to increasing the burdens of the people. He would be no party to any such result, and would take exception to any such result, just as he had done to the proposed amendments. He was very glad that Mr. Speaker had so large a majority in support of his ruling: that had restored the Speaker's prestige, and some of the authority which seemed to have been lost by former proceedings in the House. He was glad that the Speaker had strengthened his opinion by reference to safe authorities, and rejoiced that the interests of the House were in such safe hands. He rejoiced that a minority of delegates had not succeeded in setting at defiance the Speaker's ruling and the constitution of the country. The sooner the cotton-bonus question was set at rest, the better it would be. The cotton bonus would cost them much. He regretted to say that the chamber would, when it was settled, lose the services of the gentlemen who were only to be roused to activity by the cotton bonus. But he must protest against a burden being placed upon the people for the sake of those dependent upon the bonus. He should not regret if the matter were set at rest, and if the wishes, machinations, and the whole policy of the six or eight concerned in it were defeated, by some accident: it would be a proper result, if they showed their resolution and determination to adhere to their past course, during the present session, to have all they could get and anything else from whatever quarter. He should vote against the proposition.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he would point out that there were two resolutions before the House;—the first simply declared that the Assembly declined to increase the cotton bonus, and adhered to their resolutions; the second resolution was—The amendments of the Council being of a nature which, in their consequences, will bring a charge upon the people, the Assembly can by no means admit that the Council can make such amendments. That he took to be a constitutional amendment, upholding the Speaker's ruling given in the afternoon. The only objection tenable in the slightest degree to that amendment, was involved in the question whether a land order was to be considered revenue or not. The lands of the colony were put under the management of both Houses, the management of the revenue was under the Assembly only. The honorable the senior member for

West Moreton seemed to consider that land orders were not revenue. For his part, he affirmed that land orders effectually prevented revenue from land coming into the Treasury. The total land revenue was £19,000, out of that £15,000 was represented by land orders. It would be admitted, that not an acre less land would have been purchased, if these land orders had not been given. They were not used in the districts where they were earned, but came down from Drayton, Too-woomba, and Warwick, instead of cash payment for land. The buyers of land there, purchased land orders from merchants, for cash, and the land orders took the place of money, thus diminishing the revenue. The expenditure still went on, and another tax had to supply the deficiency thus made in the revenue. Therefore, they were quite safe in dealing with the question as one of revenue. As to the question of policy, whether it would be advisable or not to increase the cotton bonus, he would say a few words. Assuming the average crop, although it was more likely to be doubled in the next four years, the resolutions passed by the House, would grant some £45,000 in land orders, or, as amended by the Council, £120,000, if the Assembly agreed to the amendment. The difference would be equivalent to £20,000 per annum taken from the revenue for the next four years. Now, in the present condition of the colony, the revenue could not afford that amount. On that ground, therefore, the House was perfectly justified in refusing to accede to the proposed amendment. He thought it would have been very much wiser if the persons interested had accepted, at once, the proposition of the Government. Even that would involve a loss of £45,000 in the next two years, and an additional £20,000 in the last. It was the duty of the Government to resist any addition to the bonus, in the resolutions, and the effect on the revenue proved that the amendment of the Council was not constitutional.

Mr. BELL said that, owing to the inconsistent course taken by the Government, in regard to the cotton bonus, he felt bound to say something concerning it. The honorable Treasurer made a very convenient use of this question of land orders as revenue. On the one hand, he treated it as revenue in one case; on the other hand, he treated it as not revenue in another. The honorable Treasurer told them that the land orders were clearly revenue, inasmuch as they represented an amount for sale of land which would otherwise come clear to the revenue. If they had not been issued, they would be represented by so much cash. If that was his opinion, he had no objection to the Government standing by that opinion. He agreed with that view; but not with the utter inconsistency of the Government when again they treated land orders as the reverse of revenue. The honorable Treasurer did not treat them

down as revenue, like previous Treasurers. When he was Treasurer he treated land orders as revenue, for this reason, because they represented an amount of money which brought immigration to the colony, and thus represented capital or money brought into the colony. It prevented payment out of the revenue in cash which would otherwise have to be made, and, so far, represented revenue. Why, then, had the Colonial Treasurer stated that the land orders were not revenue? If he could bring about a re-consideration of the cotton bonus, he would discuss it upon its merits. His opinions had altered materially since the resolutions had passed the Upper House, and he would be glad to take the initiative in bringing about the re-consideration of this question; but it would not be advisable at the present time. He had risen to enter his objection to the speech of the honorable Treasurer, because he neither agreed with his views concerning the revenue, nor the cotton bonus, nor the land orders.

Mr. PALMER said he would support the motion of the Premier. He thought it would not be at all unworthy of the House, but a just judgment on the members who had grasped at too much, if the House were to drop the resolutions altogether. But he would support the resolutions as they had passed originally, uninfluenced by that consideration. He thought that the honorable members for West Moreton and Ipswich might well be satisfied with the liberal gift of the House. As to the question whether the Upper House could alter the resolutions, Mr. Speaker had decided that. There was no excuse for the conduct of honorable members who pressed forward the resolutions for an increased cotton bonus; and it did not redound to the credit of those honorable members in any way. He did not believe that any assertions of the honorable member for West Moreton, Mr. Thorn, would carry much weight; but that honorable member's allusions to him were perfectly uncalled for, and had not the slightest foundation whatever. That honorable member had stated what he knew nothing about, and what he had never been in a position to know anything about, and would be the last man in the world to whom he would communicate his intentions. Although the honorable member spoke with all the authority of the Premier, or himself, upon the subject, and though he might have extensive information and be a most gifted individual, his information extended to a small circuit, and the honorable member certainly knew nothing whatever about what he had said concerning himself, personally, that afternoon. The debate upon the cotton bonus, on a former occasion, had been exhaustive, and everything was then said that could be said upon the subject. Those who grasped too much would lose the whole, according to the old saying; and he would not pity those members who would lose the bonus if the House were to reject the resolutions alto-

gether. But the House was to do what they did do irrespective of the conduct of honorable members. He should therefore vote for the original resolutions as they went from the House.

Mr. MILES said he was in an awkward position, on the present occasion, because he had divided the House, single-handed, upon these resolutions; and now he could not vote against the resolutions, as he had done previously. He had not the slightest hesitation in saying that not one of the Government would vote for the cotton bonus, if they could act independently. But it had been a matter of expediency with the Government, to obtain the support of those six honorable members who divided in so compact a body, and whom, if it were parliamentary, he might call—if not cotton-bonus men—at all events, spinning-jennies. No Government could hold their position unless they met the views of those honorable members. He did think those honorable members had been too grasping, but understood that the honorable member for Maryborough would move an amendment—

Mr. WALSH: I shall vote against the resolutions.

Mr. MILES: He would vote with the honorable member. If cotton-growing was to be successful, it had been amply encouraged during the past nine years; and it did not require another nine years to gain experience in cotton-growing;—if it did, he thought the bonus might as well be cut off at once altogether. He believed that cotton-growing would be given up. He had always said so, and was quite prepared to say that the very moment the cotton-bonus land-order system was discontinued, the cultivation of cotton would be quite abandoned. He felt perfectly right in opposing this resolution, and did so conscientiously. If the Government were as independent as himself, they would never have given any bonus at all.

Mr. THOMPSON said he intended to vote for the motion, although he did not agree with the reasoning upon which it was founded. He had not heard a single argument against his view of the constitutional question. The House ought to have been treated to some arguments, for it was easy to say "we know you are wrong," without giving any reasons; he said as a lawyer and a member of the House, he knew he was right. As a matter of law, he was willing to stake what little reputation he had upon the construction he had given of it. The fact being, that honorable members did not take an interest in constitutional questions, a mere vote upon them was no indication of the right of it. Of course, he yielded to the Speaker's ruling. But, if honorable members would just read the Act of Parliament, and show any provision preventing the Upper House from dealing with the question, and the lands of the colony, he would give way at once. But, he was satisfied his arguments were sound, as law. With respect to the

clause on page 47 of the standing orders, which determined that—

"In all cases not herein provided for having reference to the joint action of both Houses of Parliament, resort shall be had to the rules, forms, and practice of the Imperial Parliament."

It could not alter the Constitution Act, which is quite precise and distinct in its terms. If they moved outside of that Act, they would be involved in difficulties. It was not for them to contest the point with the Upper House; they had no powers to alter the Act of Parliament. It was, therefore, quite useless to quote old precedents, if the Act did not bear them out. Then, again, some abuse had been hurled at the constituents which he belonged to. Now, he would say the farming class of East Moreton would bear comparison with any. Indeed, in New South Wales, of which he was a native, they would not find so respectable a population there in that class. From some cause or other, they paid a larger attention to comfort and respectability; and to say that the West Moreton farmers were an impoverished lot, was not in accordance with fact. He would be bound, that even if the cotton bonus were knocked off, they would make a living, and, indeed, they had had to do so this year without much cotton to claim bonus upon. The Colonial Treasurer, with his skill at figures, should not have fallen into the grave mistake of confounding the land, which was capital stock, with revenue. They derived their revenue from people upon the land paying taxes; every man, woman and child settled upon the land continually contributed to the revenue. Every man settled upon the land became an employer of labor, and did good to himself, and afforded opportunity for others to come to the colony. It was in this way they got interest upon their capital stock. How could they deal better with that stock than by expending in this way, or to induce the settlement of the country and culture of the soil? He might mention that, notwithstanding all the cries of caution, there were ninety applicants at the last land court in Ipswich, for land in West Moreton. These were not squatters or dummies, but *bonâ fide* applicants. It was also said that the members from West Moreton were delegates. He was very proud to be a delegate in such a cause. He was not ashamed of being a delegate. The stand which some honorable members made against being delegates, arose from the fact that they did not represent their constituents. But, as he represented his constituents, he was quite willing to be called a delegate. Neither did he care a button that he was called a cotton-bonus member. It was said by the honorable member for Port Curtis that he had voted on this question against his convictions;—at any rate, the lawyers in the House had brought no objection to his reasoning. In confirmation of his opinion, that the cotton bonus was no charge upon the revenue, he might say that the resolutions were not introduced by mes-

sage from His Excellency. Had the Opposition found this out as a blunder? Why had not the Government stood by their former opinion thus indicated? This was the most important point of constitutional law that had yet been before the House, and the Government gave no reasons for their view. It was not to be supposed that the Upper House would acquiesce, when it was, in the opinion of their Acting President, not a money question, or Bill to which old practices applied. It appeared to him, that the whole question of the construction of the Constitution Act, which contained very peculiar clauses, would thus be opened, and it was a question that could not be very easily laid. A somewhat similar question arose when it was put to the House, that the Pastoral Leases Bill affected the revenue. The Premier then said that Bill did not affect the revenue, although it provided for the land being alienated in fee-simple in certain events. And the Government held that it was not a money Bill affecting the burdens upon the people. No more it did; neither did the cotton bonus. It simply affected the land given them by the Imperial Government. Nothing in the standing orders could affect an Act of Parliament, nor hold good, unless within the powers given by the Act. He accepted the defeat upon the question of privileges, but it was one which they could not settle. Even in the old country, the conflict had not yet been decisively settled; it had been merely an acquiescence on the part of the Lords that they did not interfere with money Bills. He was quite confident they would have been within the four corners of the Constitution Act if they had supported the amended resolutions. He might say that neither he, nor any other member of the House, had had anything to do with these resolutions in another place. With these remarks, he begged to say that he saw no other alternative but to vote for the resolutions.

The Hon. R. PRING said he regretted he was not in the House when Mr. Speaker gave his ruling, but of course he bowed to that ruling. The question before the House referred to the message which was to be sent back to the Legislative Council. The message proclaimed the reasons why the amended resolution was sent back, and stated that—

“The Legislative Assembly having had under consideration the Legislative Council’s message of date 23rd June last, with the cotton premium resolutions, adhere to the said resolutions, in the form originally conveyed to the Council. The amendments of the Council, being of a nature which, in their consequences, will bring a charge upon the people, the Assembly can, by no means, admit that the Council can make such amendments.”

He felt rather in a difficult position because, if he gave his views on this matter adverse to the Speaker’s ruling, he might appear to question it. He trusted he would not be

thought to do so. At first sight it would appear that, owing to a value put upon the land orders, the bonus would appear to impose a charge upon the people, and that the alteration in the resolutions by the Legislative Council would, in effect, divert from the people a certain amount of revenue which they otherwise would have. The question was: Did this case fall within the strict principles followed out at home, in reference to the Lords and Commons? He differed from the Legislative Council because they had decided the question upon not correct grounds. He did not think himself, that there was anything in the Constitution Act which gave the Council the power they sought to maintain. His view was that the Act gave the power to frame laws, but it went no further. He therefore felt disposed to follow the precedents at home in respect to matters of revenue, and he saw nothing in the Constitution Act which put them in any different position. He had regarded the question in a different manner from the Council. He could not bring himself to see that the land order was a charge upon the people. That was the difficulty they had to meet. If they looked into precedents, they would see that the Lords had no power to object to the Appropriation Act. The Estimates never go to the Lords, neither do they go to the Legislative Council, but their assent is obtained by the Appropriation Act. Were these land orders consolidated revenue? Because they represented a certain value, and were called revenue, it did not make them so. Now, whatever the Auditor-General might put down as revenue in his public accounts, the real question was this, that by certain Land Acts, land orders were granted to particular persons for grants of lands possessed of a value fixed, and representing that value when purchased by the holder. But the land order could not be worth £14, say for payment of customs duties, any tax, or for stamps. It only represented money, in buying land. He thought, therefore, that this was a very peculiar case. It arose from an emergency making the land order of value when used for a particular purpose, and of no value but when so used, so that it might or might not become revenue. It differed therefore from revenue proper as passed in the Appropriation Act. What, then, had the Council done? If this cotton bonus grant were real revenue, it should have been introduced by message from His Excellency. If it represented money, why had it been sent to the Council at all? Their action in that case was really not required. If it were only a boon given for inducing immigration, and it was only to assume a certain value fixed by the Legislature, why should not the Council have had a voice in the matter? Indirectly it would affect the revenue, in a way depending upon the quantity of land to be sold. There were no precedents at home. It was all money there, and revenue, and consolidated revenue.

The land order might be treated as revenue by-and-bye under certain circumstances.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said he had expressed no decided opinion upon this matter, and it involved considerable doubt. He had contented himself with accepting the ruling of the Speaker, which was sufficient for present purposes, and for the Legislative Council, should they think fit to contest the matter. Either the Assembly would satisfy the Council that they were wrong, or the Council would convince them that they were taking a wrong course in the present instance. If the House did not take action in the way proposed, the matter would lapse. It was essential, therefore, that those who differed from the Speaker's ruling should support these resolutions. He thought, therefore, that this was the correct course, and that it was the duty of the Speaker to have ruled so as to support the privileges of the House. He did not think it necessary to enter into any elaborate arguments to show either that this was or was not revenue. The reason given in the resolution, he thought, was a substantial reason. What was a land order? To the holder it had a declared value. They sold lands to raise revenue. The £18 land order was taken at Government land sales as money. It could be discounted as so much cash. So, therefore, it was money. If the Treasurer received £40,000 of land orders in one year, he was short of cash by £40,000, and to supply that he must make taxes. The effect, then, of the alteration proposed by the Council, if acceded to, might be the increase of the burdens on the people. That was the simple train of reasoning, whether it was sound or not. Perhaps he might be able to urge that point of view. But it was a very difficult question. The honorable member for Ipswich, Mr. Thompson, was very positive in his opinion. But a long training in his profession had given him a habit of difference in opinion. At the same time, he offered his opinion with considerable diffidence. Underlying the whole question was this fact, that the circumstances of Queensland differed entirely from those in England. There never was a time when the waste lands there were in the hands of the Crown. There was no such thing as a land revenue in England, such as they had in this colony. There were, of course, the forests and other lands of the Crown, and, in theory, lands reverted to the Crown on failure of heirs. The same theory held here. But there was no analogy in the land laws of England to guide them, so that the precedents there became of less value. However, it was a matter of very great difficulty. He had upheld the Speaker's ruling, because he was not prepared to upset it. He could not disabuse his mind of the belief that a land order was cash received at the land office. It seemed to him a question affecting the revenue, as it might involve an additional burden upon the people. As to the constitutional question, as there were arguments so

forcible on both sides, it was better to support the Speaker's ruling, and leave the Council, if they saw fit, to contest it.

Mr. JORDAN said he thought cotton-growing was to be one of the great interests of the colony, and he thought it wise that the cotton bonus should be continued on a limited scale. If the question had been put before the House in the way recommended by the Upper Chamber, he would hardly have supported the increased rate proposed. He thought that what had been passed by the chamber, a short time ago, was a fair decision of the question. After all, it was a question of revenue. They were voting away £40,000 worth of land, and the people would be taxed to that amount, to supply the amount thus given. He could not view the cotton bonus in any other light than as a burden upon the people. A person bought cotton-bonus land orders, and these were expended in the purchase of land, and thus decreased the amount of the revenue, which was diverted on its way by the land orders. Therefore it was a charge upon the people. He thought some honorable members had been very hard upon the honorable members who had properly represented West Moreton upon this question. He thought the colony was largely indebted to the constituents of that district, because those who had established cotton-growing there, had established a source of wealth to the colony for all future time. He was proud, therefore, to see their representatives come forward on this question and take the stand they had taken. He did not vote for the increased bonus, because, he thought, it was a question of revenue, and that the amount proposed could not be afforded just now. He did not believe that the cotton-growers were dependent upon this bonus, but believed that they could do without it. He would not have voted for the £40,000 grant, as a crutch to support a system which could not support itself. He could not understand why honorable members could say that the cotton interests would fall to the ground. He took exception to the expression made use of respecting some honorable members, that they were wrong, and they knew it. He thought those honorable members were not wrong, and that they would not have been justified if they had not attempted to get the increase of the cotton bonus just now, in the interests of their constituents. But he believed that the cotton-growers could stand now without the support of a bonus in this colony. He was glad to hear from the honorable member for Ipswich, that the farmers of Queensland were a more respectable class than in that honorable member's own colony of New South Wales. He could give a reason for that; it was due to their admirable immigration scheme, no doubt. He believed in agriculture generally, and was glad to hear the opinions enunciated, that they should get an agricultural population to increase their wealth. He thought the Colonial

Treasurer's view of the present question was sound; but that the honorable member for Ipswich was correct to a certain extent, when he said the Colonial Treasurer went too far, for he did not believe that the Treasury would lose to the full value of the cotton bonus granted. The settlement effected by it would be the means of repaying the bonus, so that after all, the £40,000 would not be lost.

Question put and passed.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATION BILL.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved the second reading of a Bill "to provide for Additional Members of the Legislative Assembly." He said that when this Bill passed its second reading, not long ago, he had entered into a lengthy explanation of it, and he should therefore reserve his remarks on the subject, and simply move that the Bill be read a second time. It was understood, when the last session was brought to a close, that the measures then under discussion should be resumed at the same stage.

Mr. WALSH said, that although he expected to see this Bill, or a better Bill, become the law of the land, he was surprised at the way it was introduced. Even this Bill, he thought, would be better than none at all; but he must protest against its being brought forward at the present moment; because honorable members had not received any notice of such an intention on the part of the Government, and to ask the House to discuss it without due notice, was, in his opinion, to take an unfair advantage of the representatives of the people. For his part, he was quite unprepared to consider it. For the last fortnight he had been trying to get the Government to give some intimation as to when it was to be brought forward, and he had always been given to understand that it would be brought on as soon as there were a sufficient number of members in the House to deal with it. On one occasion, during the previous week, there were twenty-eight members present; but no effort was then made to pass the Bill, and now it was introduced in an unexpected and inopportune moment, and honorable members were expected to pass it; because, during the last session, in a thin House, when the country was not fairly represented in the House, it had been allowed to pass its second reading. He would put it to the Premier, whether it would not be better, if the Government really desired to pass the Bill, to let it stand over until Tuesday next, and if that were understood, there would be a full attendance of members. He thought the House was entitled to have three days at least to consider a Bill of so much importance to the country. If the Government would not consent to postpone the consideration of the Bill until Tuesday, let them say tomorrow, or Friday. It was pretty well known that the Government were not anxious to pass it, during the present session, and it was only

in consequence of the remarks made in the House, by honorable members, in reference to it, that it had been brought forward at all. No one was more anxious than he was for some measure of the kind; but he would not allow the Government to force such an important measure through the House, and he could assure them that if they refused to adjourn the debate until Tuesday next, they would not succeed in getting it read a second time that evening. He moved the adjournment of the House.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said it was only a few weeks ago that this Bill had passed its second reading in that very House; and he had then entered fully into the question. There was no great principle involved in it; and if honorable members were desirous of suggesting any additions to it, they could make them in committee. Honorable members were in possession of all the information they could have on the subject; he should therefore press the motion; and he hoped the honorable member for Maryborough would withdraw his objection.

Mr. BELL said he was surprised at the motion of the honorable member for Maryborough, as he had always understood that honorable member to be strongly in favor of the passage of this Bill. There was a strong feeling throughout the country that a measure of this sort was necessary; and any attempt to burk it would give rise to a great deal of dissatisfaction outside. The only real reason for postponing it had not been given by the honorable member. He could have understood the honorable member if he had asked for a postponement for the purpose of bringing in a Bill to do away with the two-thirds clause. In such case, he would have supported the honorable member, and should have given him credit for sincerity; because it was nearly the close of the session, several members were leaving, and there could be no doubt that the difficulty caused by that clause was increasing every day. He feared there would still be this difficulty, and that, in the absence of a sufficient number of members, it would be the duty of the Government to bring forward such a measure. He looked upon the two-thirds clause as an absurdity, although it was a part of the constitution. The most important measures were passed in that House by a simple majority; and why the number of members should not be increased, or any step taken to promote the welfare of the country, in the same way, he could not conceive. In view of the great necessity which existed for increased representation, he did not think honorable members would be doing their duty if they did anything to obstruct the passage of the Bill through its several stages as soon as possible.

Mr. PALMER said the honorable member for Northern Downs was a recent convert to this Bill, and, like all converts, he was more enthusiastic on the subject than its original admirers. The honorable member had been

opposed to the Bill until the Government had promised a member for Dalby.

Mr. BELL said he had been opposed to the details, and not to the principle, of the Bill.

Mr. PALMER: The honorable member had been opposed to the Bill until he got a promise of a member for Dalby. The necessity for passing such a Bill might appear greater to the honorable member than it did to him, or to the Government; for he had not the slightest hesitation in saying that they had no wish to pass it this session. They had brought it in last session in the hope of seeing it kicked out; and he felt convinced they were dreadfully disappointed that it had not been smothered long ago. The honorable member for Maryborough was only following out a complaint made during the whole session, that honorable members never knew, from the business paper, what questions would be brought before them. There had been a complete jumble of the Government business since the commencement of the session. A promise had been made by the Premier, that the order of the business paper should not be departed from. That promise had been pretty well kept during the last fortnight or three weeks, and it should be still adhered to. He could not tell what the object of the Government could be in bringing this Bill on so hurriedly for discussion, unless it was to prevent members from bringing their private memoranda and papers with them. He did not think the Government would gain their point by such a course. If they had a good case, it would only be improved by being thoroughly considered; but at present honorable members had not a fair chance. He hoped, however, the honorable member for Maryborough, whether he were prepared or not, would withdraw his motion, and let the Bill be discussed on its merits. His own opinion was, that a worse Bill could not well have been introduced, and he was convinced that the Government would not regret, if it were not allowed to go into committee, for they did not intend it to pass. If the Ministry were so earnest about passing an Additional Members Bill or a Redistribution Bill, their first step should be to try their power in the House, by bringing in a Bill to repeal the two-thirds clause; that was their simple duty, and they had the example of the New South Wales Parliament before them. Such a Bill would be sure to be sent home for approval, and that would give a little more time. He thought the honorable member for Maryborough had great reason to complain of the way in which the business was brought forward. For his part, he had not had the slightest idea that this Bill would come on to-day, until the House adjourned for dinner, and he was told by the Minister for Lands that it was coming on. He had understood that Ways and Means would be before the House, and he repeated it was very unfair to take this question out of its proper order.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said he had announced the intention of the Government to bring the Bill forward for discussion this evening.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS said he was somewhat astonished at the line of conduct pursued by the honorable member for Maryborough. That honorable member had accused the Government of having no serious intention of passing this measure. Now, he had been informed, on good authority, that it had been distinctly announced in the House, on the previous evening, that this Bill would be brought forward this evening, and, therefore, honorable members must have been fully aware of it. But, even supposing no such amendment had been made, the motion stood number four on the business paper, so that that honorable member and the honorable member for Port Curtis must have been aware that the debate on the question was not far distant. The motion had been some months on the paper; the Bill had passed its second reading last session, and it was understood that the questions then under discussion would be taken up at the same stage this session. It was not fair, therefore, to say that the Government were pressing the question upon the House without due notice. The proper way would be to deal with the Bill upon its merits. If it did not suit the Opposition, their course would be very plain. It had been stated that it was the duty of the Government to introduce a Bill to repeal the two-thirds clause, and it appeared to be the impression of the House that it ought to be repealed. He confessed he had been for a long time in some difficulty about the question. It appeared to him that to repeal the two-thirds clause without knowing what was going to follow, would imperil the constitution of the country; and, however anxious he might be to see additional members in the House, and to see this Bill passed, he had not fully made up his mind that, in the present state of the House, it was desirable to repeal that clause. But that question had been so fully discussed when the Bill was before the House, on a former occasion, that he would not enter into it. When this Bill was first introduced, the House were informed that it was not such a Bill as the Government would like to see; but there was no hope, at that time, of their being able to make ample provision for every district in the colony, and they had, therefore, adopted what they considered the correct course, and selected those cases in which additional representation was urgently necessary. He was unable to discover the object of the honorable member for Maryborough, in his motion for adjournment. He had given no reason for it, and he had over and over again expressed his desire that a Bill of this sort should be passed. The honorable member had also announced his intention of voting for this Bill, and he could, therefore, have no possible object in postponing it. If the

Bill passed its second reading that evening, the House could go into committee upon it on Tuesday, and he was quite sure the Government would be ready to act upon any reasonable suggestion which the honorable member might have to offer. He hoped, therefore, the honorable member would offer no further opposition—in fact, there was no ground for opposition, because it was clear that, unless honorable members agreed to a compromise, they might just as well throw the Bill out altogether. Honorable members would have every opportunity of making amendments in committee, and he hoped they would allow it to be read a second time without any adjournment.

Mr. MILES said it had been very well understood, when the Bill was before the House, last session, that it was never intended the Government should proceed with it. It was understood that the session was to be a short one, and that the House was to be prorogued, in order to enter upon the session of 1869. He believed that honorable members had, almost without exception, expressed themselves very decidedly against this measure. One of his greatest objections to the Bill was its title. It proposed to provide additional members; but he found that these additional members were to be, two for East Moreton; Wide Bay, Port Curtis and Kennedy one each; one for Rockhampton; and one each for the new electorate of Drayton and Highfields and the new electorate of Toowoomba. Now, that was an Additional Members Bill, which created two new electorates, and was, therefore, partly a Redistribution Bill.

The SPEAKER called the attention of the honorable member to the fact that the question before the House was the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MILES: If the honorable member for Maryborough would withdraw his motion, he would move, as an amendment, that the Bill be read a second time this day six months. He did not wish to see any Bill of this sort, unless it were a Redistribution Bill. The honorable member for Port Curtis was quite right in stating that the honorable member for Northern Downs had been opposed to this Bill, until the Government had promised to give an additional member to his district, and he could quite understand the change in that honorable member's opinions. He could not say how far the promise for an additional member for Maranoa might not soften his opposition to the Bill; but he wanted to see something more in it. It was not, in his opinion, a fair measure. It proposed to give two additional members to East Moreton, which was, in fact, two additional members to Brisbane. He should like to see the electorates so apportioned that justice would be done to the country. This Bill, certainly, proposed to give additional members to one or two districts, and he had no hesitation in saying they were fairly entitled to it; but it

2 w

was unfair in many respects; it was unfair that Ipswich should have three members, while Rockhampton and Drayton had only one; it was altogether unfair, and he could not see how the Government could expect to pass such a measure. He was inclined to think the Minister for Lands must have had something to do with it, by the way in which it was proposed to make Toowoomba the centre between Drayton and Highfields and another electorate to the North. But he had another objection to the Bill; he objected to it because the district of Maryborough, which contained a large population, larger than the Northern Downs, was entirely left out. No additional representation was to be given to that district, while other districts, upon which the Government relied upon for a majority in the House, were to be fully represented. For the reasons he had given, he should be compelled to oppose the second reading of the Bill; and, if the honorable member for Maryborough withdrew his motion for adjournment, he should substitute an amendment—That this Bill be read a second time this day six months.

Mr. GROOM said, that if anything were required to prove the necessity of repealing the two-thirds clause, the observations which had fallen from some honorable members that evening would be sufficient. It seemed to him that the Government were in an extraordinary dilemma, and he feared that the fatal influence which the members for Ipswich and West Moreton possessed in that House was about to be exercised again to the prejudice of this Bill and the large constituencies at present unrepresented. The honorable member for Port Curtis had stated that the Government had no intention of passing this Bill, and had charged them with insincerity. If there were any truth in that assertion, it was the duty of the House to test their wish to give representation to those districts which had risen into importance since 1864. With regard to the remarks of the honorable member for Maryborough, he might state that on the previous evening he had heard that it was the intention of that honorable member to object to the further consideration of the Estimates until the Government had given a distinct pledge that this very Bill would be brought forward; but he had also heard it announced by the Government that the Bill would be brought forward for discussion that evening, and he had come to the House for that purpose. He could not, therefore, agree to the adjournment, as he considered it would be prejudicial to the interests of the colony. He was not prepared to go into all the details of the question, but he might say that the Bill did not altogether meet with his approval. He was, however, prepared to accept it as an instalment of justice. He could fully understand the difficulties the Government would have to contend with, especially in reference to the two-thirds clause. He was aware that no Go-

vernment could bring in a satisfactory measure without destroying the many-headed influence of Ipswich and West Moreton. Those districts should not be allowed to monopolise the representation of the colony. He had been told that the electorate of Ipswich did not comprise eight hundred persons, and yet it was represented by four members. Then there was the extensive and rising electorate of Rockhampton with a population of over six thousand, which was only to have two members. Still, in the face of these facts, he thought it would be unjust and unfair to the colony, in its present position, to reject this Bill. He did not agree with the Government in the details of the measure; he did not concur in the unnecessary division of his own electorate; he did not know why it had been divided, and he knew that a large majority of the electors did not approve of it. Still he was not going to hazard a rejection of the Bill for any whim of his own, and he should be prepared to assist the Government in making it as complete as possible. He quite concurred with the honorable member who had advocated the repeal of the two-thirds clause, and he did not think there was any fear of the evil referred to by the honorable the Secretary for Works. There was no fear of that; but, on the contrary, he thought that in the present position of the parties in that House, represented by two distinct interests, and another one which did not seem to have any distinct appellation, unless the honorable member for West Moreton might give it one, there was some necessity for the repeal of the two-thirds clause; and if the honorable member, Mr. Forbes, was sincere, he would vote for the second reading of that measure when it was brought in. He did not think that he need detain the House with any more remarks on the Bill before the House, as, on its second reading, the whole of its details were brought forward; but he thought that it would be exceedingly unfair to those districts not represented in that House that night, for anything to be done to jeopardise the second reading of the Bill. He thought that there were districts not properly represented, and that if the Bill was passed it would only give partial satisfaction. It would be the duty of the Government, whatever Government was in power, to come down with a general scheme of redistribution; and he believed that the Government intended to bring in such a measure when they had time, and merely intended the present to meet the exigencies of the times, as the last census showed an increase of 33,000 people since the year 1864; and, therefore, there was a large number unrepresented. He should feel it his duty to oppose the motion of the honorable member for Maryborough, and should support the Government in the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. JORDAN thought that the honorable

member for Maryborough was most inconsistent in his conduct that evening, as for a long time that honorable member had opposed the business of the House, on the ground that the Government had distinctly promised to bring in a measure of the present description, and that he had begun to think they had no intention to do so, but intended to put it off until too late in the session. They found the Government redeeming their pledges, which he (Mr. Jordan) always believed they would do, and that the Bill would be brought forward in good time. Now, it was before them, and they had notice of it on the previous day, and yet the honorable member was determined to oppose it; not that he did not feel the immense importance of the Bill—not that he took exception to it, although he did not seem to go into the details as some honorable members did—

Mr. WALSH said the honorable member misunderstood him, as he did not oppose the Bill, but he objected to business being taken out of order. By the standing orders—

Mr. JORDAN rose to a point of order, as to whether he could be thus interrupted by the honorable member?

Mr. WALSH rose again to a point of order.

The SPEAKER said that, if the honorable member had any objection of that kind to make, he should have made it when the Order of the Day was read. It was too late now.

Mr. WALSH would ask whether that would apply to one honorable member, or to all?

The SPEAKER: To all honorable members.

Mr. JORDAN, continued: The honorable member had stated that he had objected simply on the ground that it was not to be taken that day. The honorable member did so in regard to every measure. If it were only to be to-morrow, it would be all right. That was the principle of the honorable member—"Let it be to-morrow." Why "to-morrow" was the beginning and end of the honorable member's politics; and if the Government were willing to postpone it till "to-morrow," the honorable member would have some ingenious proposition for putting it off until another "to-morrow." In that respect the honorable member was quite consistent, as it was the same with him every day, and was from the beginning to the end of the session. That was the reason that when, nearly at the end of the session, they found so little had been done. He (Mr. Jordan) did not believe in "to-morrow," but in to-day, and he was reminded of the saying "one to-day is worth two to-morrows." Is there something of importance you are intending to do to-morrow? Endeavor, if possible, to do it to-day. Not so with the honorable member for Maryborough. All honorable members had agreed to the necessity of a proposition like the present; and although they might differ in details, which were matters to be discussed in committee, yet he believed they were, as a rule, in favor of a second reading.

Mr. FORBES, on rising to address the House on the present Bill, thought that any honorable member who did not wish to repeal the two-thirds clause, had not at heart the cause of parliamentary reform. When they looked at their Constitution Act, and saw how the business of the country was impeded by the two-thirds clause, they would have no parliamentary reform until that was remedied. It put the Government in a false position. If the Government came down and said it was the will of the people that the Constitution Act should be amended, it should be amended, and not only it, but also the Electoral Act and others affecting the representation of the people. He had heard it repeatedly expressed in that House, and by the honorable member for Maryborough more frequently, that it was necessary to amend the Act in such a way that honorable gentlemen, on accepting office, should not have to appeal to their constituents for re-election.

The SPEAKER reminded the honorable member that the question before the House was one of adjournment, and must be disposed of first.

Mr. FORBES said he was speaking to the question of adjournment, and he thought that it was necessary that it should be discussed.

Mr. WALSH rose, and stated that if it was the wish of honorable members that the Bill should be discussed that evening he would withdraw his motion for adjournment.

Objection being made by several honorable members to the motion being withdrawn,

The question was then put, and the House divided with the following result:—

Ayes, 7.	Noes 17.
Mr. Palmer	Mr. Lilley
" Walsh	" Bell
" Thorn	" Fraser
" Miles	" Stephens
" S. Hodgson	" Edmondstone
" Thompson	Dr. O'Doherty
" Williams.	Mr. Archer
	" Murphy
	" Macalister
	" A. Hodgson
	" Groom
	" Forbes
	" Taylor
	" Loyds
	" Jordan
	" Haly
	" Sandeman.

Mr. FORBES was glad that he was placed in his right position at last, and had an opportunity of speaking to the general question. He had watched with much care and anxiety many attempts which had been made to bring about parliamentary reform, but each one of them had failed from the same reason that he thought the present Bill would fail from; as in an Assembly constituted as that House was it was difficult to get a majority of two-thirds. He had even known instances where a morning sitting had been resorted to for that purpose, but without success. There was an Additional Members Bill brought forward by Mr. Herbert, in 1863, which lapsed from want of two-thirds of the members being present. Then, again, the Constitution Act Amend-

ment Bill, brought forward by the present Minister for Works; the Electoral Bill; the Bill for Shortening the Duration of Parliament, which was brought forward by the then honorable member for South Brisbane, Mr. Blakeney; the Elections Bill; and the Redistribution Bill of last year; all of which lapsed from the same cause. He had had the opportunity of reading some of the debates upon those occasions, and the objections for not repealing the two-thirds clause. But he would ask why they were so afraid of the Government, who lived at the will of the people's representatives? Were they so afraid that a majority would do wrong that they should require to keep such a check on the Government of the country? Where could they find any country where there was such a check upon the constitution? The people had supported the present measure because they could not be fairly and justly represented by that House, when they found that its constitution was framed by a Legislature whose only object was to serve themselves; when they found that the most prominent feature in the Constitution Act, was a schedule providing for themselves. That Act had been tried in New South Wales, and had been found quite insufficient, it not being equal to the rights of the people of that colony. He did not think that it existed one month before the two-thirds clause was repealed.

Mr. EDMONDSTONE here called attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed,

Mr. FORBES, continued: He had had the honor of hearing their present Premier and the honorable the Minister for Works, both address themselves to the constitution, years ago, in that Parliament, and they both declaimed against it as it then existed, as it deprived the people of their political rights. The honorable the Premier told his constituents at his first election, that it was his bounden duty to see that they had their rights restored to them. He had also heard the same honorable gentleman deploring the state of the Act, with the liberality he professed in those days. Now, it was a matter which was patent to every member of that House, that such elections of representatives were not the voice of the people, and the Elections Act was declaimed against on all sides as being improperly used and openings being given by it for fraud; yet that was retained, not by the voice of the people, but by fictitious means. For his own part, he would say that it was a cry from one end of the country to the other, that they should be justly and equally represented. That was stated by the honorable the Premier, and if he (Mr. Forbes) alluded to the matter, he did not think he could be found fault with. He believed, after carefully studying the question, that there was no proper way of conducting elections except upon the basis of population. He might allude to the system of representation shortly, so that

honorable members could look at it themselves. He would propose that the colony should be divided into four great electorates, as by that system, there would be a system of representation of minorities as well as majorities. The members for those districts, although they would appeal to different constituencies, would be virtually the members for all, representing the whole of the people. Let honorable members see what would be the effect of that upon the country. Each member of that House would not be subject to the control of any little constituency, but would be in a position to say that, although he received the largest number of votes from one constituency, yet he was returned from the end of one of the largest constituencies, and could fairly and truly consider himself a representative of the colony. Although that might be a proposition novel to members of that House, it was one which had been brought about in other countries, and one, he believed, much thought of in America. He was about to refer to a letter from John Stuart Mill to Mr. G. K. Holden, 5th July, 1868, on the subject. In it that gentleman said—

"I well remember your exertions for the adoption of Mr. Hare's system in the election of the Legislative Council, and the very valuable report in which you discussed the subject. The debates in the British Parliament which have since occurred, may well have struck you by the amount of ignorance they disclosed; but great and daily progress is making in the correction of that ignorance, and many political men, including some of the most active and intelligent leaders of the working classes, are now converted to Mr. Hare's system, in principle at least, and frequently even in its detail. The doctrine of personal representation is making the same rapid progress among thinking minds on the Continent and in America. But as you are probably in correspondence with Mr. Hare, you have access to the best source of information on this subject."

That was when it was attempted to make the Legislative Council of that colony elective. The subject had been brought forward in one of the Australian colonies, and he recollected that, at one time, a Bill was introduced here for the same purpose, and adopting the system of personal representation; but was rejected from the same cause by which the present Bill would be rejected, namely, from the impossibility of getting a two-thirds majority. In all the Australian colonies it had been found necessary to get rid of that portion of the Constitution Act. They had been told that it was based upon the British Constitution Act; but he denied it was based upon it, even from the earliest time—even at the time of the celebrated *Magna Charta*. He found that, in the sixty-seventh section of that it was stated that in the agreement between the Barons and King John the act of the majority should be the act of the whole. The same principle was carried out by the British Constitution, at the present time, and

what would have been the effect of placing a check like the present upon the people there. Would it not have had the effect of causing a revolution—just such a one as had been brought about by the last Reform Act? If that was the case in England, people expected to enjoy the same independent liberty in a dependency of that country, and no man would travel sixteen thousand miles to live under a constitution which was less free. No person who had reflected carefully on the subject could refrain from attributing to it the want of political power among the people of the colony, and that had been the cause of all the evils from which it was now suffering. In New South Wales no evils had arisen from repealing the two-thirds clause, and in assimilating their constitution to that of England. In Victoria, again, where the people had more rights than in any other, they had not experienced any evil effects. Would any honorable member tell him that if they had been checked, as the people had been in this colony, that they would have been as they were. There the people knew that the constitution of the Legislative Assembly was at their will, and that their pressure would be so great as to sufficiently keep the proper conservation of their political rights. He might refer to the opinions of one of the greatest men the world ever knew, and one of the most righteous rulers, namely, George Washington; and what did he say in his letter to Maddison?—

"To be fearful of investing Congress with ample powers, for national purposes, appears to me to be the very climax of popular absurdity and madness."

Now, when they had the opinion of that great man—of a man whose views had immortalised him, and whose name would be handed down for ages, was it not worth having? Was not it the opinion of the founder of the greatest country in the world? and was it not worth while to imitate such an example? Then again, in page 216 of the same work, he stated—

"If the laws are to be trampled upon with impunity, and a minority, a small one too, is to dictate to the majority, there is an end put at one stroke to Republican Government; and nothing but anarchy and confusion are to be expected hereafter."

There was an opinion which came nearer to this colony, and which showed, at once, the necessity for doing away with the checks he had referred to. Washington, in all his works, expressed his confidence in the sovereign will of the people; and Great Britain acknowledged one sovereign, which was the will of the people. Even writers on the American constitution, at the present time, referred to the check of three-fifths which enable the slave states to have a power to which they were not entitled; and said that they had dominion over five times the population they had a right to; and for that

reason they had brought ruin and devastation upon themselves. Looking at the present question before the House, he had on a previous occasion given it his support, as he thought it would tend to promote the best interests of the colony; but he found now that there was little chance or prospect of it being passed. He found that the same rule which would object to the repeal of the two-thirds clause, would apply to any parliamentary reform, and that the Elections Bill would receive the same treatment; but that would be a matter for discussion at some future time. He found that the honorable the Minister for Works was one of those who had not arrived at any decision on the repeal of the two-thirds clause.

The SPEAKER reminded the honorable member that he was addressing the House on the third Order of the Day, which was not before the House.

Mr. FORBES said he had only referred to it as showing the impossibility of getting anything like parliamentary reform under the present constitution. He looked upon all matters of legislation as to their utility; but he doubted whether that measure would be one of utility, or whether it would be one of great advantage to the colony. He could only view it as one of expediency, in the same way as he had done on a former occasion. He believed that some honorable members who had then spoken on it wished to have a population basis entirely. Others wished it upon a manhood or adult population, alone. For his own part, he was not inclined to agree with either of those propositions; for he thought that, in the construction of the Legislative Assembly, every interest of the colony should be represented. He did not consider it was fair representation so long as the digging population of the colony were not represented in that House, nor that any other community was represented if it had not the right of sending in a member. In his opinion, property and numbers should be combined; and he was borne out in that, by high authority on the subject. He referred to a speech delivered by Sir James Mackintosh, on parliamentary suffrage—

“But if representation be proportioned to numbers alone, every other interest in society is placed at the disposal of the multitude. No other class can be effectually represented; no other class can have any political security for justice; no other can have any weight in the deliberations of the Legislature. No talents, no attainments, but such as recommend men to the favor of the multitude, can have any admission into it. A representation so constituted would produce the same practical effects, as if every man whose income was above a certain amount were excluded from the right of voting. It is of little moment to the proprietors, whether they be disfranchised or doomed in every election to form a hopeless minority. Nor is this all. A representation founded on numbers only would be productive of gross irregularity, in that very class to which all others are sacrificed.”

It was not long since, that, in the mother-country, additional members were added to the House of Commons by resolutions of the House of Commons, which showed that the prerogative for issuing writs for members of that House was a royal prerogative. He found that in 1819, Lord John Russell brought forward some resolutions in the House of Commons, for the purpose of adding to the number of members. The resolution affirmed—

“That it is expedient that the right of returning members to Parliament should be given to great towns, the population of which should not be less than 15,000 souls.”

That was the first step in modern days, for that purpose; and he found that before that time, up to the time an Act was passed for additional representation for the borough of Chester, when the royal prerogative was issued—in fact, up to the time of the passing of the first Act, in 1672,—representation was not based upon population. Then again, however small an instalment that might be, it was one in the right direction; but as he could not believe in the sincerity of the Government, or that they would bring in a complete measure, he should reserve his support of the second reading until he had more information on the subject. While so much was wanted, and so little given, it was merely asking for an instalment. He looked upon the measure as an imperfect one, and unworthy of the gentlemen pledged to bring about parliamentary reform. He noticed that when the question of the finances of the colony was brought forward, he had never seen so much apathy existing as was evinced on that occasion. On the present occasion he had some hopes that they were at last beginning to feel the necessity of the members of that House, and the people of the country, being alive to their position, and to a knowledge of the power they should use. He was not going into the details of the measure, as the present could scarcely be considered an opportune time, but he had no doubt they would receive the attention they deserved.

Mr. THORN said he did not intend to take up the time of the House with many remarks, as on the former occasion he went into details, and would not now reiterate the arguments he then used. He was very glad that his honorable colleague had delivered his speech on the great constitutional principles of English law, and he only hoped that honorable members would be edified by the tenor of the remarks then made. It was his (Mr. Thorn's) duty to oppose the second reading of the Bill, and to treat it in the same way as the Government treated the proposition for provincial councils. He thought, also, that they might save a great deal of time and bother, as they knew that the Bill would never pass. He did not see why they should at that late period of the session con-

sider a question of such importance, when so many members were away, and the Kennedy electorate was vacant. The Bill proposed additional representation for East Moreton and Rockhampton, which he could not possibly support, so far as East Moreton was concerned, after the vote that had taken place earlier that evening. If he could do it, he would disfranchise that district. He thought that a short Bill should be brought in, asking for three members, and he also would be prepared to give one member to Gympie, but beyond that he was not inclined to give any more. No doubt the honorable gentleman contemplated a great system of railways throughout the colony, and desired to effect this by an increased representation in East Moreton and Rockhampton. No doubt the honorable member for Rockhampton would swallow the bait, and would go, in next session, to any extent in favor of railways. Having no doubt that this was the object of the Premier, in the measure, he would never assent to it. The honorable member for the Northern Downs had given his unqualified opposition to the Bill last session; but the promise of a member for Dalby had altered his views. Then, again, the honorable member for the Maranoa would probably agree to the second reading, if the Bill gave that district an additional member. Why did not the Government inform the House of what they intended to do? He believed the Maranoa district would be found to have more members than the Northern Downs, and some claim to an additional member. Then, with regard to East Moreton, the Government, in this Bill, affirmed the principle that there should be a splitting up of the electorates. Now, with regard to East Moreton, he would ask them to remember that the settlers chiefly resided in the South. These settlers were mostly deprived of the franchise owing to the wretched system of registration of voters in the present Electoral Act. Those residing at a distance from the centres of population had but scanty means of registering themselves, and were kept by business, on their farms, at the only opportunity afforded them of doing so. He thought the system of New South Wales should be adopted for enrolling voters, instead of the present courts of examination for the electoral rolls of the colony. Until the people were properly registered, he should do all he could to delay such a measure as the present. In his own district there had not been far short of eight hundred additional settlers since the Bill of 1868 passed, and he might, on the basis of population, claim an additional member. But he did not altogether agree with that basis. As those who were entitled to be on the roll had only an opportunity once in twelve months of registering, until that system were amended, he thought he would be pursuing a proper course in delaying any such measure as the present. Again, it was proposed to give a member to the Kennedy, which had returned

John Bright lately. He wanted to find out whether the member returned for that electorate was on the rolls. He believed it was the John Bright who had departed this life a few days ago. He believed the writ only spoke of John Bright, and the question was whether it would not be advisable for them to move—

The SPEAKER: The honorable member is departing from the question.

Mr. THORN: It was proposed to give another member to the Kennedy: he must deprecate any member being given to that district, after what had taken place in that electorate lately. He regarded the two-thirds clause, however strange, as a great bulwark at the present time, and he would never assist in the repeal of that clause; and he dissented entirely from his honorable colleagues' views on that matter. He hoped the Government would withdraw this measure, as he saw no earthly necessity for it. There was no proper enfranchisement of the electors, and the last census returns did not show the population properly. The reason for this was, that, in some districts, the number of collectors for the census was disproportionately small compared with the number in others. Thus, in East Moreton, there were some twenty-six collectors, although the population there was very much concentrated; but, in the district he represented, there were only some seven collectors employed. In such circumstances, he could not submit to any measure of the kind proposed. He advised the honorable Premier to withdraw it, else he must record his vote against it.

Mr. HALY said the Government should not have pushed the present Bill forward, without giving all honorable members due notice of the time when they proposed to bring it forward. He thought the motion for a call of the House would have been entertained before this Bill was taken into consideration. He was not prepared either to support or to say much against the measure. The Government were not in earnest about it, or they would have had a call of the House, and allowed the Bill to be discussed upon its merits. It was brought forward at the present time because the Government had all their supporters present, and the Opposition had not theirs. An honorable member had mentioned Victoria as a colony which had done away with the two-thirds clause: that honorable member could not have gone to a worse place for an example. They had not yet produced examples here of members expelled from the House on account of bribery. He did not know what was meant by the honorable member who said that the sovereignty of the people was nothing here; nor what was meant by saying that every man above a certain income would be unrepresented. He would advise the Government, that a measure like the present should not be pushed before the members were pre-

pared to deal with it. He was quite taken unawares, and he could not vote for the Bill until reading it over. To obtain time to consider it, he begged to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. WALSH said he felt it necessary to make some remarks in explanation, owing to the unwarrantable attack made upon him by the honorable member for East Moreton, Mr. Jordan. No doubt that honorable member was encouraged by the Government to undertake that work in this House which they had not the heart or the courage to do for themselves. He might tell that honorable member that when he came here to single him out for his attacks, he could do without his lectures, and that he should keep them for other people in other places. In a kind of conventicle tone, the honorable member attributed sentiments and feelings to him, which he did not entertain. The honorable member charged him with inconsistency, and said he was only consistent in inconsistency. He had not learned in that school where men tried to serve two masters. If he had exhibited inconsistency, it was from a want of education rather than too much of that work. He had all along pressed upon the Government the necessity of bringing in a measure for representation. What did the fifth wheel of the Government coach wish them to do that evening? To force on a debate when he knew that the Bill must be thrown out. It was impossible to put the second reading to a division without that result ensuing, which the Government wished to ensue. He knew from the laugh of the Premier, which betrayed a vacant mind, on this subject, at all events, that there was some insincerity in this business, on his part. If the honorable gentleman had only studied the constitution a little more, and laughed a little less, he would have known that the measure required two-thirds of a majority of the House to pass its second reading. There were only twenty-two members present, or perhaps twenty-four. Out of those twenty-four, it would require twenty-two members to vote for the second reading, and carry the Bill to a successful issue that evening. In such a case, it was an absurdity to ask for the representation of the people. The honorable gentleman knew that, and the Government knew it. There was a combination made that this Bill should not become the law of the land. He refused to be lectured by an honorable member who was an enemy to the people or colony. That honorable member had but one object in view, to pamper and benefit this miserable end of the colony, on the success of which he staked the whole of his reputation, as a statesman and an emigration agent. If that honorable member's desires were in unison with his professions, would he not have counselled the Government to put off this Bill until they had a majority to pass it? Would he not have joined him in first passing the resolution for a call of the House, of

which he had given notice, and of which the Government were afraid? They were afraid because they knew the Bill would pass, so as to strike a blow at the preponderance of power about Brisbane. That was why the Ministry and the honorable member for East Moreton, Mr. Jordan, were so anxious to deal with the Bill that evening. The motion which the honorable member should have counselled the Government to support was a motion which might, by a little of the extraordinary manipulation in which the Ministry indulged, in order to puzzle and obfuscate the Opposition, have been brought forward earlier. If the honorable gentleman had done that, he would have done something for the benefit of the country, because he would have hastened the passing of this very necessary Bill. This was the motion to which he referred—

"1. That it is expedient to assist the Government in passing an Additional Representation Bill; and, therefore, that the Government be instructed to move for a call of this House for such early day as they may deem it convenient to move the second reading of the aforesaid Bill.

"2. That an address be presented to His Excellency the Governor, in the usual form, conveying the above resolution."

Without passing that, it would be impossible to carry this Bill. Without that, it was hypocrisy, downright hypocrisy, to bring forward such a Bill, because it was morally—aye, almost physically impossible, to induce twenty-two members to vote for this measure, unless thirty members were present. And thirty members might have been convened within a few days. The Government had not assisted him to do this in any way. Else they could have had the member for Warwick, the member for Western Downs, Mr. Ramsey, and two or three other members whose names he forgot. In short, all the members except the member for Clermont, and the mythical member for the Kennedy, could have been present within two or three days, if the motion he had given notice of had been agreed to. Without such a meeting of members, or the introduction of a Bill more palatable to the House than the present, it would be perfectly impossible to have carried it through. He was quite sure the honorable member for East Moreton knew, to a man, who would vote for the Bill, and who against it. He knew that there were not fifteen members who would vote for it; in his conscience he did not think that twenty would vote for it, as several members had already declared against it. Could the honorable member say he was anxious to pass the Bill? Could he upbraid him for the severe blow which the measure must receive that evening? He earnestly exhorted that honorable member to watch himself instead of other gentlemen, especially when he made attacks upon others, as men of honor, in this chamber. He had no doubt that the honorable member numbered in his own self many sins and

failings, as many as all the members in the House put together.

Mr. JORDAN desired that the words should be taken down.

The SPEAKER ordered the words to be taken down.

Mr. PALMER called attention to the state of the House, when a quorum was formed.

The SPEAKER read the words, and asked whether the honorable member for Maryborough had anything to say to them?

Mr. WALSH: I have nothing to say to them. I presume they are true.

Mr. JORDAN said he knew little about the forms of the House, as the youngest member in it. But it occurred to him that the words, judging by ordinary rules, were highly discourteous and ungentlemanly. He would not say that they were entirely uncalled for. But the honorable member had thought fit to repeat them in saying that "he presumed the words were true." He was entitled to ask the honorable gentleman whether he was allowed to use this description of language. If it had been the first time that the honorable member made use of such language, he did not know that there would have been any necessity to notice them. But he had previously made use of such words. None were in the habit of using them so frequently as the honorable member for Maryborough. That honorable member charged him with preaching. He pleaded guilty to that charge, and was not ashamed to own it. With lecturing; with hypocrisy; with insincerity—

The SPEAKER: The honorable member must confine himself to the words taken down.

Mr. JORDAN: The honorable gentleman had charged him with being the greatest of sinners in that House. He made that his text; and he thought he could prove that he was not the greatest sinner in the House, because he did not offend against good taste and sound sense, as frequently as the honorable member for Maryborough.

Mr. PALMER asked whether this was to grow into a debate. He denied that the words were thus used.

Mr. JORDAN: The honorable gentleman insisted upon interrupting others when speaking, frequently; but if any honorable member rose to make an explanation when that honorable gentleman was speaking, he invariably insisted upon not being interrupted. He would ask whether the honorable member for Maryborough was in order in using those words, and whether he was right in calling the honorable member to account?

Mr. PALMER said the words were not used as given. The words used were: "He had in his own person as many sins and failings as all the members of the House taken together." The honorable member for Maryborough did not say that they had any sins at all.

The SPEAKER said that if the honorable member for Maryborough said what had been put down, no doubt he was wrong. But he had not caught the words.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC WORKS said he would be glad to know Mr. Speaker's ruling, as to the words stated by the honorable member for Port Curtis.

The SPEAKER: I think the honorable member for Maryborough should retract them.

Mr. FRANCIS said he hoped the honorable member would retract the words. He was certain his opinion was incorrect, and that the honorable members on the Government benches had far more sins to answer for.

Mr. WALSH said he would withdraw the expression; but he would say that the honorable member for East Moreton, Mr. Jordan, possessed more saintly virtues than all the members of the House put together.

Mr. JORDAN rose to ask whether the honorable member was fulfilling the spirit of Mr. Speaker's ruling. Was that the style in which the honorable member should reply to that ruling?

The SPEAKER said he thought the honorable member would do well to abstain from all personal remarks.

Mr. WALSH said he should be very glad to do so, but the honorable member for East Moreton said he was ungentlemanly.

Mr. JORDAN said he had not said the honorable member was ungentlemanly. Honorable members knew he had never made use of such language. He was incapable of doing so.

Mr. WALSH: As true as he was standing here, he had heard the honorable member use the word.

Mr. JORDAN denied that he had used the word ungentlemanly in the former part of the evening. He might have done so just now.

Mr. WALSH said the honorable member did use the language.

Mr. JORDAN: Not as applied to the honorable gentleman. He said that the language was ungentlemanly.

Mr. WALSH: He was prepared to show that he was not inconsistent, to wish the Government to postpone that Bill this evening. It was impossible, as the Premier knew, to pass the Bill that night. The honorable gentleman could have carried the second reading of the Bill at the commencement, as he could have commanded a majority, and he could have insisted upon his followers, at any rate, passing the second reading. It was downright hypocrisy of them to act as they were doing. They should unite to bring the Bill to a successful issue. He did not ask for a division to slaughter the Bill. It was a deliberate effort on the part of the Premier to slaughter this great effort of the session. The Government were traitors to the people of the country, and their supporters were as bad. Was it worth while to discuss the merits of a Bill, which could not be passed without a call of the House? Did

the Premier believe he would carry the second reading that night with the majority required by the constitution? If not, with what justice, and upon what grounds could he proceed with it a single moment that evening? Clearly, the honorable gentleman did not wish the Bill to become the law of the land, and never did wish it. The present course was sheer mockery. Although the Bill showed evidence of injustice towards the northern parts of the colony, he was prepared to vote for its second reading, so anxious was he to see additional representation of the country in the chamber. The census return of male adults gave about 1,200 male adults to each electorate or member. He found in South Brisbane there were 202 male adults who returned one member. In Wide Bay there were 5,368 male adults, and it also returned one member. If it returned members according to the standard of South Brisbane, Wide Bay should have twenty-six members in the House. That showed the gross injustice of the representation in the colony, and the necessity for an immediate Representation Bill, or an alteration of the electorates. In North Brisbane there were 2,443 male adults, of whom at least 1,500 were dependents upon the public purse. In that electorate there were three members, or one member to every 800 male adults. He took into consideration male adults only, because the privilege of sharing the governing power of the colony resided only in the males, women and children not being considered. The Premier smiled at this; but the honorable gentleman knew there were fewer male adults in his electorate than there were electors on the roll, as was the case with the electorate of his honorable colleague the member for South Brisbane. Certainly, the disproportion was not so great in Fortitude Valley; but still there was the same inconsistency. Adult male population was the only basis upon which they could make their calculation upon. That argument was fatal to the position of the Colonial Treasurer in that House.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: The electors were at Gympie when the census was taken.

Mr. WALSH: He should say they had no intention nor inducement to return again. The Colonial Treasurer pinned his faith upon adult male population.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: No.

Mr. WALSH: The Colonial Treasurer said no, because the male adults had gone to Gympie from South Brisbane, and so he had changed his opinion. The Colonial Treasurer and the Premier said that male adult population was not to be the basis. He would repeat for the edification of the House what was said when the Premier and Colonial Treasurer were hungry aspirants for office. On the 24th September, 1867, Mr. Stephens said—

“If the Government would keep their promise, and bring in a Census Bill, he thought a great advantage would be gained; but he did not con-

ceive it necessary to wait for that Bill, because the Government had it in their power to arrive approximately at the same result by means of the figures and returns in the Registrar-General's office; and he thought, if they took those figures, and the adult male population of each district, as a basis, it would be a very fair one; and he for one should be quite satisfied that the returns would be correct enough for all practical purposes.”

That was the honorable Treasurer, in 1867. It was an unpleasant subject.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he denied he ever used the words as quoted from “Hansard,” which was admittedly no authority.

Mr. WALSH: He would be bound that if they turned to the *Courier* they would find the Colonial Treasurer did make use of such language. He would make it his business to turn it up that evening. Such was the opinion of the honorable Treasurer, in 1867.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: No.

Mr. WALSH: He was sure that was his opinion. It was the spirit of the constitution, and whether it was the opinion of the honorable Treasurer or not, it ought to be his opinion, since the present constitution could not take into consideration any other system. He could draw from the census further arguments to show why the present Bill was unjust. He had, however, said sufficient to show that it would have to be altered in committee. His opposition to the Bill only went so far as to enable the Government to get enough members to enable them to carry it. If the Government persisted that evening in pressing the second reading to a division, it must be with an intention to throw out the Bill. He would take care that the world should know it.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said, he must confess he was not disappointed at the tone of the debate that night. But, he was quite sure that the real insincerity was not in his mind with respect to the measure. It was a very convenient way to say, “You are not sincere,” in order to cloak one's own insincerity and vacillation, or opposition to the measure. As it was, he had never been more favorably situated for passing this Bill than he was that night. There were twenty-four members present; but, the truth was let out by the honorable member for the Burnett, Mr. Haly, when that honorable member said he had taken the opportunity of having his supporters here, to pass the Bill. He had a list of the members in his hand, and there was only one supporter absent from this second reading. He had taken the very best opportunity he could of passing the Bill this session. Unless he was able to pass the Bill that night, he saw no prospect of doing so this session. He did not think it fair to charge him with insincerity. He had introduced the Bill last session, and had got it through its second reading, then. He stated to the House, during that session—and it was

well understood by them—that this and the other measures of last session should be brought before the House again this session, at the point which they then reached.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The Bill had passed its second reading, and if there had been any breach of faith in the matter, he was sorry to say—and he said it respectfully—the fault rested with the House, and not with him. He wanted it to pass this evening; and he affirmed that the insincerity was with the Opposition. He should press the question to a division, in order that it might be seen who were the opponents of the Bill, and who were not. Of course, if he could not pass it, he should have to try some other time. He did not expect to be able to pass it into law. It was altogether a mockery and a sham; and those honorable members who had professed such anxiety that the Bill should be brought forward, were none of them heartily desirous of passing it. He should abstain from laying bare the motives which guided certain sections of the House in connection with this subject; but, he repeated, there was no chance of this Bill becoming law; and it might be a serious question with him, whether before introducing such a measure again, he should take the sense of the House as to the expediency of abolishing the two-thirds clause. He hoped he was not overstepping the bounds of parliamentary language, in referring to the motion of the honorable member for Maryborough, when he said there was no greater sham on the paper. He would read it to the House. He liked a practical joke himself, and, perhaps, this was intended for one—

“That it is expedient to assist the Government in passing an Additional Representation Bill.”

So far, so good. Then it went on to say—

“And, therefore, that the Government be instructed to move for a call of this House.”

Why could not the honorable member do it himself, if he was so anxious to assist the Government?

Mr. WALSH said he could not tell the day the Government would introduce the motion, and it was then he wished the call to be made.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That was where the insincerity was. That was the humbugging part of it.

Mr. WALSH rose to order, and moved that the words be taken down.

The SPEAKER ruled that the word should not be used.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said he would withdraw the word, and hoped some honorable member would compile a volume of parliamentary expressions, as he was sure it would be of great assistance to the honorable member for Maryborough. The motion went on, “for such early day as they may deem it convenient to move the second reading of the Bill.” Now, what could possibly be a greater sham than to expect a Government who were

insincere to make it convenient to propose the second reading of the Bill? When would a Government who were insincere make it convenient? That was why he said the honorable member was insincere, and did not intend to give any assistance in passing the Bill. The second part of the motion, respecting the address to the Governor, might have arisen from ignorance; but the Governor had nothing to do with making calls of the House, and it was a motion which the House could not adopt. He contended that he had a right to complain of the manner in which the Bill had been treated, when the understanding was that the second reading would be merely formal, and that it should be passed into committee at once, and there it might be made a good practical measure. He repeated that there was no hope of passing the Bill; but he should, as he had before stated, press the motion to a division.

Mr. FRASER said it was evident from the tone of the House, that they were not likely to pass the second reading of the Bill that evening; and he could not see that the adjournment of the debate would be at all more likely to effect that object. He felt sure that those members who were absent would all vote against the Bill. It was hopeless, in his opinion, to attempt to pass such a measure in the face of the two-thirds clause, and he should advise the Ministry, if they were sincere, to take the initiative, and introduce a measure to do away with that clause. Some honorable members, and among others, the Secretary for Works, seemed to think that would be a dangerous course to pursue; but he maintained that any provision which hindered the passing of a liberal and progressive measure should be abolished, and the sooner the better. He was quite satisfied there would be no danger to the constitution, and that it would be a step in the right direction. With regard to the argument advanced by the honorable member for Burnett, he did not think the odium attached to the Parliament of the neighboring colony had any connection with this subject. It was quite possible that the electors of this colony might not send representatives of a desirable character to the House; and the same thing might occur here, even with the two-thirds clause in existence. The honorable member for West Moreton had treated the House to an explanation of the views of Sir James Mackintosh; and no one would call the opinion of that gentleman in question. But it must be remembered that politics was a progressive science; and although Sir James Mackintosh might have been a very advanced politician in his day, his views might be anything* but applicable to the present position of things. They had only to look back two or three years, to see the position then occupied by the present Premier of England—how far it was behind the position he now occupied. He (Mr. Fraser) did

not, therefore, pay the slightest attention to the fact that Sir James Mackintosh, in his time, recommended a different course. Of course, honorable members were always instructed when they listened to the Admirable Creighton, the member for West Moreton; and it was really marvellous to hear that honorable member unravel the secrets of the State, and to see the intelligence he brought to bear upon every topic. That honorable member was disposed to vote against the two-thirds clause, and also against the second reading of the Bill before the House; and he feared that those who were associated with the honorable member in his part of the colony, were disposed to agree with him, with one solitary exception. Of course he did not blame those honorable gentlemen, with the power they possessed in the House, for endeavoring to carry their own views into effect. He could very easily prove, by statistics, that, with the additional members proposed to be given to East Moreton, the representation of that district would not be equal to that enjoyed by West Moreton, on the basis of population. According to the census returns, there were 7,684 persons in West Moreton, represented by three members, or a population of 2,561 to each member; and allowing two additional members to East Moreton, and taking the population at 13,912, there would be 3,778 persons represented by each member. He remembered that on a former occasion, when this Bill was before the House, the opinion of the honorable member for Maryborough was that the basis of representation should be the adult population of the colony; and he must say it seemed very strange to him. His idea was that taxation and representation should run together; and if that were the case, there was a fallacy at the very foundation of that honorable member's position. The argument that the additional members would be a support to Brisbane, was a fallacy, because the influence of Brisbane on East Moreton elections was, in consequence of the increase of population, greatly diminished. He was not disposed to accuse the Government of insincerity; but he thought greater energy might have been shown in the matter, so as to assure honorable members that they were honest in bringing forward this measure. The honorable the Premier was quite right in leaving the onus of deciding this question with the House, and in pressing the question on the House, in order that a practical expression of opinion might be obtained. He should support the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. ARCHER said that as there did not appear to be the slightest chance of passing the Bill, it was scarcely worth while to discuss it. He would, however, point out that the electors of Ipswich and West Moreton, who were so well represented, were taking good care that no one else should be properly represented. He would particularly direct the attention of the

Government to one clause in the Bill. Of course he had other faults to find with it which he should point out if the Bill went into committee. The great defect appeared to him to be in the 5th clause, which stated that—

“Any person being a British subject who shall be the owner or part owner of a miner's claim on any gold field or who shall hold a business license or auriferous lease may claim in virtue thereof to have his name enrolled on the electoral roll of the district in which he may reside and upon due proof that he so owns a miner's claim or holds such lease or trading license and subject to the provisions of the Elections Act of 1867 the said person shall be duly qualified as an elector.”

Over and over again there had been discussions about class legislation, and he did not think the Government should introduce another class into the colony. Their object should be to do away with classes; and to allow every man who had a part share in a claim, to vote, was not the way to give representation to the gold fields. Miners should have their share in the representation, not because they were miners, but in virtue of other qualifications. Shoemakers and tailors might, with equal justice, have a special claim to vote on the strength of their trades. It would be very easy to get over this difficulty, because there was a motion for an Electoral Bill on the paper, and a clause giving the usual qualification to persons resident on the gold fields, could be introduced. He would only add a few words in reference to the observations which had fallen from the Premier. That honorable gentleman had accused honorable members on his (Mr. Archer's) side of the House, of insincerity, and of not being really anxious to pass the Bill before the House. For his part, he totally denied that charge. When the Bill was brought before the House on a former occasion, he had supported it strongly, and voted for it, and he was prepared to do so now; and he believed it would have passed if the Government had introduced it at an earlier period of the session, when there was a fuller House, and honorable members were asking for the Bill. He thought the fate of the Bill would be due to the lukewarm interest the Government had taken in it. He had been surprised to see the way it had been shifted backwards and forwards on the notice paper; and he thought it was rather strange on the part of the honorable Premier to charge members opposite him with insincerity, when he had allowed the time to slip away until there were not members enough in the House to deal with the question. He must protest against the stand which the West Moreton and Ipswich members had taken in opposition to this Bill; and he should support the motion, though he did not think there was any chance of the Bill being passed this session.

Mr. PALMER said he must reiterate the opinion he had expressed when the Bill

was first introduced—that it was never intended to pass. If the Government had been in earnest about it they would have brought it forward earlier in the session, and not left it to the last moment, when there was little more than a quorum of members to discuss it. He had too much respect for the Premier to think he could ever have agreed to pass it. The proposed addition of four members for the South against four for the North was a perfect absurdity. According to the census, there were 21,242 male adults in the North, represented in that House by eleven members, or, at the present time, by ten, against 18,102 persons in the southern districts, represented by double that number of members, and yet they were asked to give four additional members to the South, and only the same number to the North. That was altogether too much to expect. He had assisted the Government to amend and pass other measures; but then there had always been some basis upon which they could frame a suitable measure, and that was not the case with this Bill, in its present shape. Then there was not a majority of two-thirds of the House, and the Bill could not become law. The Colonial Treasurer, referring to the remarks of the honorable member for Maryborough, had refused to be bound by the reports in “Hansard.” Perhaps he would admit that the *Courier*, a paper in which his financial statement had been held back three days, in order that it might appear in correct form, was an authority. In that journal the honorable member was reported to have said, when speaking on this question—

“The Government had it in their power to make an approximation, and if they took the male adult population, they would obtain a sufficient approximation for all intents and purposes.”

He objected to this Additional Members Bill on account of the way in which the representation was apportioned, and he objected entirely to the fifth clause. It was class legislation, as had been well observed by the honorable member for Rockhampton, and it was not a clause which should be introduced in such a Bill. He quite agreed that the miners should have a voice in electing their representatives; but to allow them, as diggers, to return members to the Assembly, he most decidedly objected. It was a wrong principle altogether to give them the franchise upon a different footing from the rest of the community. The Premier had told the House he did not expect the Bill would pass; but he believed the honorable member was terribly afraid lest it should pass its second reading. He should vote against it for the reason he had given, and because he would not lend his aid to perpetrate a farce.

Mr. THOMPSON said he did not intend to speak on the principle of the Bill, but he wished to give his reasons for voting against it. He could assure the honorable member

for Rockhampton that he and other honorable members who agreed with him were anxious that the North should have additional representation; and he cordially agreed with the honorable member for Port Curtis that an undue share of representation had been given to the southern districts. The object was evidently to secure sufficient support to carry out the Brisbane and Ipswich Railway; that would account for the two additional members to East Moreton. He could see that railway peeping through the Bill, and that was why he should vote against it. He thoroughly believed that increased representation was necessary, and when he saw the question properly introduced and supported by men in whom he had confidence, he should support it also; but he thought the evils which would be certain to follow the passing of this Bill would be greater than those which would occur if things were left as they were, and he should, therefore, oppose the motion. There was another thing he wished to point out. It had been stated over and over again that the population of West Moreton was only 7,684; but it was a notorious fact that the last census was taken at a time when no correct estimate could be formed of the real population. He believed it was nearer 17,000 persons than 7,000, and the accession of population since the passing of the Land Act was something enormous.

Mr. MILES said that honorable members had been accused of having supported a measure similar to this, on a former occasion; but he could assure the House that the charge was one that did not apply to him, for, when the Bill which had been alluded to, was before the House, for a second reading, he not only did not support it, but declared that he would vote against it. He also found that, on that previous occasion, the honorable the present Secretary for Lands urged that there should be an additional member given to the Maranoa; but the honorable gentleman, now that he was a Minister, did not seem to think that it was necessary to give the Maranoa an additional member. He did not wish to take up the time of the House, nor did he think it was necessary he should, for his opinion was that the Government never intended to carry the measure through. The Bill was one that he could not support, and, therefore, he would vote against its being read a second time.

Mr. SANDEMAN said that, after so much had already been said in respect to the Bill, he would content himself with making but a few remarks upon it. Considering the importance of the subject involved, he thought the Government were to blame in not bringing the Bill forward at an earlier period of the session. It was not fair, he maintained, to the country not to bring this measure forward till many members had left, and others were about to leave. His objection to the Bill was chiefly because he did not see there was any principle in it. Was population the principle

on which it was based? If so, why should the district of East Moreton, with a male population of 7,486, have four members, while the district of Wide Bay, with a male population of 6,199, was to have only two representatives. It might be said that the population of the Wide Bay district was not a permanently resident population, such as that of East Moreton; but, be that as it might, the discrepancy in the matter of representation was very great. For the Northern Downs, the population was set down at 2,307, and for the Western Downs at 1,407; yet those two districts were to have the same number of members. He might be told that the cause of that was the town of Dalby was situated in Northern Downs; but, if so, why was the town of Dalby not to be provided with a representative of its own? Considering those and many other inconsistencies, if population was to be taken as the standard, the principle, he maintained, was utterly bad. The Bill proposed to give additional representation to some parts of the colony, on the score of population; but to other parts of the colony not now represented there was to be no representation given at all. Nothing whatever was to be done for the large and important districts of Gregory, Burke, and North and South Cook, and they were to be as much ignored as if they had no existence. Looking at the whole question, he did not see that he would be doing his duty as a member of the House, were he to agree to the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. JORDAN said he could not agree with those honorable members who maintained that the male adult population should be the only basis for a measure of this kind. Honorable members opposite had quoted the number of male adults in the several districts as being the population of those districts. Now that, he held, was a principle which it was too late in the day to lay down, even in this conservative colony. Let them take one or two of the squatting districts and see what was the number of adult males in those districts as compared with the total population. In the Mitchell district he found there were 618 males, but only 80 women and children; and in the Leichhardt 3,234 males, but only 820 women and children. Such was the state of the population in two of the principal pastoral districts of the colony; and such being the case, he was not surprised that honorable members on the opposite side of the House—who were afraid of progressive legislation, who were afraid of the development of popular theories—should object to population generally as the basis for such a measure, and should endeavor to limit the basis to the male population, because the effect of that would be to give to the squatting interest still greater power and influence than it even now possessed. Such a principle, he maintained, was a false and pernicious one, and was at variance with the principles acted on not only in Great Britain but also

in every British colony. The honorable member for Port Curtis suggested, tauntingly, that they should descend to the degradation of adopting the principle of universal suffrage. Now, he did not see, for his part, that there would be any degradation in that, at all. Indeed, he should rejoice to see the principle of universal suffrage adopted and carried out. That was the extent of reform which John Bright had always asked for in England; and a great advance in that respect had recently been made in England, as honorable members were well aware. He himself believed fully in population being the proper basis of representation, and especially the colony of Queensland, where, he maintained, the great interests of the colony had suffered by the limitation of the franchise. This limitation of the franchise had given to the gentlemen representing the pastoral districts a power that had been subversive of the highest interests of the colony. He believed the Government were sincere in bringing forward this Bill; and when he addressed the House on the amendment brought forward by the honorable member for Maryborough, he firmly believed that the Bill would be carried. It was only upon the division on that amendment taking place that he saw the Bill would not be carried. The honorable member for Maryborough had accused him of saying that his only consistency was his inconsistency. Now, he would assure the honorable member that he did not say so. What he said was that the honorable member for Maryborough was one of the most consistent members in the House, in always desiring to defer everything till to-morrow. Had not the honorable member done everything he could to prevent the Government carrying their measures through? And he would go further and say that they were indebted, to a great extent, to the opposition of the honorable member for Maryborough, for the Bill before the House having been so long put off. He hoped the proceedings that had taken place that night would convince the Government of the absolute necessity of the repeal of the two-thirds clause. He had never been in favor of that clause. It was, he believed, introduced by the old Tory party; and it would never be possible to get a Redistribution Bill passed till that clause was done away with. He felt confident that if the Ministry would bring forward that question on an early day next session, they would be able to carry it; and he would promise them his hearty support on the occasion. He would just like to add a word or two as to the population of East Moreton. He would not quote the number of males merely, but the total population. Well, the population of East Moreton was 13,912, and the district had only two members; while the population of West Moreton was only 7,684, yet for that district there were three members. But it was said that the population of the district had very greatly increased. But, that could not

be accepted as any justification of the discrepancy, inasmuch as the population of East Moreton had also greatly increased. But the discrepancy became more apparent when they included Ipswich with West Moreton. The population of West Moreton, including that of Ipswich, amounted to 12,705; and the number of representatives was six. Now, the population of North Brisbane, Fortitude Valley, and East Moreton, amounted to nearly double that of Ipswich and West Moreton; and yet the number of representatives was also six. He contended that there should be three additional members for East Moreton, in order that the district should be as largely represented as West Moreton. He also thought that two additional members should be given to Rockhampton. It had been said in the course of the debate, that the Ministry had received a sudden accession to their strength from the honorable members for North Brisbane, because of some arrangement to get the railway constructed from Ipswich to Brisbane. Now, the fact was, that the Ministry had not received any such accession of help, for during the whole of the last session and of this session, the members for North Brisbane had given the Ministry a consistent and persistent support. But, still, they had not been thick and thin supporters of the Ministry, for when the Government did not announce a sufficiently bold policy, the members for East Moreton and the members for North Brisbane opposed them; and that more strongly than any other honorable members had done during the whole session.

Mr. S. HODGSON said he did not wish to give a silent vote on this important measure. He very much regretted to hear the way in which the honorable member for Rockhampton, Mr. Archer, spoke of the honorable members for Ipswich and West Moreton, in saying that he believed they had made up their minds not to give any additional representation to any electorate in the colony. Now, he fully concurred in what was said by the honorable member for Ipswich, Mr. Thompson, when he said there was no ill-feeling towards the northern districts of the colony on the part of the members for Ipswich and West Moreton. On the contrary, they looked on the northern members as their natural allies; and if they were to pull along together, they would be able to check, in a great measure, the reckless extravagance of other members. Now, he objected to the Bill as throwing the political power of the colony mainly into the hands of Brisbane and Toowoomba. He considered that Brisbane and East Moreton were fully represented at the present time; for not only were those places represented by seven members, but there was also the fact that many of the members for other districts were citizens of Brisbane, and those gentlemen took as much interest in what concerned Brisbane as if they were members for the city. He thought the time

had hardly yet arrived for increased representation for any part of the colony. He believed that if they were to add to the number of members of the House, the result would be increased extravagance, because more power and influence would be brought to bear upon the Ministry in behalf of those districts to which additional members might be given. The honorable and learned member for the Burnett, Mr. Pring, stated that at the present time there were three interests in the House—the pastoral, the cotton bonus, and the railway interests. Now, he held that, if the number of members were increased, the number of interests would be increased. They would then have four or five interests, which would lead to more pressure on the Ministry, and consequently to more expenditure. He was opposed to population being taken as a basis for representation. He did not think it would operate fairly in this colony, in particular, because of the population being so scattered. Nor was it the principle that representation was based upon in England; otherwise, London, with its population of three millions, would return a larger number of members than the whole of Scotland.

Mr. GROOM said he would vote for the second reading of the Bill; and he was very much astonished that there was so much objection to it. It would be in the recollection of honorable members that a great many objections were raised to the Reform Bill, in England, when it was before the House of Commons for a second reading. Mr. D'Israeli admitted some of the objections, but urged that they could be amended in committee. Now, he was prepared to admit that there were some objections to this Bill, but they could all be amended in committee. It appeared to him, however, that there was a pre-determination on the part of a few honorable members not to allow the Bill to pass; but he was convinced of the earnestness of the Government in the matter, especially after the speech of the honorable the Premier. He was astonished by the statement made by the honorable member who last addressed the House, when he said that this Bill seemed to be mainly intended to increase the representation of Brisbane and Toowoomba. Now, it was intended by this Bill to increase the representation of this colony by eight additional members, four of whom were to be given to the northern districts, three to the southern districts, and one to the central district. He could not see how such a distribution as that could be regarded as increasing the political power of Brisbane and Toowoomba. Although it seemed to him essentially necessary that a Redistribution Bill should be passed, he did not see that it would be possible to do so this session. Whatever Bill might be afterwards brought in ought to be of a more general character; for it was unjust not to give representatives to those places that had risen into importance since the existing Act came into force, while additional

representation was given to those places where the population had increased. When the honorable member for Port Curtis was Colonial Secretary, the country went to the expense of £4,000 to enable the census to be taken, in order to provide a basis for a Redistribution Bill. Well, here the present Government had brought in a Redistribution Bill; and it was, on the face of it, a fair and equitable measure—and whatever objections there might be to it, they were such as could be remedied in committee. He believed that the opposition that was offered to the Bill was of a purely factious nature, and was not based on *bonâ fide* public grounds. Considering the preponderating influence exercised in the House by the honorable members for Ipswich and West Moreton, he thought it must be apparent to every other honorable member that until a counterpoise was provided, it would be impossible to do justice to the colony generally. He hoped the honorable the Premier would divide the House on the question, in order that the country might know who were the obstructionists of any reform measure.

Mr. WILLIAMS said that notwithstanding the remarks made by the honorable member for Toowoomba, with respect to the honorable member for Ipswich, Mr. S. Hodgson, he had no hesitation in saying that he fully indorsed what had been stated by that honorable member, on the subject before the House. He had no hesitation whatever in saying there was a compact between the Ministry and the members for the Downs, for the purpose of getting the Brisbane bridge built, and the railway made between Ipswich and Brisbane. Now, if the Ministry got this Bill passed, they would be able to pass a measure for the completion of the railway and the bridge; and hence the support they were receiving now from the members for the Downs. The honorable member for Toowoomba had also let it out that one of the purposes of this Bill was to swamp the influence of the West Moreton and Ipswich members in that House. If such were the case, it would, of course, be his duty to try and prevent that taking place as long as he could. Notwithstanding what might be said to the contrary, he could assure the House that he was most sincere, and not factious, in his opposition to the Bill before the House; and he would oppose it in every shape and form that the rules of the House permitted. The honorable member for Rockhampton said that the reason the Ipswich and West Moreton members opposed the Bill was because they did not wish to give additional representation to the North. Now, that was quite a mistake, for he (Mr. Williams) had told the honorable member for Maryborough that the reason he objected to the Bill was that it did not give enough new members to the North; and he would oppose it upon that ground alone, if there were no other. He would oppose the Bill, though he were to stand alone. Though

sitting on the Government side of the House, he was a perfectly independent member; and if there was a compact formed to swamp the district of which he was one of the representatives he would do all in his power to swamp the Government.

Dr. O'DOHERTY said he regretted very much that he had not been able to be in the House during the whole of this very important debate, yet he could not help rising, after the remarks that had been made by the last speaker. Anything more extraordinary than the remarks of the honorable member, in a representative Assembly, he had never heard. The honorable member stated that he was prepared to offer every opposition the forms of the House would allow him to exercise, in order to prevent any increase in the representation of the colony.

Mr. WILLIAMS rose to explain. He begged to inform the honorable member that he said nothing of the sort. What he said was, that he objected to the Bill because it did not give enough representation to the North.

Dr. O'DOHERTY: The honorable member had evidently forgotten the purport of his observations. The honorable member stated, in the most positive manner, that he would oppose any measure that would do away with the preponderating influence of himself and his brother representatives for Ipswich and West Moreton. Now, if that did not mean that he would oppose increased representation, there was no meaning in words.

Mr. THOMPSON rose to order. The honorable member for Ipswich, Mr. Williams, had denied having said so; and, therefore, it was not competent for the honorable member for North Brisbane to repeat his assertion.

The SPEAKER said that if the honorable member for Ipswich had denied making a certain statement, it was not in order for the honorable member for North Brisbane to reiterate that he had made a certain statement.

Dr. O'DOHERTY: He willingly admitted that the honorable member for Ipswich did not make the assertion in so many words, but the words used by the honorable member allowed but one inference—the inference which he had drawn. The honorable member stated that Ipswich and West Moreton at present exercised a certain influence in the House, and that he would have recourse to every form of the House, which it was competent for him to resort to, in order to prevent that influence being lessened. Now, it was against that declaration that he protested. He thought that independent members of the House would have no difficulty in agreeing with him in the opinion that the honorable members for West Moreton and Ipswich had exercised a very strong influence in that House during the present session. It appeared to him that those honorable members had virtually controlled the Government during this session; and now when they had

obtained all they could hope for from the Government—when they had obtained the cotton bonus—

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They have not got it, yet.

DR. O'DOHERTY: The honorable the Minister for Lands might say so, but virtually they had got it; and it was tolerably plain to him that the honorable members for Ipswich and West Moreton considered they had got it; for, if not, it was wholly inconceivable to him how they could now come forward and oppose the Government in the way they were doing. With regard to the Bill before the House, he must confess that he was in a complete fog about it. It seemed to him that the whole thing was a sham; and he must confess that he admired the Ministry for the ability and tact they had shown in bringing it forward at that particular time. He should not have admired the eloquent address of the honorable the Premier to his constituents, on this subject, so much as he did, if he had thought the Ministry would have acted, in respect to this measure, in the way they had done. Now, he must confess his belief that neither the honorable the Premier nor the Ministry, as a whole, had the slightest idea, when they brought in this Bill, that it would pass; and, if they were really in earnest in this matter, it appeared to him that it was quite possible, yet, for them to pass the measure—and that, too, during the present session. The Government now saw clearly who were their opponents. They saw they were entirely in the hands of the honorable members for Ipswich and West Moreton—and was that a position they could desire to continue in? Was it a position that a Ministry should submit to remain in—a position that placed them, on every occasion when important measures were brought before the House, under the control of the members for Ipswich and West Moreton? He thought it was not. Now, as one of the representatives of a constituency that asked for nothing under the Bill, he desired, for one, to see the principles of representative Government carried out; but he denied that that House, constituted as it was at present, carried out the principles of representative Government in Queensland; and he maintained that, till there was an increase of members, who would represent those new places that had sprung up, during the last few years, in the colony, representative Government here would continue to be a farce.

MR. FRANCIS said he agreed with the Bill so far as the preamble or title of it went, in stating that it was desirable to provide additional members for the Legislative Assembly. He thought, however, that it should only be a small number, because it seemed difficult to find candidates for some of the existing constituencies. It was possible the honorable the Premier might have thought the House would consent to the second reading of this Bill; but he was not at all clear upon the

point. However, he hardly thought the honorable gentleman was very sanguine in his anticipations; and he must have been satisfied that if the Bill passed a second reading it would be greatly altered before it passed its last stages. But giving him credit for the absence, in this instance, of that insincerity that was attributed to him, the honorable gentleman, he thought, must have considered that it would be a capital dodge to bring forward this Bill, at this particular time, to enable him to recover some of that popularity which by some of his late proceedings he had endangered, and, to some extent, lost. He was sure that the honorable gentleman's worthy friends in the Valley, to whom he made such great promises, were not quite so gullible as he might think they were.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that, in order to put the honorable member and the House right in this matter, he desired to state that he never made any promises of the nature that had been alleged, as he would yet be able to show.

MR. FRANCIS: He imagined that with the view of making things pleasant outside, the honorable gentleman made certain statements, which had been construed into promises. Now, it was not at all in a bad spirit the honorable gentleman did so; and he deserved a great deal of praise for his happy intention to make things straight, and to make it appear that the Ministry were heartily in favor of progressive legislation. But all through the present debate there had been running in his mind the idea that there must have been a third motive in the honorable gentleman's mind in bringing forward the Bill that night. He had observed that when any great potentate, such as the Sultan of Turkey, or the Viceroy of Egypt, visited England, it was the custom to have a review of the military. Now here they could not have a review, because they had no soldiers; but they might, in their humble way, devise an entertainment of some kind. Perhaps something in the way of a farce could be improvised for the occasion. Now, throughout the debate, it had run in his mind that such an idea was present in the fertile brain of the honorable and learned gentlemen, in originating this debate. He believed, for his own part, that there were several essential prerequisites to the passing of any honest rational measure of reform. The first of those was the abolition of the two-thirds clause; but he was not now to say one word in support of that opinion;—the next was that each electorate should be made a single one; and in the next place—and this was a very bold statement, and one that had been hinted at by the honorable member for North Brisbane, Mr. Fraser—that, to do away with the difficulty as to an adult male population basis, they should have a personal representation;—and he would support that. In the next place, in order to put it out of the power of the people of the Kennedy district, for example, to

say that they were unable to send a member to represent them, there should be payment of members, and he was prepared to support that. Now, he looked upon that as an essential prerequisite for any reform of that House, and he believed it would have a much more beneficial effect than honorable members were aware of. Besides, there must also be a determination to make registration a real thing. They also wanted a Ministry that would pledge itself to a measure of reform. If the question came to the vote, he would vote for the second reading of the Bill; and, in doing so, it would simply be in order to provide additional members to that branch of the Legislature.

The question was then put—That the Bill be read a second time; and the House divided as follows :—

Ayes, 15.	Noes, 10.
Mr. Lilley	Mr. Palmer
" Stephens	" Williams
" Taylor	" Thorn
" Macalister	" Haly
" A. Hodgson	" Sandeman
" Bell	" Thompson
" Jordan	" Royds
" Fraser	" S. Hodgson
Dr. O'Doherty	" Murphy
Mr. Edmondstone	" Miles.
" Groom	
" Forbes	
" Francis	
" Walsh	
" Archer.	

The SPEAKER, in announcing the division, said that as the majority did not amount to two-thirds of the whole House, as required by the Act, the second reading of the Bill was negatived.