

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 24 NOVEMBER 1870

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 24 November, 1870.

Ways and Means—Financial Statement.

WAYS AND MEANS—FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

The House went into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of Ways and Means.

Question :—

Spirits—Brandy, of any strength not exceeding the strength of proof by Sykes' Hydrometer, and so in proportion for any greater or less strength than the strength of proof, per gallon, twelve shillings.

Mr. BELL rose to move an amendment on the item before the committee; and he said his reason for doing so was that he disapproved of the principle of increasing the duty on brandy from ten to twelve shillings. He was inclined to think that it would prove not to be a successful change in the tariff; the increase being too great, it would be productive of a large amount of smuggling, the tendency of which would be to decrease the revenue hereafter. It might be in the recollection of some honorable members that in the year 1865, when he altered the duty on spirits from seven to ten shillings, a great fear was expressed that that increase would induce smuggling, and that it would not conduce to the collection of a large revenue under that head. He should be borne out by many persons, when he said that, whether that was a wise or an unwise change, the amount of smuggling and illicit distillation which had taken place since, was much to be regretted and deplored.

It was the opinion of some honorable members, and it was well known out of doors, that since the free circulation of colonial rum, a system of making up or working the new spirit into other kinds of liquors for drinking had become the practice in Queensland; indeed, brandy drinkers said that in most cases, outside of the large towns, they could detect the flavor of new rum in most of the drinks given to them. As this was the first item of the tariff, in giving his reasons for objecting to it, he might state to the Treasurer, and for the information of the committee, what his intentions were in regard to the items which followed. He preferred that the duty on brandy should remain as it was, and not be increased to twelve shillings; he should move that in the item of flour, "nil" should be substituted for the duty proposed; he had an objection to the smallness of the *ad valorem* duty, and to make up for the apprehended loss on brandy and flour, he should propose, at the proper time, to raise the *ad valorem* duty from $7\frac{1}{2}$ to 12 per cent. He was aware that, if duties, on the one hand, were taken off, on the other hand, reasonably, others should be substituted;—unless the committee wished to throw back the tariff on the hands of the Treasurer, and thus express their dissatisfaction with it. He thought it was not an unreasonable compromise, and he proposed it to the Treasurer, if the honorable gentleman still thought it was worth the trial to hold fast by the increased duty on brandy, that he should let the duty on flour go, and increase the *ad valorem* duty to 12 per cent. He formally moved—

That the amount "twelve shillings" be omitted and "ten shillings" substituted in lieu thereof.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he must oppose the amendment, which was evidently an attempt to alter the whole system of his tariff, which the Government meant to stand by. If a duty of twelve shillings on brandy would induce smuggling or illicit distillation, so would a duty of ten shillings. He believed there was very little of such manufacture taking place in the colony, for all that the honorable member for Northern Downshad stated. The fact of the matter was, that brandy was a spirit that was consumed by the wealthier classes in the colony, who would have the superior brands, irrespective of the increase of duty; and they could best afford to pay that duty. Inferior qualities would not be imported, perhaps, but the consumption of the superior case brandy would not be in any way interfered with, and it was a sure source of revenue, which would yield £10,000 or £11,000. If he should consent to the course proposed by the honorable member, the Government would lose, with the duty of £21,000 expected from flour, a sum of £32,000, which it was proposed to make up by increasing the *ad valorem* duties.

Mr. BELL explained that if the Government gave up the flour duty, he should be

satisfied to leave the duty on brandy; and his proposal was, that the loss on flour should be made up by increasing the *ad valorem* duties.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: He did not understand the honorable member so. The items of the tariff being put *seriatim*, they must be taken as they stood. The Government would stand by their duty on brandy, and would press the original motion.

Mr. MILES agreed with the Government tariff, with the exception of one or two items. Brandy was not one he objected to. He objected to a tax on flour and on machinery. However, they would talk about those when they came to them. He had great pleasure in supporting the Government for an increased duty on brandy.

Mr. EDMONDSTONE said it was with some regret that he had heard from the Treasurer that the Government were so determined to adhere to the terms of their tariff. He was in hopes that any amendment proposed to be made in the tariff could be gone into generally, even though only the first item was before the committee now. He was very much pleased to see that the bulk of the taxes were put upon what were considered luxuries. One honorable member proposed that the duty on brandy should be decreased; another suggested that it should be increased. Possibly, the increased duty might be a temptation to smuggling. In speaking of the tariff as a whole, it was not of a sufficiently protective character to please the inhabitants of Brisbane. There were points in which the want of that protection—

The CHAIRMAN called the honorable member to order. The honorable member for Brisbane must keep to the question.

Mr. BELL insisted, as for himself, that the honorable member was in order discussing the tariff.

Mr. ATKIN said he could not see how a review of the tariff was to be made unless an honorable member could refer to the relative bearing of the respective duties one upon the other.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he thought it desirable that honorable members should be allowed to debate the question as they liked. He believed it would be best to confine themselves to single items; but perhaps they liked still more to have their own way.

Mr. EDMONDSTONE: He did not trouble the House much, and a little indulgence was very acceptable. On many articles of the tariff the taxes might be increased with considerable advantage; and in other instances they might with equal advantage be allowed to come in free. All that competed with the farming population ought to be taxed, certainly, as much as possible. He agreed with the honorable member for East Moreton, Mr. Jordan, and the honorable member for Drayton and Toowoomba, to the full extent they went in respect to the protection of the farming interest. He asked that the Treas-

urer should impose a tax on salted fish, which was in the list of the late Treasurer. Persons in the Bay and elsewhere would have advantage from such a tax. The reduction of the duty on salt was objectionable, and especially so when the difference was put upon flour. Again, the duty on methylated spirits would operate against local manufacturers, which should be avoided; and if any duty could be substituted for it, he should be very glad. The restoration of the duty on salt would be sufficient to make up for any deficiency that might arise from taking it off. If methylated spirits must be taxed they ought to be classed with the oils, at sixpence a gallon. It had been proved that it was impossible to extract the methyl—by Mr. Mackay, before the House of Commons—so as to make the spirits convertible into drink. The methylated spirits imported were used principally for dissolving oils, for making varnishes, and the principal part was used by the druggists.

Mr. JOHNSTON said he could not consent to the arrangement advanced by the honorable member for Northern Downs, for reducing the duty on brandy. He had been a keen observer of all matters in the spirit trade for the last five years, since the duty was first raised here; and he had not heard of one instance of smuggling in brandy. He had heard of the illicit distillation of rum, certainly. The increased duty of twelve shillings a gallon on brandy would operate against, and be oppressive on, one class—the vendors of spirits by retail. The increased two shillings duty was not enough to justify them in raising the price of liquor from threepence to sixpence a drink, so they could not get it from the consumers. It was well known to most persons, especially to those engaged in the spirit trade, that the licensed inn-keepers were actually selling their spirits at a less price than they got them for by wholesale, in order to meet the requirements of the public; and they did it by reducing their spirits in a way that would not do generally for public-houses. By making the duty on brandy fifteen shillings a gallon, that class would be justified in advancing the price of drinks to double; and the extra five shillings a gallon would be a justification. Those persons who were in a position to get their case of brandy in their own homes would not be deterred from consumption by the high duty; those who would not pay it could fall back upon some commoner spirit. He moved that the item be increased to fifteen shillings.

The question was put, that the item be reduced, as proposed by Mr. Bell, and it was resolved in the negative, upon a division by 20 to 9 votes. The original amount was then put, and affirmed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said, in reference to the next item in his tariff, that he intended to make some modifications, the object of which was to enable the holders of gin to

realise on present stocks before the proposed increased duty came into operation. The same was done in this particular case when the alteration of the tariff came into force in Victoria. It had been represented to him that great injustice would be perpetrated, unless some provision was made; and, yesterday, he mentioned to the honorable member for Brisbane, Mr. Pring, that from what he had heard from honorable members and persons in the trade, he would do this. He would alter the second clause in the tariff to the effect that it should not have effect until the 28th February; that low proof spirits should only pay duty in proportion to strength—in the same way as had been done in Victoria. From the 1st March all spirits must pay the full duty. He formally moved the item as altered.

Question :—

Spirits or strong waters, excepting brandy, of any strength not exceeding the strength of proof by Sykes Hydrometer, and so in proportion for any greater or less strength than the strength of proof, until 28th February, 1871, inclusive, per gallon, ten shillings.

Mr. CRIBB said he was glad to find that the Government had followed the suggestion he made yesterday. He should support the Government.

Mr. BELL trusted, he said, that the holders of other spirits were equally in the favor of the Government with the holders of gin. He could not see why gin should be in favor. There might be something in it, but really he could not see it, and he should be very glad if the Treasurer would explain.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: He could not understand it at all, himself, till it had been explained to him. Almost all the gin which was now in bond was very much under-proof. It had been sent up from the other colonies, where the same alteration had taken place as was here proposed to be made. When the alteration in the tariff of Victoria took place, immediately all the under-proof spirits were shipped off to New South Wales and this colony, and they were immediately replaced by proof spirits. There was no place, now, for the holders of such spirits to send their stock to; and if it had to compete with strong spirits, of proof, holders would have to sell at a great reduction, or their low spirits might not be saleable in the market. The time conceded would allow them to move off their stock.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked if the Colonial Treasurer included whisky and rum in the item moved?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON: On behalf of the spirit trade, he desired to draw attention to one or two matters. He questioned whether it was politic to circumscribe the time in any way. The duty could be collected on under-proof gin, whisky, and rum, as easily and as correctly as on proof spirits. It was convenient to the trade to be able to put a case of gin

on the market at a price to meet the requirements of the people; and he did not see why the trade should be prevented from doing so. The revenue could not lose by the importation of low proof spirits, and there was a market for the article. Leave the question an open one between the people and the merchants, and withdraw the limitation. The whole of the low proof spirits in bond could not be moved off in the time specified, and those persons who might have to rush their stocks out of their hands might still be involved in a ruinous loss. He moved—

That the words "until the 28th February, 1871, inclusive," be omitted.

Question :—

That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the question.

Mr. STEPHENS said, he was unable to see what was the object of the alteration made by the Treasurer; distinctly it was not the best way of putting an end to the difficulty which the honorable gentleman saw. He would get an enlarged revenue if he left the item without alteration; and honorable members all knew that proof spirits would be imported for the future; for it was simply telling the importers that they should not import weak spirits—that they must import proof spirits, and water them themselves, here. The alteration proposed would bring no additional revenue, and it was an interference with trade. Let the consumers and the dealers settle the matter amongst themselves. He considered spirit drinkers fair subjects for taxation.

The COLONIAL TREASURER observed that his sole object in making the change was, that he imagined it would increase the revenue. It was extremely successful in Victoria; so much so, that he understood Mr. Samuel proposed to introduce it himself in New South Wales. The Government calculated on a considerable accession of revenue from it.

An HONORABLE MEMBER: How much?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: They could not tell.

Mr. STEPHENS: There was an irreconcilable difference between that reason and what the Colonial Treasurer had said before.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Of course, it would be no gain to the revenue if the whole of the under proof spirits were taken away and proof spirits substituted in the bonded stores.

Mr. BELL considered it would be better for the Treasurer to avoid involving his tariff with the mysteries of trade. It was not clear to the House what injustice would be done by collecting the duty forthwith, as originally proposed in the new tariff. It would be a very difficult question for the consumer to know whether or not it was proof gin that would be delivered to him by the dealer, who was to benefit by the alteration.

Mr. JOHNSTON was anxious that his amendment should be carried, because, he said,

indents had left the colony for large quantities of underproof spirits, and when they arrived—as they could not, within the time specified—the holders of those stocks would be even greater sufferers than the holders at the present time. The House were providing by taxation simply for present emergencies; it would be well to have as few complications as possible. They had had no intimation that the Government intended to take a course that would restrict trade.

Mr. CRIBB spoke in support of the course taken by the Government as having a tendency to give consumers a pure article, instead of spirits as low as twenty-two to twenty-five degrees below proof. There would be no inducement to the trade to import an inferior article.

Mr. STEPHENS could see no force in the argument of the honorable member. The importer would procure a good article, and he could water the spirits himself here, instead of having it done by the manufacturer at home. There would be no additional proof, or guarantee, that the consumer would get a better article than now.

Mr. CRIBB pointed out that there would be trouble and expense in the way of the local trader interfering with the spirits, and that it would not pay him to do so.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY argued that the House should support the fair trader. The public would have the benefit of it. Even if the item were passed, he believed a great deal of the low gin manufactured in Germany would be imported, and the revenue would get the benefit of it.

Mr. JOHNSTON pointed out that simple changes in the size of the cases, and the importation of spirits in bulk, would enable the unprincipled trader to gain any advantage he now gained over his customers, while the fair trader would have no additional guarantee from the system proposed. The best way to encourage trade was to leave it without restrictions, or with as few as possible.

The question was put, and the amendment was negatived, on a division, by a majority of 15 to 13.

The motion of the Colonial Treasurer was then put and passed.

Question :—

That the duty upon spirits, cordials, or strong waters, sweetened or mixed with any article so that the strength thereof cannot be exactly ascertained by Sykes' Hydrometer, be ten shillings per gallon.

Agreed to.

Question :—

That the duty upon methylated spirits be five shillings per liquid gallon.

Mr. O'DOHERTY moved as an amendment that the duty be reduced to sixpence per gallon. He thought it would fall very heavily upon a particular class of persons. This kind of spirit could not be used in the same way as ordinary spirits; it was required chiefly by cabinet-makers for mixing with their

varnish for polishing furniture, and the imposition of a duty of five shillings per gallon would put a stop to that industry, while it would add very little to the revenue.

Mr. JORDAN seconded the amendment. Methylated spirits were mixed with some other spirit so as to make them unfit for purposes of drinking.

Mr. THORN opposed the alteration on the ground that if this kind of spirit were made free of duty, it would be extensively used by publicans and others in the interior. Instead of five shillings he should like to see the duty ten shillings per gallon.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the methylated spirits imported into the colony were of very inferior quality, and he proposed to have them made here, under the supervision of the Government. If the expense were not too great he would not object to reduce the duty on the home-made article. If honorable members would allow the item to stand as it was, he would reduce the other to sixpence per gallon.

Dr. O'DOHERTY with that understanding would withdraw his motion. Amendment by leave withdrawn and original question agreed to.

Question :—

That the duty on wine containing more than 25 per cent. of alcohol of a specific gravity of .825 at the temperature of 60 degrees of Fahrenheit's Thermometer, for every gallon in proportion to strength be ten shillings per gallon.

Agreed to.

Question :—

That the duty on wine not containing more than 25 per cent. of alcohol of a specific gravity of .825 at the temperature of 60 degrees of Fahrenheit's Thermometer be six shillings per gallon.

Mr. ROYDS moved that the duty be reduced to three shillings per gallon. He thought it was not desirable to place such a heavy tax upon light wines. Some greater distinction should be made between these and the stronger class of wines.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he was sorry to be obliged to oppose the honorable member. This was simply a question of revenue, and the Government would gain about £6,000 by the increase of duty; and he did not think they would be justified in acceding to the proposed reduction, unless some very strong reasons were given for it.

Mr. SCOTT said he thought that as the duty upon spirits had been increased, it would only be fair to give the people of the colony some wholesome drink instead. Large quantities of inferior spirits were consumed in the bush, which was not the case when colonial wines were generally drunk. The duty upon these wines was much lower in the other colonies, where they made a good deal of wine, than in Queensland, and he could not see why this colony should be placed in a worse position than they were, especially as it was not at present a wine producing colony. He believed that if the

duty were reduced the consumption would be proportionately increased, and no loss would accrue to the revenue. He, therefore, begged to move—

That the import duty upon all wines, containing less than fifteen per cent. of alcohol, be three shillings per gallon.

Mr. MILES said the object of the tariff was to meet a deficit in the revenue, and he could not understand those honorable members who proposed to reduce the duty upon these unimportant articles. When the poor man's bread was to be taxed, light wines ought not to be exempted from duty. He hoped the Government would not consent to the reduction.

Mr. ATKIN: As no distinction could be made in reference to colonial wines he should oppose the reduction. The consumption of these wines was chiefly confined to the wealthier classes, who could afford to pay for them. Therefore, not to deprive the revenue of the assistance which this duty would afford, he should vote for the item as it stood.

Mr. THORN supported the original motion. A good deal of wine was being produced in the colony, and this duty would give some encouragement to producers.

Mr. STEPHENS said the question really afforded no room for discussion. A tax was to be levied on flour, and now it was actually proposed to take off the duty on light wines, which were unquestionably a luxury. The thing was an absurdity.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The only point to discuss was whether colonial wines could be brought into more general use, and that was found to be impossible. Before these wines could be let in duty free there must be some federal union between the colonies. In New Zealand they had got over the difficulty by a side wind, but he did not propose to follow the course which had been adopted there. He would rather see the duty increased, as he believed it would induce the importation of a better class of wines. The Government could not see their way to consent to any reduction on this item—at present the revenue derived no benefit whatever from this import.

Mr. MacDEVITT regretted that no means could be adopted to classify the different wines introduced into the colony. The honorable Premier had stated that the revenue at present was not benefitted by the duty on colonial wines, but, if by a reduction of duty, they could be made an article of general consumption, it would perhaps be different, and a great benefit would be conferred on the people of the colony. The New Zealand Government had encouraged the use of these wines, by giving a bonus to importers—and if some such means were employed here to place them within the reach of the colonists generally, he believed the demand would increase so much that the revenue would derive considerable benefit. It appeared to be the opinion of every honor-

able member, except the honorable member for Maranoa, that it would be wise to reduce the duty. He would therefore suggest that the tariff should remain at six shillings per gallon, and that a bonus should be given to importers so as to reduce the duty to say two shillings per gallon.

Mr. CRIBB said that each speaker had referred to this class of wines as being used by the upper classes only. His experience of the wine trade in this colony proved to him that when the duty was three shillings per gallon three-fourths of the colonial wine imported was consumed by the working classes. Now these persons drank very little of it, they all used ardent spirits, which had a very injurious effect upon them. Working men were obliged in this climate to drink something besides water, and he thought it would be very desirable, by reducing the duty, to encourage the general use of light wines. If the duty were reduced to three shillings, the increased consumption would make up for at least half the estimated revenue from the higher rate—say £3,000, so that there would not be much lost. He felt strongly on this subject, because he had seen so much drunkenness arising from the use of ardent spirits. Colonial wine, he repeated, was used chiefly by the working men, and not by the upper classes. For his part, he preferred it to imported wine. He had not made up his mind how he should vote, but he should be glad if the Government would reduce the duty to three shillings.

Mr. BELL: Honorable members were generally of opinion that the reduced duty would operate favorably, but the question for the House to consider was a question of revenue, and if flour was going to be taxed, wine could not be exempted from duty.

Dr. O'DOHERTY would have been much pleased if he could have seen his way to support a reduction of the duty upon these wines, but he was obliged to view the question as it affected the public revenue, which was the chief consideration. Otherwise, there could be no doubt that the introduction of light wines for general use was a matter of vital importance to the colony. He had, perhaps, had more opportunities than most honorable members of observing the deplorable results arising from the wholesale use of ardent spirits of all kinds in this colony, and he had no hesitation in saying that a very large proportion of the crime and suffering which existed could be traced to that cause. The honorable member at the head of the Government had stated that the revenue derived from colonial wines, at present, was little or nothing; therefore, the proposed tax would have the effect of prohibiting their importation. There would be a difficulty, of course, in bringing these wines into general use, but the honorable member for Kennedy had suggested a mode of doing so; and he did think it was a matter of vital importance to the public health that some effort should

be made to encourage their importation, so that they might take the place of ardent spirits. If colonial and continental light wines could be introduced at a low rate, he felt convinced that a large revenue would soon accrue from that source.

Mr. BELL suggested that the difficulty might be met by some member bringing the question forward in a separate form at some future time, when he had no doubt, from the unanimity of opinion which seemed to prevail, the proposition to reduce the duty would be favorably entertained. In the meantime, the item might be passed for the present.

Both amendments having been withdrawn in acceptance of this suggestion, the original motion was put and passed.

Question :—

That the duty on ale, beer, porter, cider, perry, and vinegar be sixpence per gallon.

Mr. THORN moved, as an amendment, the addition of the words "in wood."

The question was put, and the amendment carried on division. Ayes, 16; Noes, 11.

On the question being put in its amended form,

Mr. GROOM moved that the word "sixpence" be omitted, and the word "ninepence" inserted in its place.

Mr. ATKIN seconded the amendment. He thought this was a very fair article upon which to raise revenue; and as it was extremely probable that some of the items lower down in the list would be reduced, it would be well if the Colonial Treasurer could see his way to accept this increase.

Mr. CRIBB thought it was very unfair to increase the duty upon vinegar, which was quite high enough as it was. The object of the honorable member for Drayton and Toowoomba, in moving the amendment, was no doubt to protect the beer made in the colony. But the honorable member did not think vinegar was made in the colony. He thought sixpence duty was quite enough for either of them. It was not certain that colonial beer would keep during the hot season; and by putting on a high duty on imported goods they would be shutting out English beer from the market altogether. The duty, in fact, would become a protective duty; and he should oppose it on that score. The colony was not in a position to impose protective duties. The Americans had tried them, but they found they did not answer, and they were now reducing their duties rapidly. He objected to the exclusion of English ale. Many persons retained their English taste, and preferred it to the colonial article. The colonial beer was good, but he liked the other better. He had heard no reasons advanced which induced him to support the proposal to increase the duty to ninepence, and he should therefore oppose the amendment.

Mr. MILES said he would give the honorable member a reason. Lower down there was a duty on flour, which might be struck

off the list. He wished to take off the tax from the staff of life, and put it upon luxuries.

Mr. STEPHENS: The honorable member had himself given a very good reason when he said that colonial beer was good, but English beer was better. The latter was, therefore, a luxury, and should be taxed accordingly.

Mr. WALSH could not allow it to be said that beer was a luxury, for to some constitutions it was a necessity. He had never yet heard of a tax put upon the poor man's beer. In the old country, they always resisted every attempt to rob a poor man of his beer. He objected to the tax, because he believed it would injure the revenue for the benefit of a few persons about Toowoomba and Brisbane. There were numbers of persons living in the northern districts—in Rockhampton, Cardwell, Maryborough, and other places—persons to whom beer was a necessity, and the beer produced at Toowoomba and elsewhere could not be sent to those places. In fact, nine-tenths of the population of the colony never tasted it. Many of them had never heard of Toowoomba beer, and it would be an injustice to them to put a heavy duty upon imported beer to protect two or three persons only.

Mr. HALY said he could give a most disinterested opinion in favour of the motion before the House, for he believed he had never drunk a gallon of beer in his life. But while he said so, he would further state to the House that ale was the only beverage he allowed to be brought upon his station, and it was in some cases necessary to persons recovering from sickness. He would like very much that colonial wine could be introduced at a low rate of duty, or even duty free; for he believed, especially after what had been stated by the honorable member for North Brisbane, Dr. O'Doherty, on the subject, that light wines, which could be sold cheaply, would be better for the working classes than beer. For his part, he would never allow grog to be brought on his station, for it was impossible to say in what way the effects of it would end. However, he would oppose the tax upon beer because he considered it was a tax that would fall especially on working men, who required the refreshment afforded by a glass of beer.

Mr. ATKIN said he would support the amendment, and observed that when the duty on beer was previously increased from three pence to sixpence a gallon there was no protest made by the honorable member for the Burnett, Mr. Haly, against the increase. Now, there was a necessity to obtain a certain amount of revenue, and he would rather see the required increase derived from articles which might be deemed luxuries than from flour and other articles which constituted the necessities of life.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS said he believed that the opposition to the pro-

posed tax on beer was for the purpose of benefitting the few at the expense of the many. Colonial wine, by the increase of the duty upon it, had been shut out from the colony, and the same would be the case with beer, if the proposed duty should be agreed to. The object of the amendment was to encourage certain industries in the South—in Brisbane and Toowoomba, for instance—but it would operate most unjustly on other parts of the colony. The tax on flour was absolutely necessary. It was neither more nor less than a tax occasioned by the expenditure for the construction of railways in the South. It was, therefore, he might say, altogether a railway tax.

Mr. MILES said he would support the proposed increase. It was so slight that it could scarcely be felt. In the up-country districts, the people paid four shillings a bottle for beer; and he thought that those who could afford to pay that much could well afford to pay sixpence a gallon additional. He would certainly much sooner see an additional tax placed upon beer than that there should be a tax placed upon flour.

The Hon. R. PRING said that on this occasion, he would vote in favor of the amendment, though he should be sorry to rob any poor man of his beer. He could not agree with the views expressed by the honorable member for the Burnett, Mr. Haly, or by the honorable the Minister for Works, for he considered that it would be a greater severity to place a tax on the consumers of flour than upon those who thought they could not live without beer. The honorable member for the Burnett had limited his observations to the case of his own station; and the whole question seemed to that honorable member to be, whether people on his station should have a certain amount of beer when recovering from sickness. Now, a man recovering from sickness could not, if beer was a necessity, be much hurt by the additional cost of sixpence a gallon; but it would be a very hard thing, indeed, that the community, generally, should, at all times, have to pay an addition price for their daily bread. Now, he would vote for the amendment, because he was opposed to a tax upon flour. If they imposed duties for revenue purposes, let them impose those duties in a way that would incidentally promote native industries. If, by the imposition of taxation, they could encourage native industries, so much the better. He would, willingly, for revenue purposes, in the first instance, support an increased duty on butter, hams, and cheese, because those were, in a certain sense, articles of luxury, and not absolute necessities of life, but flour was; and, besides, a tax on those articles would encourage the promotion of agricultural industry, and would induce agriculturists to come to the colony and remain in it. If they were to negative the tax upon flour, they must agree to this increased tax on beer, in order to enable the

honorable the Treasurer to make up the amount of revenue necessary to meet the estimated expenditure.

Mr. HALY thought that if the honorable and learned member for North Brisbane had been present when his honorable colleague, Dr. O'Doherty, addressed the House on the subject, he would have expressed himself differently from what he had done. He believed that if light colonial wines could be introduced into the colony free of duty, a great benefit would be conferred upon the community.

The Hon. R. PRING said he should be very glad indeed to see colonial wines introduced into the colony at a nominal duty, or altogether free of duty; but that could not be done. There could not be a differential duty as between colonial wines and wines imported from Europe. If both Houses of Parliament agreed to pass a measure making any difference whatever, the Governor could not, according to Imperial instructions, assent to it. He must say that he very much doubted if the tax on wines increased the revenue to any great extent. He would like to know what course the Ministry would take respecting the motion and amendment now before the House.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that the amendment proposed by the honorable member for Drayton and Toowoomba was that the duty on ale and beer, porter, &c., should be raised from sixpence to ninepence per gallon. Well, the honorable the Treasurer had said that he would have no objection to accept the increased duty; but if, when the question was put to the House, a division was called for, the Ministry would vote for their own proposition.

The amendment was then put, and carried without division.

Mr. THORN proposed—

That upon ale, beer, porter, cider, perry, and vinegar, in bottle, there should be imposed for six reputed quart bottles one shilling, and for twelve reputed pint bottles one shilling.

The motion was put and passed.

The following duties were then agreed to without discussion:—Tobacco and snuff, 2s. 6d. per lb.; cigars, 5s. per lb.; opium, 20s. per lb.; and coffee, roasted, and tea, 6d. per lb.

The COLONIAL TREASURER next proposed—

That coffee (raw), chicory, cocoa, and chocolate be subject to a duty of fourpence per lb.

Mr. CRIBB pointed out that there was a difference between the duty on raw coffee and roasted coffee, and he thought, therefore, that there should also be some distinction made between raw and prepared cocoa.

The COLONIAL TREASURER concurred in the suggestion, and the question was put and passed—the duty of 4d. per lb. on cocoa being confined to prepared cocoa.

The COLONIAL TREASURER next proposed—

That the duty on raw cocoa be twopence per lb.

The motion was agreed to.

The propositions that the duties on refined sugars, per cwt., be 6s. 8d.; on raw sugars, 5s. per cwt.; and on molasses, 3s. 4d. per cwt., were agreed to without discussion.

The COLONIAL TREASURER next proposed—

That upon rice, oatmeal, and maize meal, there be imposed a duty of forty shillings per ton.

Mr. FYFE opposed this item, as he considered that it was especially a tax on the necessities of life. He thought there were many other things on which a tax that would yield as much to the revenue might be imposed. Now, a tax upon the necessities of life ought only to be adopted as a *dernier ressort* by the Government, when pressed for revenue—and a tax on the necessities of life should not be resorted to except for revenue purposes. They might tax luxuries as much as they liked, but they ought not to increase the cost of the necessities of life to the working man.

Mr. STEPHENS said he would support the proposed duty on the three items mentioned. They were at present considering the best way of raising a revenue to meet their necessary expenditure. Now, as to the article of rice, it had been subject, for several years past, to the same amount of duty as was now proposed. As to the duty proposed to be placed on oatmeal and on maize meal, the additional amount of taxation, if there was any addition, must be very slight. The duty on the three articles mentioned would only produce about the same amount as had been derived from them hitherto.

Mr. BELL said he agreed with the views that had been expressed by the honorable member for Rockhampton, Mr. Fyfe, upon this item. He considered that rice was as much a necessary of life as tea, coffee, or flour. It was an article which he believed could not be grown in the colony, and therefore, as he thought, it should be exempted from the list of dutiable articles.

Mr. McILWRAITH said he would like to point out to honorable members who opposed the duty on rice, that it was only by such a duty the Chinese portion of the population of the colony could be made to contribute to the revenue of the colony.

The motion, as originally proposed, was then agreed to.

The COLONIAL TREASURER next proposed—

That the duty on salt should be twenty shillings per ton.

Mr. ATKIN opposed the motion. He said he could not understand why the duty on salt should be reduced from 40s. to 20s. per ton. It was well known that for several

years past the duty on salt had been 40s. a ton, and he did not see why it should be reduced, when it was intended to increase the duty on flour. He would therefore move, by way of amendment—

That the duty on salt remain at forty shillings per ton.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that the reason why the Ministry proposed a reduction of the duty on salt was, that they considered salt to be more highly taxed in proportion to its value than any other article included in the tariff. In considering the question of reduction, the House should also bear in mind that large quantities of salt would be required for the preservation of meat for exportation, and upon which there could be no drawback granted, inasmuch as the quantity of salt used for such purposes could not be fairly estimated. If, however, the House was determined to increase the duty on salt beyond the amount proposed, the Government would not object to it, as their only purpose was to obtain revenue sufficient to meet the expenditure necessary for the government of the colony.

Mr. MILES said he would like to know if rock salt was to be included in this item. Rock salt was an absolute necessity on stations for the preservation of cattle and sheep in a healthy condition. He therefore thought that it should be included in the list of exemptions; for he considered that it would be monstrous to put a heavy duty on that which was necessary for the preservation of the health of sheep and cattle, which formed the principal article of the food of the people in the colony.

Mr. HALY said he could fully corroborate what had fallen from the honorable member for the Maranoa in saying that on some stations salt was absolutely necessary for the preservation of stock. In consequence of the high duty now placed upon salt, the squatters were very careful of their salt; but he was sure that if the duty were reduced there would be about double the quantity used that was at present used.

Mr. McILWRAITH said that he believed as much salt would shortly be produced in the colony as would be required for cattle or the preservation of meat for exportation; and, he thought, it would be a great injury to those who had embarked their capital in the establishment of salt works if the Legislature were to reduce the duty on salt at the present time.

The original motion was then put and negatived on division by a majority of 18 to 12.

The amendment that the duty on salt stand at forty shillings per ton, was then put and carried without division.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved the next item on the tariff, as follows :—

Question :—

Butter, cheese, bacon, hams, and hops, per lb., twopence.

Mr. GROOM: As he thought the Government could make up their minds to lose one item from which they expected to raise £21,000, in this view he believed it right to make up the difference in another form. The sum of £18,122 in cash was sent out of this colony, last year, for butter alone. The Government expected to raise £3,180 on that article; and he proposed to double the tax, and thus to give them £6,000. The reasons which induced him to make this motion were clear upon the face of it; and he wished to throw the colony upon its own resources. He moved—

That "fourpence" be substituted for "twopence," in respect of the item of butter.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he could not at all allow that the Government must lose the duty on flour; and they would rather lose the expected revenue altogether than have it made up in the way proposed. He adhered to the item.

On the suggestion of Mr. STEPHENS, the item of "butter" was put separately, the other items being withdrawn meanwhile.

Mr. THORN suggested that the honorable member for Drayton and Toowoomba should move for 3d. a pound; 4d. might prove a prohibition.

Mr. GROOM said the article could be produced in the colony; there was a surplus, but there was no market for it.

Mr. JORDAN: Owing to the import of an article called butter from the South, the price was not sufficiently high to make the business of the dairy profitable here. He was not afraid to acknowledge that he supported the amendment on the ground of protection.

Mr. WALSH said that when he was in Sydney, last March, he saw good butter at 5d. a pound; and, when he left Brisbane, it was 1s. 3d. a pound. That shewed this colony was not able to supply itself with butter. The poor people in the neighborhood of large towns would feel the increased duty.

Mr. KING observed that the whole of the items were very largely used by the mining population in the North, who were quite sufficiently taxed.

Mr. FYFE characterised the amendment as letting in the thin end of the wedge of protection with a vengeance. He joined the honorable member for Wide Bay in protesting against fresh taxation upon articles which were to be sent into the interior or to the distant districts for consumption. The tariff was for revenue purposes, and a great many questions had been discussed; but he protested against protection, and against taxing the necessities of life, for the sake of Toowoomba ale and the constituents of the honorable member who moved the amendment.

The Hon. R. PRING supported the amendment, under the impression that it would be beneficial for the country. It would not have the effect that honorable members representing mining interests anticipated. The effect of the amendment would be that dairy farms would spring up around Gympie, and the other diggings, and the miners would get good fresh butter instead of the rank, salt stuff, now offered to them, ticketed "Woollongong." He assured the honorable member for Rockhampton that the thin end of the wedge of protection had been introduced before the House saw him.

Mr. CRIBB said, butter could not be produced here all the year round, and that the colony must rely for it on the South. When it could be produced good, however, it fetched more money than the best Woollongong; and no protection was required.

Dr. O'DOHERTY: He saw a good deal in the argument of Mr. Cribb; and, if butter could not be produced here in the summer, the high duty upon the imported article would prove a serious drawback, he feared, upon the comfort of the people. No doubt the higher duty would be an enormous aid to the struggling farmers who were opening up the land, and who would thus be enabled to keep a little dairy. The complaint, at present, was that they could not compete with the imported Woollongong. This was one of the strongest arguments for opening up the country by improving inland communication.

Mr. ATKIN asserted that butter was made in the Brisbane district, all the year round; and he referred the honorable member for Rockhampton to the West-End Dairy, to prove that in his district it could be supplied at all seasons.

Mr. FYFE spoke to the general question of protection, and condemned its selfishness, as exemplified in the proceedings of the farmers of Bellerine, and Barrabool Hills, in Victoria, of which he had been a witness. There had been a squatting ascendancy in the Queensland Legislature heretofore, and now the country was threatened with an agricultural ascendancy.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it would be better for honorable members to look at the question as one between free trade and protection;—the latter was now advanced to suit localities, not the whole colony, and it was brought in because honorable members who were ostensibly free-traders voted for such increased duties as that proposed in the amendment.

Mr. MACDEVITT: What was the duty on flour but a protective duty?—yet he was aware that the Treasurer disclaimed any attempt at protection. The debate on the tariff brought out many things which it was good for the House to hear. It was refreshing to hear honorable members for Ipswich and West Moreton ask why the

northern miners should be taxed for the protection of the farmers, and renounce any advantage from it for their constituents. The honorable member for Brisbane, Dr. O'Doherty, said, with the honorable member for Ipswich, Mr. Cribb, that butter could not be manufactured here, all the year round. If it could be, another authority said that there could not be enough produced in all Moreton and the other agricultural districts to supply the North. If that were so, what became of the duty, from the protectionist point of view?

Mr. McILWRAITH said, as the question of free-trade and protection had been opened up, they might as well have enough of it. The honorable member for Rockhampton had left Victoria much too soon to have come to a proper, or rational and sound, conclusion on the progress and results of protection in Victoria. If he had remained there longer, he (Mr. McIlwraith) was satisfied, from the intelligent reasoning of the honorable member on other matters, that he would have come to the same conclusions as himself. It was a remarkable fact that, in Victoria, the men who directly and immediately paid for protection, rather than those who benefitted directly by it, were the protectionists. Protection never became lively in the colony before the digging population actually took it up, and became the most thorough-going protectionists;—and they were not the people immediately benefitted by it. And, in the general election, every mining constituency returned a protectionist representative to Parliament. Protection was not, as the Premier said, illiberalism. The colony could not have protection and revenue at the same time, as the honorable member for Ipswich, Mr. Cribb, and others, seemed to think; but a tariff might prove extravagantly expensive or ruinous to a country. The Government should have made a downright protest against anything with a tendency to protection, even in regard to sugar, if they were sincere in their professions of free trade.

Mr. STEPHENS said, if butter could be produced in the colony, in the winter, to meet requirements, the duty would be a protection to the farmer; if it could not be produced in the summer, the duty would yield revenue; and the result would be that the Government would get a return. The question was only one of degree.

The question was put, and the amendment was affirmed, on a division, by 15 to 14 votes.

Question :—

That the duty on cheese, bacon, hams, and hops, be two-pence per lb.

Mr. GROOM moved as an amendment, that the duty on these articles be increased to 4d. per lb.

Mr. JOHNSTON supported the original motion. Bacon was an article of import which added very little to the revenue, and an additional duty of 2d. per lb. would scarcely be worth levying. Cheese was also an article which the best dairymen in the colony had been unable to bring to anything like perfection, and it might be left at its present rate of duty without injuring the revenue. Hams came under the same category. The colonial hams were good, but not equal to the imported article. He considered 2d. a lb. was a fair duty for these articles, and he should, therefore, uphold the tariff of the Colonial Treasurer.

Mr. MORGAN was in favor of the increased duty.

Mr. JORDAN said he found that by increasing the duty on the principal items of farm produce, they would obtain a revenue of nearly £9,000 a year, and this would half meet the anticipated revenue from the tax upon flour, which they might be able to do away with. He hoped, therefore, the honorable Treasurer would accede to the proposition.

Mr. WALSH observed that the increased duty on bacon would amount to about £3 upon every pig that was cured, which was a very heavy tax to impose for the benefit of a few farmers around Brisbane. There had been a great outcry in Tasmania about a tax of £2 upon cattle, but this was a more oppressive duty.

Mr. GROOM said, that so far from the tariff in Tasmania being held up to execration, it had given the greatest satisfaction. Numbers of persons were leaving this colony in consequence of the scarcity of employment, and he thought some effort should be made to bring about a better state of affairs, which was what honorable members on his side of the House were now trying to do. One honorable member had designated the flour tax as a railway tax, and no doubt it was for the benefit of the Darling Downs squatters. He should press the question to a division, that the people of the country, when the next elections took place, might know who were their friends and who were not.

Mr. KING expressed his surprise at the moderation of honorable members on the Opposition benches. If they had the power of imposing a protective duty upon all these articles which were produced in the districts they represented, to the injury of the other districts, why did they not insist upon one shilling duty at once?

Mr. BELL said he had no doubt the honorable member for Wide Bay would tell his constituents that the increase of duty would make them pay a higher price for these articles. He held a totally opposite opinion. As long as the importers had the fixing of prices in their own hands, so long would those prices be high; but when there was another class who could produce those articles, they would become cheaper. They

had all along been paying famine prices for imported articles without knowing anything about it; but when the same goods were produced in the colony their proper value would be known, and consumers would reap the benefit.

Mr. HALY could not understand the argument advanced by the honorable member for Northern Downs. The high duty would act as a prohibitory tax and there would be no competition at all.

The question was then put and negatived on division by a majority of 16 to 14, and the original motion was agreed to.

Question :—

That the duty on soap (not including toilet soap) be five shillings per cwt.

Agreed to.

Question :—

That the duty on potatoes, onions, hay, and chaff, be ten shillings per ton.

On the motion of Mr. GROOM, the first two items were considered separately.

Mr. HANDY moved, as an amendment, that the word "potatoes" be omitted. Potatoes were like flour, the staff of life, and should be placed upon the same footing, and exempted from duty. He must object to any tax being imposed upon the national esculent. Who would be benefitted, and who would be injured by the imposition of a tax upon these articles? The answer was simple—a few small farmers on the Darling Downs and about Toowoomba would reap all the advantage. But there were large centres of population in other parts of the colony—around Ipswich, Rockhampton, along the coast, and in the interior—where the cultivation of these articles was not yet started, and it would be very hard, considering the high price they paid for cartage and freight, to deprive them of their chief means of subsistence. He protested against the tax, and would divide the House upon it. And now, as he had abstained from addressing the House since the last opening, he would take the opportunity of making a few observations upon other subjects. He objected entirely to the imposition of a tax upon machinery of any kind, and he also objected to the proposed tax upon the salaries of the civil servants. The very fact of the Government bringing forward a scheme of taxation of this kind, impressed him strongly with the belief that their policy was objectionable and unstatesmanlike, and not such a policy as should be put forth by the Government of a colony like this. A paltry tax upon the pay of the civil servants was a poor way to raise the revenue of the colony; the Government ought to be aware that these persons were sufficiently taxed already. The tax in itself was unequal—it did not press upon all the civil servants alike, and it was, therefore, objectionable. There were some officers who had been appointed in the

palmy days of prosperity who received high salaries, while others who had taken office after the crisis were not nearly so well paid. The tax was, therefore, unjust, and there were other modes of raising the revenue, as he would shew bye-and-bye. It would be much better, for instance, instead of levying the tax, to reduce the number of the civil servants.

Mr. THOMPSON said he hoped the honorable member would excuse his interruption. He wished to remind him that the different items were being discussed seriatim, and he hoped the honorable member would confine his remarks to the item now before the House.

The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES said he was loth to interfere with the honorable member, but he must address himself to the question under discussion.

The COLONIAL TREASURER pointed out that the tax upon the civil servants would come on for debate when the second resolution was moved.

Mr. HANDY said he would then content himself with moving that the word "potatoes" be omitted.

Mr. ATKIN suggested that, if the honorable member wished to take off the tax upon potatoes he had better move a reduction of the duty; as, if his amendment were carried, the item would be included in the last paragraph and classed with all imported goods not enumerated in the list, and subject to an *ad valorem* duty.

Mr. HANDY said he would then, with permission, withdraw his motion, and substitute the following amendment :—

That the duty upon potatoes be five shillings per ton.

The question was put, the House divided, and the amendment was negatived by a majority of 23 to 7. The original motion was then put and passed.

Question :—

That the duty on hay and chaff be ten shillings per ton.

Mr. GROOM moved, as an amendment—

That the duty upon hay be increased to twenty shillings per ton, and that the duty on chaff be ten shillings per ton.

He moved this amendment in consequence of the large sums which were annually sent out of the colony for produce which could very well be grown here. It was entirely owing to the large quantities of hay imported from the other colonies, and the high price charged for bringing hay down from the Darling Downs, that it was not grown to a much greater extent.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he must oppose the amendment. It was useless to reiterate his arguments. Once for all, he affirmed these were not protective duties, but were solely for revenue purposes. These articles were taxed, not because they could

be grown in the colony, but because they were included in a general scheme.

The amendment was then put, and the House divided. Ayes, 14; noes, 14.

The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES said it now became his duty to give a casting vote, and, adopting the usual practice of not increasing the charge upon the people, he should vote with the Government.

The amendment was then negatived, and the original motion put and passed.

Question :—

That the duty on wheat, barley, maize, oats, and malt, be sixpence per bushel.

Mr. GROOM moved, as an amendment—

That the duty on these articles be one shilling per bushel.

Mr. KING said, before the question went to the vote, he wished to point out that the increased duty would press very heavily upon the constituency he represented—more so, perhaps, than upon any other. The mining population of Gympie employed a large number of horses; horse labor being required for working whims, for the cartage of quartz to the crushing machines, and for other purposes. They had to import food for those horses, and the additional duty on maize alone would be equal to 1s. 6d. a week for each horse employed. That would be a very oppressive tax, and he hoped the House would pause before assenting to it.

Mr. STEPHENS said it appeared that the honorable member must represent a district which was in the position of a house divided against itself. They were constantly hearing of the great producing capabilities of the Wide Bay district; but now they heard nothing about the producers: the consumers only were referred to. If the land was of such excellent quality—and he believed it was—and there were a large number of industrious farmers settled upon it, why did they not supply their own district? If they grew enough to do that, the tax would not affect them in the least.

The Hon. R. PRING said he had also been astonished to hear the statement of the honorable member, because he understood that he represented Wide Bay as well as Gympie; and in the district of Wide Bay there was a very large and a settled population, whereas Gympie had only a floating population. The honorable member, too, was about to bring in a Bill to grant agricultural leases around Gympie, and he could not, therefore, understand his opposition to the tax.

Mr. WALSH: The farmers on the Mary River did not want protection; there was no class of men who despised it more. The character of their farming was sufficiently good to enable them to compete with the world; they did not ask for protection, and certainly not protection from the people of Brisbane. The honorable member for Northern Downs was quite mistaken about the population of Gympie; it was not a shifting

one at all. It was a more settled, and certainly a more thriving population, than any about Brisbane. There was very little change in it, except it was continually attracting fresh comers to it. He thought the honorable member for Wide Bay was perfectly right in protesting against the additional duty. The diggers had necessarily to depend upon their horses. A great deal of their work was done by horse labor, and the supply of food was for the most part imported from the other colonies. The farmers around Maryborough did not care to give their attention to the cultivation of maize; they could raise a much more remunerative product. He should be very sorry to see any fictitious encouragement given to the growth of maize in this colony, for he had generally found those who cultivated it nearly starving. As he had often observed, when this article was the sole dependence of the small farmer, if he got a good crop one year his neighbors were sure to do as well, and down went the price at once. The Government had considered it necessary to put on a duty of 6d. in a general scheme of taxation for revenue purposes, and he hoped the Opposition would not persevere in their attempts to increase it.

Mr. KING: As the honorable member for North Brisbane, Hon. R. Pring, had commented upon the remarks he had made on this item, he might say that when his election was contested, an attempt was made to get up this cry of protection, and the best card which he held in his hand at the time was a speech by the honorable member at Too-woomba, to the effect that it was the intention of his party to place a duty of 1s. upon maize. He (Mr. King) had pledged himself at the time to oppose it, and he had been sent down to oppose it. It had been stated that no member was returned to that House except to obtain some pecuniary advantage for his constituents; but that was not the case with him. His constituents did not ask him to barter his vote for any such consideration, and he believed they would never do so.

Dr. O'DONNELL said he should gladly support the increased duty. He thought the growth of maize could not receive too much encouragement in this colony. Any legislation in this direction would receive the fullest approval of the people. It was known to most honorable members that throughout the length and breadth of the most prosperous country in the world, America, maize was one of the standard crops, and not only was that the case, but it formed the chief food of the people. Why was that not the case here? The maize grown in this colony was quite as good and suitable for the purpose, and it would grow quite as luxuriantly. Here, the people had not yet acquired the taste for it, and he believed the principal reason for that was that no encouragement to assist its expensive growth had been given to the farmers of this colony. He hoped

that would be done by putting on this additional duty. Then, instead of maize being entirely used for horse feed, it would become one of the chief articles of consumption by the people themselves. It was entirely with a view to that result that he supported the proposed increase.

Mr. THORN said that as the interior districts of the colony could not compete with the other colonies in supplying the Brisbane market and other markets of the colony, because of the low cost of carriage by water, he would for that reason, if there were no other, support the amendment for the increase of duty. In the Darling Downs and West Moreton districts, maize was grown to a very large extent; and he believed that by increasing the duty on importations of maize from the neighboring colony, agricultural industry in the districts he had mentioned would be encouraged, and the colony greatly enriched.

Mr. MILES said he would support the proposed increase, because he believed they should endeavor, as far as possible, to supply themselves with articles of agricultural produce. He was surprised to hear the honorable member for Wide Bay say that it was his intention to bring in a Bill to promote agricultural settlement, and yet oppose a proposition that would tend to secure the permanent settlement of an agricultural population, by rendering their industry profitable.

Mr. MORGAN said that as the representative of an agricultural constituency, he would support the proposed increase of duty on imported maize. He did not think that a shilling a bushel would be felt by the consumers of maize.

Mr. JOHNSTON said he would support the proposition of the Government, as he considered that a duty of sixpence per bushel on maize was quite high enough. The honorable members for the Darling Downs, Toowoomba, and Warwick, advocated the proposed increase of duty on the ground that the farmers in their respective districts were unable to compete with farmers in New South Wales, because of the higher cost of carriage between their districts and Brisbane, as compared with the cost of carriage between the maize producing districts of New South Wales and Brisbane. Now, he did not agree in that opinion; for as the cost of carriage from the Manning and Clarence River districts was eightpence a bushel, a duty of sixpence added would amount to a shilling and twopenny; but the charge for bringing a bushel of maize from the Darling Downs to Brisbane was only eightpence. Such a difference, he thought, gave a good measure of protection to the native producer.

The original motion was then put and carried without division.

The duties, as specified on the following articles, were proposed *seriatim*, and agreed to without discussion:—Bran and pollard, 2d. per bushel; biscuits, maizena, arrowroot, jams, jellies, dried fruits, and candles, 1d.

per lb.; bottled fruits and pickles, reputed quarts, 1s. per dozen; ditto pints, 8d. per dozen; bottled mustard, reputed pounds, 1s. per dozen; ditto, half pounds, 8d. per dozen.

The COLONIAL TREASURER proposed—

That the duty on cordage and rope be one penny per pound.

Mr. JOHNSTON pointed out that the proposed duty would amount to about £10 per ton, and maintained that it would have the effect of seriously affecting the business of ship chandlers at every port of the colony. Ship captains requiring large supplies of rope and cordage would send to Sydney for them, and would obtain a drawback of the duty on their leaving the colony; but those requiring only small supplies, whether coasters or seagoing vessels, would not have a like advantage. He therefore thought that the duties on rope and cordage should be placed in the *ad valorem* list, and he moved accordingly.

The COLONIAL TREASURER accepted the amendment that the articles in question should be placed in the *ad valorem* list, and the amendment was agreed to.

The COLONIAL TREASURER next proposed—

That the duty on flour be fixed at twenty-five shillings per ton of two thousand pounds.

Mr. ATKIN moved that the article of flour be struck out of the tariff. He thought that, taking into consideration the increase of duties which had been made, a duty on flour would be quite unnecessary for revenue purposes, and it could not be justified upon any other ground. He would not take up the time of the House by going into any argument on the question, because he believed that every honorable member had already made up his mind as to how he would vote on the question. He would wish to ask what course the Government would adopt with respect to this item if the motion before the House was negative.

The COLONIAL TREASURER stated that if the House should negative the motion, the Government would accept it as an expression of the opinion of the House that there should not be a duty placed upon flour; and flour would accordingly be placed in the list of articles exempted from duty.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that the Government felt bound to press on this item for revenue purposes, and on that ground only. Some honorable members might consider that by the additions they had made to the duties on other articles the general revenue would be increased, and that therefore the Government could do without a tax on flour. Now, he could tell honorable members who thought so that they were quite mistaken. At any rate, the Government believed that the additions that had been made, instead of having the effect of increasing the revenue, would have the effect of lessening it. Now, looking at this tax solely as one for revenue purposes, the Government felt they could not give it up

notwithstanding all the outcry that had been made against it as being a tax on the poor man's bread. The outcry against the tax on that ground was altogether an absurd one. The tax would amount to about 4s. 4d. a year on every consumer. The tax would fall most heavily upon squatters, who had to purchase large quantities of flour for those employed on their stations, and upon those who had large families. Now, he must say, he was astonished to find members of the late Ministry, who intended proposing a tax of forty shillings per ton on flour, opposing a tax of twenty-five shillings per ton; and he was the more astonished by their objection being advanced on the ground that this tax of twenty-five shillings per ton would be a tax on the food of the people. Well, if twenty-five shillings would be a burdensome tax on the food of the people, what would have been the burden of forty shillings? It appeared to him that the policy of the late Government, as regarded a duty on flour, was intended for protective purposes, whereas the present Government only desired to impose a tax on flour for revenue purposes.

Mr. LILLEY said that no doubt the honorable member who now occupied the office of Treasurer found, on the present Ministry succeeding to office, the draft of a tariff, in which it was set forth that a duty of 40s. a ton should be imposed upon flour. Now, he could assure the House that he never consented to that tariff; and, as honorable members of the present Government knew, that tariff could not have been brought in without his consent, as he was then at the head of the Government. He very well knew that the honorable member for South Brisbane, who held the office of Treasurer in the late Ministry, prepared his tariff for protectionist purposes. Now, he must say that, for his own part, he was not a protectionist, but a free-trader. He would, however, admit that if increased taxation was necessary for revenue purposes, it should be imposed so that it might have a protective incidence. The tax proposed by the Government was not, in his opinion, a grinding tax; but he considered it was an objectionable tax, inasmuch as he could not but regard it as the beginning of an obnoxious system of taxation—the beginning of a system of taxation that should not be resorted to until all other means of raising a revenue were exhausted. Before proposing a tax upon flour, the Ministry should have, at least, resorted to a land tax. Now, such a tax was proposed by Mr. Francis, while member for East Moreton; but he (Mr. Lilley) opposed it, because he considered that it was not then the proper time for the imposition of such a tax. Still, he was in favor of a land rent, which he had advocated for several years. When the Land Act of 1868 was under consideration he stated fully his views upon the subject; and he now maintained that the only elements in that Act which had tended to promote agri-

cultural settlement were those which were based upon that system. He yet hoped to see a land rent imposed for revenue purposes. He did not think it was desirable to place a tax upon flour, and he hoped the House would reject the motion now under consideration.

Mr. HANDY also opposed the motion, as it would fall very heavily upon poor people with large families. The tax amounted to about a penny a pound on flour. Now, in the case of a family of twelve persons, and considering that every person consumed eight pounds of flour a week, the tax which the head of the family would have to pay for this most necessary article of food would amount to twelve shillings a week; and how could a poor man be expected to pay that amount, and the other taxes for which he was liable?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY pointed out that the honorable member's calculations were very far astray. The amount of taxation that would, from the proposed duty, fall upon a person with a family of twelve, would amount to only eightpence a week.

Mr. BELL said he was not ashamed to say that he was in favor of the amount of duty which his honorable friend the member for South Brisbane, when Colonial Treasurer, intended to impose on imported flour. A tax of twenty shillings on a ton of flour would only have an irritating effect so far as the native producer was concerned. Now, they had no right to legislate for the annoyance of any portion of the community. The honorable the Colonial Secretary had said that the tax would fall most heavily upon the squatters; and that he would be considerably out of pocket by it; yet he shewed that it would not be so very heavy after all. By his own shewing it appeared that, on a station where fifty people were employed, the tax would amount to only £10 or £11 per annum. The honorable member complained very strongly of the tariff left behind by the Mackenzie Ministry being made use of by their successors, and yet he had made all the use he could of the tariff that was left in the Treasurer's office by the late Ministry. As to the proposed tax he considered it a most unnecessary one. He considered it would have been much better that the Treasurer had sought to obtain the amount he expected from this tax, by increasing the *ad valorem* duties from seven and a-half to ten per cent.

Mr. MILES said he would vote against the proposed tax, and maintained that the squatters on the Darling Downs and some other districts would not feel it, because of their having reduced the number of their work people, on account of the fencing in of runs. Besides that, however, they had introduced a system requiring that during the busy time—the time of shearing and pressing—the men should supply their own rations. He believed the honorable the Colonial Secretary had introduced that system on his stations, and it was now becoming the

usual practice to do so. He had tried to introduce it on his own station, but he could not succeed. He would certainly vote against the motion.

Mr. HALY said that this tax was asked only for revenue purposes, and not as a measure of protection. He entirely agreed with the honorable the Treasurer in saying that the additions which had been made to the proposed taxation on some articles, by the action of the Opposition, would have the effect of lessening, instead of increasing, the revenue; and, entertaining that opinion, he felt bound to vote for the proposed tax upon flour. He was sorry he would have to do it, as he was sure it would cause great hardship to poor men with large families, while it would be nothing at all to single men who had no one else but themselves to provide for. As, however, he believed there would be a loss occasioned to the revenue by the additions made upon some items by the members of the Opposition, he felt it to be his duty, in respect to the tax upon flour, to vote against his own convictions.

Mr. KING, though a general supporter of the present Ministry, felt it would be his duty to oppose the proposed tax upon flour, because he considered it would press very heavily upon the community generally, and especially on the poorer classes, inasmuch as flour was a principal article of food. He fully agreed with the honorable member for Fortitude Valley, that a tax on flour should not be asked for until all other sources of taxation for revenue purposes were exhausted.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS said he could not give a silent vote upon this question. No doubt he might be taken to task by his constituents for supporting the motion before the House, but he believed he would be able to give them a good and satisfactory reason for his doing so. He considered that, for revenue purposes, the proposed tax upon flour was necessary; and he also consented to it because he considered that twenty-five shillings a ton was a merciful deliverance from the forty shillings a ton which the previous Government intended to impose. Now, he had many reasons for believing that a duty of forty shillings a ton was agreed to by the late Ministry. He did not believe that the honorable member for South Brisbane, while holding the office of Treasurer, would have dared to have his tariff printed unless it had been previously agreed to by the other members of the Ministry. He was astonished at the way in which some honorable members changed their views when they passed over to the Opposition side of the House.

Mr. LILLEY desired to repeat, for the honorable member's information, that a duty of forty shillings a ton on flour was not consented to by the Cabinet of which he was at the head.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Well, the tariff which was left in the office by the

Treasurer for the late Government, contained such a proposition. Now, he could not help believing that if the late Government had remained in office, they would have asked the House to support them in imposing a duty of forty shillings a ton on flour. For revenue purposes there was an absolute necessity for this tax; and he maintained that there was no tax which could be so easily and inexpensively collected, or that would yield so large a revenue. He hoped that the House would consent to the proposition of the Government. Honorable members on the Opposition side of the House had boasted that they were the farmers' friends, but he thought they could not do so any longer if they rejected the motion before the House. If the motion were carried it would have the effect of, incidentally, benefiting the farmer, and promoting agricultural pursuits.

Mr. GROOM said it would be his duty to support the Government on the present occasion; and he must say, that he considered that in respect to this question, there was a great amount of back-sliding on the part of some of those gentlemen who were members of the late Government. One of the principal propositions which were to have been brought forward by the late Government was a tax upon flour; and one member of the late Government had informed him, that if they had remained in office they would have proposed a tax on flour for the benefit of the colonial farmers. Now, he was pledged to support this proposition; and he must say that he did not think the tax was of so obnoxious a nature as some honorable members had tried to make it out to be. He would support the tax because he believed that it would be for the benefit of the farming interest. He would not pretend to support it for revenue purposes, because he believed there were other sources from which a larger amount of revenue could be derived than what the Government expected to derive from a tax of 25s. a ton on flour. He might also say that he voted for the tax because he was a thorough protectionist. In the course of the debate, reference had been made to America, and it was said that many of the people of America had changed their opinions as to the benefits of a protective policy. Well, on the other hand, he could inform honorable members that, in the State of California, a protective duty of forty per cent. *ad valorem* had been placed upon all flour and breadstuffs imported into that State; and the effect had been greatly to encourage the prosperity of the farming interest. Now in this colony they had extended encouragement to the growers of sugar and cotton; and the mining community were about to ask for encouragement for their industry, by the abolition of the duty on mining machinery. Well, such being the case, he did not see why the House should refuse to extend a small measure of encour-

agement to the farming interest. Wheat growing was one of the most precarious industries in the colony. For example, one farmer whom he knew had a splendid field of wheat; and when it was about ready for cutting, he sent to one of the neighboring colonies for a reaping machine, the full cost of which, to the time of delivery, amounted to £70. But in about a week from the time of the machine being ordered, the whole of the wheat was utterly destroyed by rust.

Mr. JORDAN said, if the Government were in such extreme circumstances, they should propose an income tax or a land tax, the proceeds to be appropriated for roads; and that would be a great relief to the general revenue. After the Government having said so much about the liberal way they were going to deal with the roads of the colony, he objected to their course of action altogether. They should never tax flour. He remembered the Minister for Works once talking about the distress in Brisbane. There would always be some distress in large communities; widows, with large families, were left destitute, and, although they did not eat much, yet there should be as little difficulty as possible placed in the way of their obtaining the prime necessity of life. He (Mr. Jordan) remembered what Sir Robert Peel had said after the repeal of the Corn Laws at home. It was found, twelve months afterwards, that the consumption of flour was very much increased, and the right honorable gentleman, alluding to the fact, made this simple remark, which carried very great weight: "I am not aware that there are any cases of surfeit." The meaning of that was, that some persons, in previous years, were without food. If the Government would place additional duty on those articles of farming produce which were included in the tariff, and which had been over and over again referred to for the purpose, that would prove a great benefit to the agriculturists, and the £21,000 expected from flour would be replaced.

Mr. STEPHENS, in explanation, and in answer to the honorable the Colonial Treasurer, said it would be remembered that, in 1869, the Additional Customs Act was re-enacted for one year, with the distinct understanding that the whole subject of the tariff would necessarily have to be brought under the consideration of Parliament during the present year—the session of 1870. So far as that was concerned, it was a Cabinet question, and so it was understood by the whole of the Ministry. As Treasurer, it was his duty to draw up a tariff, and he did so, at very great trouble. He got all the information that he could get at the time, and he sketched out a tariff, or the basis of it. That, and all the information which he had obtained, he left in the Treasury. He believed he could say positively that it had never been seen by his colleagues; it was seen by the present Treasurer before it was seen by any member

of the late Government, he knew. The question had never been mooted in the Cabinet, as to what was the nature of the tariff, though he had prepared it. The honorable member for Drayton and Toowoomba had alluded to the late member for Western Downs, Mr. Taylor. He (Mr. Stephens) could remember, two or three days after the late Ministry resigned, shewing it to Mr. Taylor, in the smoking room. But, so far as the Cabinet were concerned, it was merely a memorandum of the conclusions he, as Treasurer, had arrived at with his figures. He could not vote for the item in the tariff, which was a very good one, taken as a whole; but the honorable gentleman opposite had altered details to make a very large increase of taxation, from the figures he had left in the Treasury.

Mr. MACDEVITT said the Minister for Works always succeeded, somehow or other, in producing an impression on the House; and, on this occasion, he had stirred up the pot. The honorable gentleman was greatly moved about the duty proposed by the late Government of £2 a ton on flour; and, to remove the evil of that, he acceded to the proposal of his own colleague, to put a duty of 25s. on that article. It was a strange conjunction to see the honorable gentleman followed by the honorable member for Drayton and Toowoomba, which shewed the interest felt in this discussion; they were generally as far asunder as the poles, though now united in supporting the question. He gave credit to the honorable member for Drayton and Toowoomba for sincerity, but he doubted that the proposed tax would be protective. Even supposing that wheat could be raised on the Darling Downs, it could not be brought to Brisbane as cheaply as it was imported from the other colonies, on account of the want of means of communication; and he (Mr. MacDevitt) was therefore relieved from supporting the tax, even if he wished to do so, upon protective principles. The cry which was raised about the tax falling upon the poor man was unworthy, because the duty would not amount to more than about a half farthing per pound; but he opposed it on the ground that the Treasurer should have exhausted every other means of taxation before resorting to a tax on flour. The convenience with which the revenue could be collected was not a reason he would admit. So long as they had the land to resort to, there was no necessity to tax flour. He acquitted the honorable member for Fortitude Valley of inconsistency in opposing the duty on flour.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS said it appeared to him rather extraordinary that honorable members came forward with two stories in their mouths—one to deplore the annual deficiency, and the other to oppose the means of remedying it. A land tax had been suggested by the late Premier. He put it to the honorable member if his theory had

not been that, if we were all to begin again, he would have a rent for all the land. The circumstances of this colony were not adapted to a land tax, as were those of England, where the value of every rood of ground was well ascertained and fixed. Here, the value of landed property was most uncertain. To put a tax of two pounds an acre on second-class pastoral land would certainly be unfair; and to put the same rate upon agricultural land would decidedly be extremely harsh upon the struggling farmer; and to put only the same on vineyards would be out of all proportion and inconsistent. When this colony had settled down, and people had in the course of time forgotten what they had paid for their land—some sixteen pounds an acre, and others fifteen shillings, for which it could be got now—it might be thought about. But the Government were the holders of enormous quantities of land at present, and to put a tax on it as it was disposed of to the people would be absurd. There was an objection made against the duty on flour, because it was said to be the beginning of a bad system; but if the House found that there was a necessity for imposing such a tax at a crisis, that was no reason why they should continue it. It was also objected to on the ground that it was obnoxious. Well, it would touch everybody; and the result would be £20,000 in the Treasury. A man would have to drop taking one glass of beer, a nobbler, a month to cover it—fourpence a month out of his luxuries. Sir Robert Peel had said, that generally that was the most obnoxious tax which touched everybody, and therefore the greater the outcry against it. The duty on flour would largely benefit the revenue, while the individual would feel it in an infinitesimal degree. It was well known to the old natives of New South Wales that the men raised upon maize, or hominy, on the Hawkesbury, were the finest men in the country. It was a fallacy to speak of the duty on flour pressing on the poor man, because the poor man would refuse anything but the best wheat bread; and, it would be generally advantageous that maize meal, or corn flour, should become popular food. The honorable member for Northern Downs would, in preference, increase the *ad valorem* duties; but those duties pressed upon clothes, which were as necessary to the poor man as flour. He (the Secretary for Lands) could not understand the object of honorable members of the late Government in opposing this tax, considering that they were so lately in favor of it, unless merely for the sake of opposition. He believed that parties had changed sides, and that the Government were more liberal to the people than the Opposition. At all events, they were giving the people a greater measure of liberality than had ever been proposed by the "great liberal party."

Mr. LILLEY: When the opportunity arose, and that would be before long, he should be quite able and willing to meet his honorable

friend, the Secretary for Public Lands, on the question of a land tax, or land revenue. He was sure the honorable gentleman had not reflected very deeply upon it, or he could never come to the conclusion that, because a man paid a small sum to the State for the exclusive enjoyment of land, it acquitted him and his land for ever of all obligations that the State incurred for protecting him in his occupation.

Mr. MORGAN said that, at his election, he promised his constituents that he would try for some measure of protection for them; but the protection he wished to see given was something similar to that which was given to the sugar and cotton growers. If the honorable gentlemen who sat on the Treasury benches had come down to the House and stated in a bold and straightforward way that they brought forward the flour duty as a protective measure, they should have had his support; but now he must inform them that he should vote against them. He thought that a tax put upon that which was a necessary for every human being in the colony was not a fair tax. There were other and more legitimate sources of revenue; and if the Government must have the money, there was the land to tax.

Mr. HALY only wished to say that he agreed with the system of land tax which the honorable member for Fortitude Valley had spoken of, if it could be carried out as he understood it. The existing restrictive land laws would have to be swept away, for they only encouraged perjury and corruption. He condemned the "new chum" system of business which the honorable member for Maranoa had spoken of—that of making the shearers pay for their own rations: those men would leave more than the value of their rations in the shape of wool on the sheeps' backs.

Mr. THORN said he should be again obliged to vote against the Government, and he regretted it exceedingly, with honorable members on the other side of the House. Amongst other modes of increasing the ways and means, in the event of the Government losing the flour duty, he mentioned the interest due by the Brisbane Water Works on the loan for that undertaking. Wheat could not be grown on the Downs, so that protection for that industry was not required.

Mr. McILWRAITH said that, had the tax on flour been proposed for the purpose of encouraging an industry which there was some probability of establishing in this country, he would have supported it. But of the six honorable members who represented the Downs, not one had said that wheat could be grown there. As a protectionist, he could not vote for it; as a matter of revenue, it was objectionable.

Mr. STEPHENS: He should vote against the tax. The first need of this country was an agricultural population settled on the lands. Having that foundation, the colony had something to trade. Next, it was re-

quired that assistance as far as possible should be given to the establishment of manufacturing industries. Looking down the tariff he found that a good deal of encouragement had already been given to the farming classes. He believed, therefore, that some measure of encouragement should be given to those trades which afforded employment to skilled labor at a high rate of wages. He would, therefore, prefer to increase the *ad valorem* duties upon articles which could be manufactured in the colony, and thereby give increased employment to skilled labor, than have a duty on flour. Boots and shoes, saddles, and other things could be manufactured in the colony; and in voting against flour, he was prepared to assist the Government in raising the *ad valorem*, which would give the encouragement he desired for skilled labor. He believed that 10 per cent. was added to the value of all invoices in addition to the $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. *ad valorem* authorised by the present Act. That was a complication which might be done away with, by raising the *ad valorem* duty to ten per cent.

MR. CRIBB: The vote he should give would be a very unpopular one, but, he believed, it was right. He should vote for the duty on flour, because it was a judicious tax; it would not be felt by anyone, and it would yield £21,000 to the revenue, which was required in the present circumstances of the colony; and, he believed, there was no other source available.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER said the conduct of honorable members on the Opposition benches appeared to him to be very inconsistent. They had pressed for an increase of duty on beer, butter, bacon, cheese, and other articles, the price of which affected the poor man quite as much, and now they objected to about a half a farthing in the pound on the poor man's flour. This appeared to him very inconsistent, especially coming from those who had all along asked for protection to farmers. They proposed to sacrifice a revenue of £20,000 or £21,000 by taking off the duty on flour, and to make it up by increasing the *ad valorem* duties. But those duties embraced items that were used quite as much by the poor man. He would also point out that the price of flour had fallen of late years very considerably, and that even with the additional duty, it would not reach former prices. It would scarcely be felt by the consumer; and considering that the duty would represent a large addition to the revenue, he hoped it would be passed.

MR. JOHNSTON would give some explanation of the reasons which obliged him to oppose the Government on this question. He should be sorry to think that the country was in such a deplorable state, that it was necessary to impose such a tax. At the same time, he must confess to holding protection principles, though he could not consent to tax the entire community in order to protect an

interest which was not permanent. It must be evident to every person who had been in Queensland for any length of time, that the flour market fluctuated from month to month, and in view of the scarcity of flour made in the country, if the colonists were dependent upon it, the result might be very serious if a bad season occurred. They might possibly have to pay, as they had some time back, as much as £30 or £40 per ton. Until the colony was capable of producing flour in sufficient abundance to supply its own wants, he thought it would be an injustice to the whole community to tax them for the sake of those who were connected with this industry. He hoped the Government would not be inconvenienced by the withdrawal of the duty, and would be able to make up the amount of revenue they required without it.

MR. DE SARGE said he would explain in a few words his reasons for supporting the Government. In the first place, every honorable member in the House had denied the existence of poor men in this colony. In the second place, the honorable the Premier had informed the House that this duty would only amount to 4s. 4d. a year upon those persons who were not poor, and that he thought they could afford to pay very well. Besides, this would be a general tax upon the population of the colony, and would not press upon any particular class more than another. For these reasons he should vote for it. He had heard it argued that it was an unpopular tax; but as the addition to the revenue of the £20,000 which it would bring in, appeared to be an absolute requirement, and as this duty was only resorted to as a *dernier ressort*; and further, as the members who now opposed it had intended to have levied a similar tax of £2 per ton, if they had been in power—for he did not suppose their evasions of this charge would have much weight—and some duty on flour, either direct or indirect, had been considered necessary, he should vote for the smaller amount as it appeared in the Government tariff.

MR. GROOM said he must express his conviction that the imposition of a duty of twenty-five shillings per ton upon flour, was not going to bring about such a disastrous state of things as the honorable member for Ipswich, Mr. Johnston, had predicted. He had no fear that the colonists would have to pay £30 or £40 per ton in consequence of this tax. He did not believe it would affect the price of flour in the slightest degree; he rather thought it would have an exactly opposite effect. He said again, he hoped the Government would come to a division on this question, in order that the farmers in the colony might know who were their friends and who were not. There had been a great deal of excitement in reference to this question, and he was afraid there was going to be some little shirking to avoid a temporary unpopularity. He hoped no honorable member would desert the principles he had

advocated, because a cry had been raised that they were going to tax the poor man. Honorable members who complained of this tax being a heavy one, should remember that the Government had compelled people, in certain districts, to form themselves into municipalities, and in those cases they had to put their hands into their pockets and pay much more in the shape of rates than they would have to pay by this moderate tax, and not a word was said about that.

Mr. FIFE said he was under no pledge to his constituents, and should give an independent vote upon the question. He might say, however, that they were in favor of free trade, and not protection to a certain class. The question of protection had not received the attention which he thought its importance deserved, and he was sorry there were not some commercial men in the House to take up the matter. It closely affected the commercial relations of this country with the rest of the world, and as Queensland was dependent upon other countries, and especially upon the other colonies for her supplies, it would be dangerous to cut off those supplies and to depend upon one particular district to furnish them. A period of drought or floods might, in that case, produce serious results. He should certainly vote against the imposition of any tax upon flour.

The question was put, and the amendment was carried by a majority of seventeen to thirteen.

Question :—

That the duty upon coals be one shilling and sixpence per ton.

Agreed to.

Question :—

That the duty upon oils, mineral and other kinds except perfumed oil, salad oil, and castor oil, be sixpence per gallon.

Mr. GROOM moved the addition of the words "kerosene oil." He thought this tax would be felt very oppressive in the country districts, although it might not effect the people of Brisbane. Kerosene oil was very generally used, and if those honorable members who had opposed the duty on flour were consistent, they would vote against this item, which was essentially a poor man's tax. It was entirely an imported article, and one which was not likely to be produced in this colony.

Mr. THORN supported the Government tariff.

Mr. CRIBB agreed with the honorable member for Drayton and Toowoomba, that the tax was a heavy one, and would add a considerable percentage to the price of the article. He thought it would be much better to withdraw the item, and let it come under the *ad valorem* duty.

The amendment was negatived without division, and the original motion put and passed.

The next item, "leather unmanufactured," was withdrawn, by the permission of the House.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had been informed by those who were acquainted with the process of manufacture, that, as the leather decreased in weight, its value increased; so that, if this tax were passed, the article lowest in value would be taxed the highest. He proposed, therefore, to place it among the articles which would be subject to an *ad valorem* duty.

Mr. GROOM said he wished to ask whether it was competent for any honorable member to propose any new duty. The Government had lost, by one vote, £21,000, and he should like to know whether any other articles might be proposed as dutiable.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had understood that, when honorable members had taken the tax off flour, they intended to increase the *ad valorem* duties. The Government had brought in a tariff, and they had interfered with it; he should, therefore, leave to them the responsibility of making any such increase, and move the item as it stood.

Question :—

That the charge upon all goods imported into the colony not hereinbefore enumerated or hereinafter exempted from duty for every one hundred pounds in value be seven pounds ten shillings.

Mr. ATKIN moved that the article of fencing wire be taken out and placed on the fixed list, and that the duty upon it be £3 per ton. It was used to a considerable extent in the interior, and, as it was used as a means for reducing the number of consumers, he thought it would be a very equitable tax.

Mr. HANDY was sorry to oppose the honorable member for East Moreton, whose opinions were generally so sound. He must, however, remind the honorable member that the only persons who used this wire were the distant squatters, who found it very expensive to get it out to their stations. The inside squatters had all their runs fenced in. He would also remind the committee that a good many of the outside squatters were abandoning their country because they could not afford to pay their rent, and a large extent of country was becoming uninhabited. It would be very hard to impose an extra tax upon this class of persons. Not only did he object to a tax upon fencing wire, but he was also opposed to the imposition of a duty, either directly or indirectly, upon station machinery. He thought, also, that sugar machinery should be exempted from duty. The colony was yet in its infancy, and it was desirable to foster these industries. There were not many sugar mills in the colony, but there were a good many persons who were prepared to introduce the requisite machinery, and this tax would prevent them from doing so, and be the means of checking a good deal of enterprise.

Mr. BELL could not see upon what principle the amendment was based, or how the honorable member who moved it could reconcile the course he was now taking with his previous action with regard to the tariff. It could not be from any protective policy, because they could not expect to make fencing wire in this colony. He admitted that his own runs were fenced in, but it was rather hard that, when the squatters had done their best to improve and further the capabilities of their runs, it should be brought as an argument against them. He could see no principle whatever in the amendment, and, as the duty was proposed for revenue purposes, he thought the House would be unwise to forego it.

Mr. THORN was averse to the proposition to place this item on the fixed list. He did not think the tax would be an oppressive one.

The Hon. R. PRING supported the motion, as he thought the House, having done away with the tax upon flour, should assist the Government in making up the amount lost to the revenue. He could not see that this tax would fall heavily, because when squatters fenced in their runs they were able to dispense with labor which otherwise they would have to employ.

Mr. GROOM opposed the amendment. If the tax had been proposed before the Darling Downs squatters had fenced in their runs he could have understood it; but when he observed, from recent returns, the number of runs which were about to be forfeited for non-payment of rent, he could not consent to what he considered would be an act of injustice. If there had been any necessity for this tax he might have voted for it: but it seemed to him, on the face of it, to be a species of revenge upon the outside squatters. There was very little fencing going on now, and, as the article was already subject to an *ad valorem* duty, he should not vote for the amendment, and if the question were pressed to a division he should walk out of the House.

The question was put, and the amendment was negatived, on division, by a majority of 22 to 7.

The COLONIAL TREASURER then moved—

That upon all goods imported into the colony not hereinbefore enumerated, or hereinafter exempted from duty, there be imposed for every one hundred pounds in value a duty of seven pounds ten shillings.

Mr. BELL said that the *ad valorem* duties were now placed in a very different position from that which they occupied when the tariff was first placed before the House, and that because the duty proposed to be placed upon flour had been struck out. That duty having been negatived, it would be necessary to supply its place with some other duty. Now, in the colony of Victoria the *ad valorem* duty amounted to ten per cent., and he understood that it had operated beneficially towards the progress of the colony, and he had no

doubt that a similar *ad valorem* duty here would be attended with an equally beneficial effect. He would, therefore, move that the *ad valorem* duty be increased from seven and a-half per cent. to ten per cent.

Mr. GROOM said he would like to know what course the Government intended to take with respect to the amendment that had just been made; or if they had made up their mind as to some other scheme for making up the deficiency that would be occasioned to the revenue by the duty on flour being negatived.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he could not at present give the honorable member a distinct answer to the question he had put. All he could say was that it would be necessary for the Government to make good the amount which it had been expected would be obtained from the proposed duty on flour.

Mr. CRIBB remarked that since the imposition of the *ad valorem* duties at seven and a-half per cent., the increase to the consumer had been ten per cent. Now, if two and a-half per cent. were to be added, the charge to the consumer would amount to thirteen per cent. When the *ad valorem* duties were first brought before the House, he asked the then Treasurer, the late Mr. McLean, if goods from Sydney would be admitted free, having paid the duty at that port, while goods imported direct from Europe and America would be subject to a duty, on arrival here, of ten per cent.—the amount originally proposed. He was informed that such would be the case. After a prolonged discussion, the *ad valorem* duties were reduced from ten per cent. to seven and a-half per cent. Now, though it was the fact, he could scarcely expect honorable members to believe him when he stated that there was no difference whatever on the duties on goods imported from Sydney, and on goods imported directed from Europe. He might further inform the House that he had paid, when the *ad valorem* duties were first imposed, £1,000 more than he should have been required to pay, on goods he imported from Sydney. The honorable the Treasurer of the late Government assured him that the Ministry of which he was a member proposed to do away with that duty. But such had not been the case; for on goods which he had imported from Sydney since then, he had had to pay the same amount of duty as he would have had to pay on goods imported direct from home. Now, with the other incidental charges, the proposed increase of duty would fall upon the purchaser of goods to the amount of twelve or thirteen per cent.

Mr. STEPHENS stated that the value of the goods would be taken as that at the port of shipment, with ten per cent. added; therefore, the increase proposed on the *ad valorem* duties—by the honorable member for the Northern Downs—would only amount to one and three-quarters per cent., instead of two and a-half per cent., as had been stated.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that the Government found themselves in this position, that they had not carried their tariff as submitted to the House. But the Government had not been defeated by the Opposition, but by the support which the Opposition had received from some honorable members who were, generally, considered to be supporters of the Government. For his own part, he did not consider that any tariff that might be introduced could be perfect. As the amendments which had been made on the tariff would have the effect of lessening the revenue by £21,000, the House, he considered, was bound to agree to the imposition of some tax that would make up that amount. It was, he maintained, as much the duty of the Opposition, as of the Government, under the circumstances, to propose some means of obtaining an amount of revenue from some other source equal to that which would be lost by the striking out of the duty on flour. Without going into minute calculations, he might say that the Government was prepared to accept, in lieu of the duty on flour, an increase of the *ad valorem* duties from seven and a-half to ten per cent.

The original motion was then put and negatived on a division—Ayes, 9; noes, 18.

The Hon. R. PRING said he could not allow this question to pass without expressing his views on the question. The House he thought had been dragged into what he considered was a piece of hasty legislation; because he believed the Colonial Treasurer had lost to the revenue £15,000 by the House negativing the proposed duty on flour, without the Colonial Treasurer being afforded the opportunity of making up the amount from some other source. Because the honorable gentlemen had been deprived of that amount, was the House to be called upon, hastily, to impose an *ad valorem* duty of two and a-half per cent. in addition to the *ad valorem* duty of seven and a-half per cent. at present imposed? Now, before proceeding further in the matter, he would like to know whether, because of this £15,000 of anticipated revenue from the proposed duty on flour being lost, there would be any deficiency. Instead of being asked to rush into this increase on *ad valorem* duties, he would like to know, in the first instance, whether the honorable the Treasurer could or could not do without it? He maintained that the House should have more information on the subject, before they were asked to proceed further with legislation upon it. Until the honorable member for the Northern Downs proposed this increase, he had no idea whatever that there would be such an increase on the *ad valorem* duties proposed, in order to make up for the revenue expected to be derived from the proposed duty on flour—which had been negatived. Now, on behalf of the inhabitants of the colony generally, he protested against the hasty legislation that was being attempted, and especially as against the increase of the *ad*

valorem duties, unless honorable members had a fuller opportunity afforded them of considering the question in all its bearings. If he had had the slightest idea that the negation of the duty on flour would have led to an increase of the *ad valorem* duties, he would have voted differently from what he had done. He must say that he could not understand the course pursued by some honorable members in this matter. And he would only add, that, if legislation was to be conducted on a similar basis, he should feel disposed to say good bye to his friends.

Dr. O'DOHERTY protested against the hasty system of legislation attempted to be carried out by the present Government, especially in the matter of the *ad valorem* duties. He was glad to say that he and the honorable and learned member for Fortitude Valley were at one in opposing any addition to the *ad valorem* duties at the present time, inasmuch as he believed that there were other sources from which the required amount of revenue could be made up. He felt bound to protest, on the part of the constituency he had the honor to represent, and also on the part of the community generally, against the hasty system of legislation proposed by the present Government. His constituents, he was sure, would agree with him in what he had generally advocated during the present debate—and what he had advocated was based upon the principles of protection, but which some might designate as encouragement to native industry. The colony had paid heavily for the protection of the cotton interest, the sugar interest, and the pastoral interest; no interest had progressed in this colony that had not been protected, and that the great body of the people had not been called upon to pay heavily for. And those interests were all established. In the present sitting, the House had burdened the people with a very large amount of additional taxation; and he thought it was dangerous to press the burden too far. The people might not be able to bear it. In this matter, all party feeling should be thrown aside. In conjunction with his honorable colleague, Mr. Pring, he protested against this hasty work—he protested against an addition of two and a-half per cent. to the *ad valorem* duties.

Mr. MILES said he had made up his mind to vote against the duty on flour, and to make it up by an increased *ad valorem*. It was extraordinary for the two honorable members for Brisbane to object at the last moment, especially for the honorable and learned gentleman, Mr. Pring. The honorable member for Northern Downs declared his intentions early in the sitting.

The Hon. R. PRING said he was not prepared to accept the explanation offered, and he cared not for the honorable member for Northern Downs. He denied that he was in the House when the honorable member declared that he intended to propose the in-

crease of the *ad valorem* duty in lieu of the flour duty, or that he was bound by what the honorable member said he was going to do, when he chose to speak of it at an improper time; and he denied that the duty proposed on flour was rejected on the understanding that the *ad valorem* duty was to be increased. If so, he should have expected the Government not to oppose the amendment; and he should expect them, not the Opposition, to come forward with a substitute for the source of revenue closed against them by the action of their opponents. So far as he was concerned, he said that he had strong views on the present question. He admitted that all other honorable members who held different opinions to him had a perfect right to hold them. But he considered that the circumstances under which the amendment before the committee was carried, and the way they had been drawn into voting for it—either by mistake or otherwise—was confessedly and decidedly hasty legislation. He joined with his honorable colleague, Dr. O'Doherty, that whatever the result, the question ought not to be decided in the present sitting. They might all regret it hereafter, when it would be too late. This was a general scheme of taxation; it did not stand on the same footing as fencing-wire or anything like it;—this was a very heavy tax of two and a-half per cent. additional on an already weighty *ad valorem*. It affected every man in the colony. New South Wales charged only five per cent., while Queensland was laboring under seven and a-half per cent. *ad valorem* duty, and it was still to be increased. The Premier knew that when they were colleagues together in the MacKenzie Government, whether the Treasurer was right or wrong, he was prepared to reduce the *ad valorem* duty, it was found to be so oppressive: yet, after that, the honorable gentleman was willing, now, to have it increased.

MR. BELL said the reckless assertions of the honorable member for Brisbane, Mr. Pring, were as plentiful as blackberries. He did not object to listen to them, but he denied the right of the honorable gentleman to say—and when he did say it, he went beyond himself—that the members of the committee acted hastily, and came unprepared to act, and voted without due deliberation on such an important question. Did it follow, because that honorable gentleman did not think of the subject—or, if he thought of it now, that he was not fit to give it due consideration—that others had not done so? He (Mr. Bell) told the honorable gentleman that he had given it due consideration. He had told the Treasurer and the House what his intention was, and he had told his late colleague, the honorable member for South Brisbane; and, no doubt, they had all given it due consideration. It appeared that the honorable and learned gentleman had taken the present opportunity to obtain a little bit

of popularity—it was a very good opportunity—at the expense of the party he was supposed to belong to, to sacrifice all that had been done with the consent of that party. He (Mr. Bell) hoped and trusted that the wise men in the chamber had come to the right conclusion on the *ad valorem* duty. He thought they had taken the right direction, in which they had followed the admirable example of Victoria, which colony had succeeded so well that he hoped all the colonies would follow.

THE HON. R. PRING: Of the honorable member's personalities he took no notice; but he would tell him that he was as capable of forming an opinion or judgment on any question as himself; and if the honorable member thought that he was to be dragged into any arrangement by him, he made a great mistake; and the estimate he had formed of the honorable member's character was lower than his own. The honorable member had thrown down the gauntlet. He (Mr. Pring) denied that he spoke for popularity—he did not need it in Brisbane—he was popular enough, as his late election proved. He only wished the honorable member needed popularity as little in his constituency, and that no dodgery to get votes at an election was required. The honorable member might go to the Treasurer or any one else, but that did not bind him. Talking of the amendment having been consented to by the party, he did not consent to it, and for the reason that if he belonged to the party, he was chosen as the head of it; and, therefore, he should have been consulted. He denied the right of the honorable member to speak of party action in that way. If the power was put into his hands, as leader, why was he not consulted?—instead of two or three of the party going behind his back for their own purposes, and then turning round and saying that he did not act with them, that he was acting against them. He never went by the back door; he always walked in at the front: and if the party suffered by their action—as they did before, and would again, if they followed that dangerous game—they had only themselves to blame for allowing themselves to be committed and blindly misled by treachery, and in spite of their agreement with him.

MR. GROOM said he must confess, without talking of treachery, that the party did accept the honorable and learned member for Brisbane as Opposition leader; but, if it was arranged that the flour duty was to receive organised opposition, he ought to have led off on the subject. Having been defeated, the Government should have been prepared with a remedy to recoup the Treasury for what they had lost. The proposition to increase the *ad valorem* duty would do an injury. It might be another attempt to uphold his particular views on protection, but he thought the Government laughed in their sleeves when they saw how far the honorable member

for Northern Downs went in his scheme. The Government had got the revenue they wanted, and the honorable member would not now get his exemptions. That only shewed the necessity for accepting the honorable member for Brisbane as leader, and recognising him as such by sticking to the arrangement made; the party should have consulted him. When the *ad valorem* duty was first passed, honorable members sat in their old chamber till seven o'clock in the morning, opposing, combatting, shilling by shilling, to reduce the duty from ten to seven and a-half per cent.; yet the higher duty was proposed now without any consideration. Judging from what he saw going on, and the disregard of responsible government and of organisation evinced by some of the party, he should, if it continued, be obliged to leave the Opposition side and take his seat behind the Ministry.

MR. ATKIN: The honorable member seemed to forget that, after the division, now was the time to move any amendment for a less sum than the proposed ten per cent. *ad valorem*. He had yet to learn that individual members were to give up their opinions, and run after the honorable and learned member for Brisbane, Mr. Pring, to tell him what they were going to do. If he was leader of the Opposition, why did he not come down to the House and tell his party what he wanted them to do? He talked about treachery, when he came down at the last moment;—that was unkind. It was the duty of a leader to direct his followers in the House. He (Mr. Atkin) should be prepared to move certain exemptions, and he protested against the honorable and learned member saying that he would not consent to this and that. He denied that his conduct was that of a leader of a party, when he could not instruct him; for the honorable member confessed to the Premier, in the smoking room, that he did not feel competent to speak on such subjects as the tariff; and he (Mr. Atkin) now renounced any allegiance he ever owed him. It was perfectly competent for any honorable member to express his opinions on this or any other question.

The Hon. R. PRING said he did not object to the speech of the honorable member for East Moreton; and it might be well for him to renounce his allegiance. But he had been forewarned—he had been deceived once before, and was quite prepared for the attempt to deceive him again—and he renounced that honorable member and the party, before his declaration to withdraw his allegiance. The honorable member might retail private conversations from the smoking room, if he liked; perhaps it suited him. He (Mr. Pring) durst say he did say what had been stated, that he did not understand finance; but he had said the same in his speech to the House during the present debate, and he had said so often before. If he was supposed to know everything, because

he was leader, then he would be such a leader as was never known before.

Dr. O'DONERTY deprecated a personal altercation.

Question :—

That the words (ten pounds) proposed to be inserted be so inserted.

Put and affirmed. Ayes, 18; Noes, 10.

The COLONIAL TREASURER then moved the following list of exemptions, to which he had added flour :—

Anchors and cable chains over three-eighths of an inch in diameter, iron ore, plain sheet iron (not including galvanized), pig, bar, rod, scrap, and hoop iron, boiler plates, tin plates, block tin, sheet and pig lead, zinc, sheet, copper, muntz metal, unwrought steel.

Gold, silver, and copper coin, and unmanufactured gold and silver.

Printed books and newspapers.

Live animals.

Manure, green fruit, garden seeds, and garden produce, bulbs, trees, shrubs, and flour.

Antique curiosities and specimens of natural history.

Outside packages in which goods are ordinarily imported, and which are of no commercial value except as covering for goods.

Passengers' cabin furniture and baggage, and passengers' personal effects (not including vehicles, musical instruments, glassware, chinaware, silver and gold plate, and plated goods, and furniture, other than cabin furniture), which are imported with and by passengers *bonâ fide* for their own personal use, and not imported for the purposes of sale.

Naval and military stores, stores imported for the service of the Colonial Government, or for the use of Her Majesty's land or sea forces, and wines and spirits for the use of His Excellency the Governor, or for naval and military officers employed on actual naval or military service and on full pay.

Mr. GROOM moved, as an amendment—

That the words "green fruit" be struck out.

He had intended to move that green fruit should be included in the articles subject to the *ad valorem* duty. It would yield a revenue of £1,200 a year. He begged to retract what he had said on a previous occasion, that bananas were charged duty at the rate of fourpence a dozen in Victoria; but all fruit was subject to the *ad valorem* duty.

Mr. ATKIN opposed the amendment. Fruit was a necessary for the population of this country, especially in the North. Oranges were in season but a short time here; and apples were not generally grown.

The COLONIAL TREASURER desired that fruit should remain on the list of exemptions. If we taxed fruit, New South Wales would retaliate, and tax our pine-apples and bananas.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said there was another objection to the amendment. The duty had been tried and abandoned in New South Wales, because the greater portion of the fruit imported was spoiled before it could be taken out of bond. The article required

to be taken from the ship immediately she made fast alongside the wharf.

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. HANDY proposed that "station machinery" for wool washing be added to the list of articles exempted from duty. He did this in pursuance of a pledge made to his constituents.

Mr. DE SATGE objected to the amendment because others in favor of mining, sugar, and meat-preserving machinery would follow, if it were carried.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY opposed the amendment. The squatters did not require exemptions, when no other interest enjoyed a similar privilege.

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. KING moved—

That quicksilver, and machinery used for mining purposes, be included in the list of articles exempted from duty.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he could see no reason to make any exception in favor of this kind of machinery, more than any other. The tax was upon machinery generally. The present tariff did not admit of any reductions whatever, and he did not believe this tax would be found at all oppressive. It might be felt by those who imported quartz-crushing machinery, but they would, no doubt, recoup themselves by putting a slight addition on their charges for crushing.

Mr. MACDEVITT said he thought the honorable Premier was very unhappy in his argument when he said that there was no greater reason to exempt from duty quartz-crushing machinery, than sugar machinery; and that if he contrasted the position of the miner with that of the sugar grower, he would come to a different conclusion. Not only had the sugar interest been protected annually, by the admission of its machinery duty free, but the Legislature had provided the sugar growers with a class of labor peculiarly suited to the climate. The sugar planter not only obtained his land upon easy terms, but was allowed to distil rum; and with all these advantages, the sugar interest was placed in a very favorable position, compared with other interests. There could be no doubt that the Government of which the honorable member was Premier, had promised to abolish this duty.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The only promise the Government had given was, that if sugar machinery were exempted from duty, mining machinery should also be taken into consideration; the promise went no further than that. It was now necessary to tax all kinds of machinery, for revenue purposes, and no exception could be made.

Mr. MACDEVITT: He did not mean to say that any formal promise had been made by the honorable member himself, but it was generally understood that the Government were willing to do away with this duty. The honorable member's colleagues had visited Gympie, from time to time, and on two

occasions, they had made this promise. On the first occasion it was made by Mr. Lamb, who went up alone; and on the second occasion, by Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Pring. The honorable Premier said that the imposition of a tax upon quartz-crushing machinery would not affect the digger; but that was an argument he thought the honorable member should have foregone, because he could not have advanced such a statement on the gold fields with any chance of its being accepted. He could assure the honorable member that the greatest inducements were necessary to get machinery placed on the ground, because of the uncertain character of the reefs; as if the reef did not prove payable, it became valueless. In proof of the difficulty of getting this kind of machinery on the ground, it was a well known fact that the diggers were in the habit of guaranteeing a certain number of tons of quartz for crushing, and they sometimes even subscribed and gave a bonus to induce the erection of a machine for this purpose. The addition of a heavy tax upon this article would deter people from putting up quartz-crushing machines, and a check would thus be given to an important industry. He had made a calculation in connection with this subject, and he found that in one year, a crushing machine of average power, crushing say 250 tons of quartz a-week, would increase the riches of the colony by some £70,000 or £80,000. It must be remembered, too, that the digging population represented a large number of persons who consumed dutiable articles. Then, again, honorable members should take into consideration the advantage which the Government derived from the opening up of these gold fields, and endeavor to foster an interest which added so largely to the revenue. He had been informed that the discovery of the Ravenswood Diggings had caused such an advance in the price of cattle that the squatters in the district were able to carry on their operations with profit to themselves and benefit to the country. If, therefore, the abatement of this duty would give increased prosperity to the mining interest, it was worth the consideration of the House.

Mr. MILES supported the amendment for the exemption of this article from duty, on the ground that they were not in a position to make quartz-crushing machinery in the colony. He should also support any motion to exempt from duty machinery for meat preserving. They were obliged to import this machinery from Sydney or Melbourne, and it was very hard to tax an industrious class in order to aid the resources of the country. The diggers were a class of colonists who were specially taxed. They had an export duty to pay on their gold, and to compel them to pay an additional tax to carry on their operations, seemed to him to be a suicidal policy. He had, therefore, great pleasure in supporting the amendment of the honorable member for Wide Bay, and he

should also be glad to assist him at some future time, in abolishing the export duty upon gold.

Mr. WALSH said that much as his sympathies were in favor of the miners, it was impossible, in accordance with the rule which had been laid down, for the Government to accede to this exemption. He would take the opportunity of correcting a wrong impression which appeared to be entertained with regard to the gold export duty. It was about the fairest duty which could be imposed. It was originated at the request of the diggers themselves. When the diggings were first opened a monthly tax was levied, but this did not give satisfaction, as it fell upon the lucky and unlucky digger alike, and the export duty was substituted. Now, the men who found the gold paid the duty. Honorable members must bear in mind that the gold fields were very costly, and the Government must get some revenue from them.

Mr. FIFE said he thought there should be some general law regulating the importation of machinery of all kinds. At present, bonuses were given to encourage the sugar and cotton industries, but no advantage was afforded to the mining or meat-preserving interests.

Mr. HALY was opposed to the amendment, and thought the proposition to exempt this article from duty a very extraordinary one, considering the divisions which had taken place.

Mr. HANDY expressed himself in favor of the exemption from duty on machinery of all kinds in a young country like this, because he considered it the duty of the Legislature to foster every industry. There was only one objection to the abolition of this duty. The owners of quartz machinery, as a rule, were not diggers; they were usually strangers from the other colonies, and therefore the real digger would receive no assistance.

The question was put, and the amendment negatived, on division, by a majority of 15 to 11.

Mr. BELL moved, as a further amendment—

That to the list of articles exempted from duty be added, the words "cotton in the piece, linen in the piece, and woollens in the piece."

He said that, some time ago, tenders had been invited by the Government for some clothing, and in consequence of the tariff which then existed, the whole of the clothing had to be made in Sydney. He hoped the subject would receive the consideration its importance merited.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he was afraid the exemption of these articles from duty would open the door to a good deal of fraud. It would be better to let the tariff stand as it was.

Mr. STEPHENS said that after the increase of the *ad valorem* duties, he thought the Government might fairly accede to this exemption. He could not see in what way it would open the door to fraud.

Mr. WALSH observed that a Bill had recently been passed to encourage the manufacture of these articles, which would be completely nullified if this amendment were carried.

The question was put, and the amendment negatived, without division.

Mr. JOHNSTON moved the following amendment—

That the words "saddle-trees, saddlers' ironmongery, and gerskins," be added to the list of articles exempt from duty.

The amendment was negatived, without division.

Mr. JOHNSTON moved as a further amendment—

The addition to the list of exemptions of the words "doeskins, moleskins, tweed in the piece, corduroys, Bedford cords, printed shirtings, and flannels."

The question was put, and the House divided. Ayes, 13; Noes, 13.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES said he should give his casting vote with the noes, in order to leave things as they were.

The amendment was therefore negatived.

Mr. STEPHENS said he should not have spoken if the Chairman had not given a reason for the way he had recorded his casting vote. That reason was not a correct one. He did not, by giving it, leave things as they were. On the contrary, his vote had the effect of increasing the duty from $7\frac{1}{2}$ to 10 per cent., and, therefore, adding to the taxation.

The original motion, that the articles enumerated in the list as exempted from duty, be so exempted, was put and passed; and on the motion of the Colonial Treasurer, the Chairman reported progress, and the resolutions in committee were adopted.

The House having resumed, the tariff resolutions agreed to in committee were reported and agreed to.

The COLONIAL TREASURER then moved—

That a Bill be brought in for granting to Her Majesty certain duties of Customs.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was brought in and passed through its several stages, and ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Council.