

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**FRIDAY, 10 SEPTEMBER 1886**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

*Friday, 10 September, 1886.*

Petition.—The Railway Embankment at Milton Swamp.  
—Formal Motion.—Health Act Amendment Bill—third reading.—Settled Land Bill—third reading.—Manufacture of Locomotives and Ironwork for Bridges in the Colony.—Free Exchange of Products between the Australasian Colonies.—Bridge over the Burnett.—Adjournment.

The SPEAKER took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

### PETITION.

Mr. FERGUSON presented a petition from the minister and members of the Wesleyan Church, Rockhampton, praying for the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Act; and moved that it be read.

Question put and passed, and petition read by the Clerk.

On the motion of Mr. FERGUSON, the petition was received.

### THE RAILWAY EMBANKMENT AT MILTON SWAMP.

Mr. NORTON said: Mr. Speaker, — I rise to ask the Minister for Works—I have given no notice, as the subject was referred to yesterday—if he can supply any information as to the cause of the subsidence of the railway embankment at Milton Swamp, or whether the responsibility attaches to anyone in particular in connection with it, so far as can be explained?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. Miles) said: Mr. Speaker, — I have made inquiries and have received information from the Chief Engineer to the effect that the embankment has now ceased to subside any further. It has gone down altogether about five feet, but there has been no subsidence since yesterday, and the engineer has come to the conclusion that it has now come to a sound foundation. The subsiding of the embankment has caused the road to rise about five feet. The embankment now is stationary, and the Chief Engineer has come to the conclusion that no further subsidence will take place.

Mr. NORTON: I should like to point out that there is still danger of further subsidence if we get much more heavy rain. I believe that the subsidence is consequent upon the heavy rain, and to all the drainage under the railway line having been stopped owing to the new drainage works not having been completed. The old drain which ran underneath the railway has been blocked up to such an extent that about a fortnight or three weeks ago great complaints were made by the people in the vicinity, who had the water thrown back on to their premises. If that is the case, it is quite possible that in the event of more rain further subsidence may take place—unless the new drain is at once thrown open.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No doubt the hon. gentleman is quite correct. The Harbours and Rivers Department are erecting a new concrete culvert to drain the water off, and it will be completed within a day or two. There is no doubt whatever that the stoppage of the water has softened the ground to some extent, and caused the embankment to subside. The culvert will be completed in a day or two, and the water will then be drained off.

### FORMAL MOTION.

The following formal motion was agreed to:—

By Mr. MELLOR—

That there be laid upon the table of the House, a copy of a petition, addressed to the Chief Secretary by ratepayers of the Wide Bay district, against the rating of improvements under the proposed amended Divisional Boards Act.

### HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

#### THIRD READING.

On the motion of the PREMIER (Hon. Sir S. W. Griffith), this Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Council for their concurrence, by message in the usual form.

### SETTLED LANDS BILL.

#### THIRD READING.

On motion of the ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. A. Rutledge), this Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be returned to the Legislative Council by message in the usual form.

### MANUFACTURE OF LOCOMOTIVES AND IRONWORK FOR BRIDGES IN THE COLONY.

On the Order of the Day being read for the resumption of debate on Mr. Annear's motion—

“That, in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived when, from the number of skilled mechanics in the colony, an effort should be made by the Government to encourage the manufacture within the colony of locomotives and all rolling-stock in future required for our railways, and all ironwork required for our bridges”—

On which Mr. Bulcock had moved that the question be amended by the insertion, after the word “Government,” in the 3rd line, of the

following words—"due regard at the same time being paid to the rights of the general taxpayer"—which stood adjourned (under sessional order of 14th July last) at 7 p.m. of Thursday, the 19th ultimo—

Mr. KELLETT said: Mr. Speaker,—I have little to add to what I have already said on this question. I believe in encouraging the mechanics of the colony. I believe it would be to our benefit to have all the locomotives and other works of the kind mentioned in the motion made in the colony. This is like everything else; it requires a commencement. It is, I think, the duty of a wise Government to foster and encourage the people brought to these shores. We have now a wise Government, inclined to do what they consider good for the colony, and I think this is a step in the right direction. I understand that we would have to pay but a very little more for locomotives manufactured in the colony than if we import them from England and send the money out of the colony for them. On the other hand if we manufacture them here we will have in the colony the men engaged in their manufacture, and they will be paying daily to our revenue through Customs. I think, therefore, the money will be well spent, even if we do have to pay a little more for locomotives manufactured here, than we might possibly get them for if imported from England or America. There have already been a good many works of the kind referred to manufactured in the colony, and we have made several dredges here far superior to those sent out from England. The work here comes under the supervision of the Government for the time being, and it is substantial and not covered over with putty and paint without their knowledge, as many imported machines are—made for sale and not for useful work. I understand that already we have had three engines made in the Ipswich workshops and they have not required anything like the repairs, and have lasted on the road much longer without repairs than the imported ones. We know that the engines we import require to have a great deal done to them before they are fit to go to work, and the cost of repairs and alterations and so on makes the real cost of them a good deal more than the first cost. We may safely say, that if we have to pay no more than 15 per cent. for work of the kind done here than what we could import it for, the money would be well spent. I do not believe in the amendment moved about the rights of the general taxpayers. I take it the Government will look after the taxpayers, and see that all get fair play. I think if this motion is carried out it will do good to all the people in the colony by establishing workshops for work of this kind; and by commencing in this way, though we may have to pay a little more at first, in a few years we will be able to get work of the kind done in the colony as cheaply as we could import it, and really the money will be returned to us threefold in the future. I have great pleasure in supporting the motion of the hon. member for Maryborough.

Mr. CAMPBELL said: Mr. Speaker,—I look upon the motion of the hon. member for Maryborough with very great suspicion, and I am afraid that, if passed by this House, it will have a very serious effect hereafter. I have no doubt there will be several motions of a more direct character to follow this. I believe there are members in this House only waiting to see the result of this motion to bring down motions of a more direct character. While I have a very great deal of sympathy with the iron-workers of this colony in the depressed state of trade, I have also sympathy with those engaged

in other branches of industry in this colony, who have been suffering for a number of years. I would like to ask why they should be called upon at this particular time to bear extra taxation to bolster up one particular and small industry of the colony. Why should the farmers of this colony, after having borne now four years of drought, be called upon to bolster up this industry? Why should the miners of North Queensland be called upon to do so? Are they not taxed heavily enough already? Then there are the railway employes and many others. The pastoral tenants have suffered, but they have borne it patiently, and why should not the others do the same? I think it would be a very serious thing indeed if such a motion were allowed to pass this House. The hon. member for Darling Downs, Mr. Kates, told us that some time ago he had a conversation with one of the iron-masters of this town, who told him that if they got a contract for locomotives they would have to import very expensive machinery and also a number of skilled mechanics to build the locomotives. Well, sir, I take it we have too many mechanics in the colony; and if we are to import more for this special work, what will be the consequence when a large contract for, say, fifty locomotives is completed if the Government is not prepared to enter into another? There will be a bigger hue-and-cry even than there is now. They would say, "You have encouraged this industry; we have imported expensive machinery and brought out first-class workmen to build these locomotives, and now we are idle; you must give us another order whether you want the locomotives or not." As to what was said by the hon. member who just sat down—that he had been told by one of the locomotive superintendents in Ipswich that the engines built there were better and cost less to keep in repair than any others—I can tell the hon. member that no part of them was made in the colony except the boilers. They are all made of duplicates which came from England. I trust the House will not commit itself to this motion. I am very sorry that the hon. member for Enoggera moved the amendment, for I would rather negative the motion right away. If there is any proof wanting, Mr. Speaker, that it is protection pure and simple it is to be found in the fact that the hon. member for Maryborough will not accept the amendment of the hon. member for Enoggera. I trust the House will carry the amendment by such a sweeping majority that no member will venture for a very long time indeed to introduce a protective motion in this House.

Mr. NORTON said: Mr. Speaker,—I do not think the House ought to consent to the motion being carried without the amendment. When no amendment had been proposed I was quite willing that the motion itself should be carried, because it has been the practice hitherto where a colonial tender was slightly higher than an English tender to give the advantage to the colonial tenderer. That has been done up to a certain extent, and I think it is desirable that the principle should be adhered to. Now, for the purpose of enabling foundry owners to go in for this sort of work, I think it is desirable to give the kind of assistance which was asked, I think, by Messrs. Forrester and Co., who spoke at one of the deputations which waited on the Minister for Works. It was then said that if they could get a certain advance on the first contract, they would then be in a position to put up the extra works required, which would enable them to carry out similar contracts in future without any advance. Now, that is a fair thing. Mind, it is not inducing people to come here and start new works altogether; we have foundries which could undertake the work with some additional expense, if they

had sufficient inducement. If, by giving them a higher price for the first batch of locomotives, we could induce them to extend their works, we might very well do so; but there it ought to end. I do not believe in going further than that. I would point out that, if this amendment is negative and the motion carried, it is most distinctly a motion in favour of protection.

Mr. KATES: No.

Mr. NORTON: But it is. I shall vote for the amendment, and if that is lost I shall decidedly vote against the original motion.

Mr. KATES: There is nothing in the motion.

Mr. NORTON: The amendment proposed is, that due regard is to be had to the rights of the general taxpayer. Now, if the Government are not to have this due regard to the rights of the general taxpayer—if we are to carry this motion with the distinct understanding that the rights of the general taxpayer are not to be considered—of course it is protection of the most distinct kind, and I am decidedly opposed to it. Now, I would like to draw attention to a paragraph that appeared in the *Courier* this morning, in a letter from its Sydney correspondent, which I think is very well worth noticing. He refers to the scientific and mechanical exhibition which has just been held in Sydney, and speaks of the number of exhibits that are not from local manufactories at all, but imported articles. He says:—

“Amongst the things on view is a model of a magnificent floating dock, which is now being constructed in England”—

Constructed in England, mind—

“to the order of the Atlas Ironworks Company, at a cost of about £200,000. When this model was being explained to me I reminded the gentleman who performed the service that the representatives of the Atlas Company were included in the deputation that waited on the Government some weeks ago to complain that contracts for ironwork that could be manufactured in the colony were given to British firms, and that it was strange that as the company possessed the appliances for constructing their dock at their own works on the Parramatta River, they did not do so. All that he could reply was that by giving the order for the dock to an English firm the company saved a very large sum of money. Precisely so. But a company that does this sort of thing with respect to manufactures that it requires for its own use should not make an outcry when the Government imitates its example.”

Now, I commend that paragraph to the attention of all hon. members who are not disposed to vote for the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Enoggera. There we have the very men who are agitating to have Government work done in the colony sending home to England when they want work done for themselves, though they are the men who do that class of work. I say, sir, I am quite prepared to take up the position I did the other day before this amendment was proposed, but beyond that I cannot go. I set my face most distinctly against protection, except for the mere purpose of helping people who are established here, or who will come here, to increase their establishments so as to carry out work it is desirable we should have done. I am quite willing that they should get a certain percentage to enable them to start, but nothing more. Whether they are in a position to carry on after that is their own business; if they cannot carry on without further protection, I say let their works be idle. I believe they could carry on when they once got started. Now, with respect to these locomotives made at Ipswich, we cannot regard them as a fair specimen of what can be done in the colony, because, as the hon. member for Aubigny explained, they were simply put together in Ipswich from duplicates which had been lying there for a long while. Before it could be put together a special order

had to be sent home for the parts that were wanted. When those parts arrived they were put together and answered remarkably well. According to the reports they may have cost a few pounds more than the others which have been imported, but very little more, although whether we can strictly rely upon the accuracy of those reports I am not perfectly certain. At any rate, I believe they work well, and that shows that if the separate parts are brought out they can be properly put together in the colony. I intend to support the amendment, and if the amendment is not carried I shall certainly oppose the original motion.

Mr. FRASER said: Mr. Speaker,—If the hon. member who moved this resolution had been prepared to accept the amendment of the hon. member for Enoggera, I should not have said a word on the subject. The fact that he has not done so strengthens the suspicion in my mind that there is something more in the resolution than appears on the face of it; and that suspicion is confirmed by the line of argument pursued by the hon. member in introducing his resolution. In his opening remarks he disclaimed any intention whatever of introducing the question of free-trade and protection; but, singularly enough, he began almost immediately to compare the condition of protected Victoria with that of unprotected New South Wales. If the hon. member's object had been merely to benefit the iron-workers, there was no occasion to introduce the resolution at all; for the deputation to which the hon. member for Port Curtis alluded, when they waited upon the Chief Secretary, obtained an assurance that the Government would give them, as far as was practicable, and as far as circumstances would justify them, the concession they required. Mr. Forrester, on that occasion, informed the Chief Secretary that if his firm, or any other firm in the city or elsewhere in the colony, had a contract given to them for something like twenty locomotives, he would guarantee that for the future they would turn out locomotives superior in quality and cheaper in price than the imported article. That that would be the case I am convinced from the experience of the firm so often alluded to in this debate—the Phoenix Foundry of Victoria. I am credibly informed that locomotives are turned out by that firm now considerably cheaper than they were imported from either England or from America; and that the uniform testimony of the engineers and drivers on the Victorian lines, where they are used, is that they are easier to work, require less repairing, and are in every respect a more efficient and superior article. It has been said that this foundry has a monopoly; but I am assured by persons who know the facts thoroughly well that the only monopoly they have is this: that they secure their contracts by fair tender; and they have not always been the successful tenderers. If similar results could be secured by similar means in Queensland, the Government would be fairly justified in making such a concession as that which is asked for. The hon. member said it would be necessary before contracts of this kind could be executed to bring skilled mechanics out from England or elsewhere to do the work. This, I think, is a mistake. Mr. Forrester is, I believe, an engine-builder of great practical experience, who has worked for years in some of the best workshops in Great Britain, and he states without any hesitation that they have all the skill that is required to turn out locomotives in a complete and thoroughly efficient manner. I must again express my surprise, if this is all that is wanted or meant by the hon. member for Maryborough, that he did not at once accept the amendment of the hon. member for Enoggera, which simply added to the resolution that “due

regard should be paid to the interests of the general taxpayer." Surely the hon. member would not press upon the House or the country any motion or measure which would be inimical to the interests of the taxpayers at large! I am not going to enter upon the question of freetrade and protection, beyond saying that it is a notorious fact, which cannot be disputed, that the protection of any branch of industry to such an extent as would satisfy protectionists must always be injurious to the interests of the taxpayers at large.

Mr. W. BROOKES: That is not our opinion.

Mr. FRASER: I know it is not the opinion of the hon. member for North Brisbane; but it is my opinion, and for that reason I shall support the amendment of the hon. member for Enoggera.

Mr. W. BROOKES: Before the question is put, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say—

The SPEAKER: The hon. member has already spoken.

Mr. SHERIDAN said: Mr. Speaker,—I do not wish that this very interesting debate should close without saying a few words on the subject—a subject in which I take great interest. I think the hon. member, Mr. Annear, has done very good service to the country in bringing forward this motion, and particularly for the excellent manner in which he has recommended it to the acceptance of the House. For my own part, I should have been perfectly satisfied to let the matter rest when the Minister for Works made a very favourable speech, promising the hon. member almost all that his motion asked for. Had it rested here the people of the country would have been very well satisfied; they would have seen that a Minister who takes a great interest in the matter had acquiesced almost entirely in what Mr. Annear had stated. With regard to the amendment of the hon. member for Enoggera, I do not see how it can clash with the motion, nor why it should not have been accepted by the mover at once. Of course every Government will pay due attention to the rights of the general taxpayer. I think it would be very unjust on the part of any Government to carry a motion in which they did not take into due consideration the interests of the taxpayers of the country. That the ironwork to which we allude can be made in the colony there is no doubt. There are magnificent foundries in Brisbane, and, as I understand, the proprietor of one of them states that in a very short time he will be quite prepared to tender for the manufacture of the ironwork for bridges and locomotives. There are also foundries in Maryborough, and I may say that one of those foundries is at this moment quite prepared to construct locomotives if they have the opportunity of doing so. The hon. member who introduced this motion did not, either in his speech or in the motion itself, suggest that skilled mechanics should be sent for from home. He merely stated that the proposal is made in order to keep the skilled mechanics we have now in the colony, and that they might continue to be employed in the colony. I believe that at this moment there are sufficient mechanics in the colony to carry out any contracts that may be let for locomotives and iron bridges. I hope the hon. member for Maryborough will accept the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Enoggera, and I hope it will pass without division. It is a matter which interests the whole colony, because the greatest benefit will be derived from keeping our money in the colony. We ought, therefore, to have all the work done here that we can. I am not a protectionist, but I think the time has not yet arrived when Queensland can enter into a policy

of freetrade. I, therefore, do hope, as I have already stated, that all that can possibly be done will be done to keep this work in the colony; that the amendment will be accepted by the mover of the motion, and that the motion, as amended, will pass without division.

Mr. MACFARLANE said: Mr. Speaker,—I have already spoken on this motion, but I wish to make a short explanation in reference to the statements made by the hon. member for Stanley (Mr. Kellett) and the hon. member for Port Curtis. In the course of the debate those hon. members stated that engines said to be made at the Ipswich workshops were only put together there by the workmen, the several parts thereof having been imported. That is not exactly correct. The engines were actually made in the Ipswich workshops with the exception of some work that could not be made by anybody in the colony if they got a contract for building locomotives, such as brass funnels and other brass fittings required for engines. With those exceptions the engines were made by the workmen in the Ipswich workshops, and I am in a position to state that they are the best three engines we have on our railways at the present day.

Mr. ANNEAR in reply said: Mr. Speaker,—In introducing this motion to this House I stated that I did not wish to discuss the question from the standpoint of protection *versus* freetrade. But that subject has been brought in by other hon. members during the debate, and they have been the means of the discussion drifting in the direction it has gone. I am still of the same opinion as I was when I introduced the motion—namely, that it has nothing whatever to do with protection or freetrade. It cannot in any way be called a protection motion, because the engines and the bridge-work, which I contend should be made in the colony, do not come under the tariff. No duties whatever are paid on those articles. I very much understated my case—as a rule people think I overstated it, but in bringing this question before the House I very much understated the arguments in its favour. As regards the construction of locomotives, I find that the largest locomotive manufactured in Victoria is 39 tons without the tender, while the largest in Queensland is 20 tons. The cost of a 39-ton engine in Victoria is £2,800, while the cost in this colony for a 20-ton engine is £2,200. It is quite true, as one hon. member remarked—the hon. member for South Brisbane, Mr. Fraser—that the locomotives now made in Victoria are equally as cheap as those imported from England or America. The hon. member for Aubigny stated just now that he thought we had too many people in this colony already.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I rise to a point of order. I did not say anything of the kind. I simply said that we have too many skilled mechanics, as we cannot find employment for them.

Mr. ANNEAR: I admit the hon. gentleman said we have too many skilled mechanics in the colony. I am of opinion that we have not one-twentieth part enough to carry out those works we have in contemplation, and for which the colony has gone to the London market to borrow money. The hon. gentleman said that, having so many of these men in the colony, if we brought more out there would be nothing for them to do. When locomotives were first introduced in England, the old women said, "Good gracious, what will we do now with our horses?" But there was far more work for the horses to do afterwards than before. The argument of the hon. member seems to me very absurd. I have been in the colony for twenty-three years, and what has taken place during that time? Wages and everything are

better now than they were twenty-three years ago, and, in my opinion, if we go on progressing during the next twenty years as we have done during the past twenty they will still further improve. Bringing people into the colony does not make it poorer; it makes it richer in every way. I am very well satisfied with the debate as far as it has gone. I think hon. members generally have discussed the question in a fair and intelligent spirit with two exceptions. Those two exceptions are the junior member for Enoggera and the junior member for Fortitude Valley. Those two gentlemen have declared themselves freetraders to the backbone. In my opinion, there is not a freetrade colony in all Australia. The Colonial Treasurer of this colony, who says he is a freetrader, is, I think, about the greatest protectionist we have. I would venture to say to the two hon. members to whom I have just referred, that a larger reading of the facts of history, and a greater respect for people who have arrived at conclusions different from theirs, will in course of time lead them to wider views and a more correct understanding of what is required in the circumstances of Queensland. Authorities have been freely quoted by them on the freetrade side. I may be permitted to follow their exampleshortly in support of the principle of my motion, and I scarcely think hon. members will dispute the authorities which I shall bring forward, or treat them lightly or in a contemptuous way. I will go back to the beginning of the history of the United States as an independent nation, when it was in the same position as we are now, having a great territory with very few people in it; and will quote the opinions of some of its distinguished men. I quote now from a lecture delivered in the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce, in the year 1879, by a most eminent citizen of Brisbane.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What is his name?

MR. ANNEN: His name is the Honourable William Brookes, the junior member for North Brisbane. That is the name of the lecturer, but the words are given by that gentleman as quotations from other authorities:—

"I suppose it will be admitted that the men who framed the constitution of the United States were great men, who framed, advocated, and secured the adoption of the Federal constitution—who ruled the country throughout the next generation, and thus laid the foundations of the national policy of the United States—were not manufacturers, not personally interested in any form of handicraft; they were connected, directly or indirectly, with agriculture, which was then not merely the chief, but the sole reliance of nine-tenths of the people."

I wish to impress this on hon. members: When hon. members speak about the construction of locomotives and bridge-work, they take it that the work is confined to those people who work at those different trades exclusively; but that is not the case. Those people become consumers and bring trade to the agriculturists and the general producers throughout the colony.

"These great statesmen all but unanimously suggested and commended the fostering of home manufactures by placing protective duties on the productions of foreign rivals. They undoubtedly believed that they were thus promoting the welfare of American agriculture, and securing to the farmers a more assured and constant and a larger recompense for their labour, by creating nearer, steadier, and better markets for their produce. Washington was all his life an extensive and practical farmer, never personally interested in manufactures at all. In his first Annual Message, January 8, 1790, he says:—'The safety and interest of the people require that they should promote such manufactures as tend to render them independent of others for essential, particularly for military supplies.' Congress responded on January 15, 1790, a week afterwards, by ordering:—'That it be referred to the Secretary of the Treasury to propose and report to this House a proper plan or plans, conformably to the recommendation of the President in his speech to both Houses of the

Congress, for the encouragement and promotion of such manufactures as will tend to render the United States independent of other nations for essential, particularly for military supplies.' The Secretary thus appealed to was Alexander Hamilton, not a small man for even those days of giants, and never, so far as Horace Greeley says he has heard, engaged in the manufacture of either horn gun-flints, or bass-wood pumpkin seeds, or wooden nutmegs. Hamilton took his time to consider the matter, but at length, December 5th, 1791, responded in a report which remains to this day a landmark in United States history. In the introductory paragraph he says:—

"The embarrassments which have obstructed the progress of our external trade have led to serious reflections on the necessity of enlarging the sphere of our domestic commerce. The restrictive regulations which in foreign markets abridge the vent for the increasing surplus of our agricultural produce, serve to beget the earnest desire that a more extensive demand for that surplus may be created at home; and the complete success which has rewarded manufacturing enterprise in some valuable branches, conspiring with the promising symptoms which attend some less mature essays in others, justify a hope that the obstacles to the growth of this species of industry are less formidable than they were apprehended to be, and that it is not difficult to find in its further extension a full indemnification for any external disadvantages which are or may be experienced, as well as an accession of resources favourable to national independence and safety."

"In adjusting the duties on imports to the objects of revenue, the influence of the tariff on manufactures will necessarily present itself for consideration. However wise the theory may be which leaves to the sagacity and interest of individuals the application of their industry and resources, there are in this, as in all other cases, exceptions to the general rule. Besides the condition, which the theory itself implies, of a reciprocal adoption by other nations (do not forget that this was written December 5, 1815, more than sixty-five years since), experience teaches that so many circumstances must concur in introducing and maturing manufacturing establishments, especially of the more complicated kinds, that a country may remain long without them although sufficiently advanced, and in some respects even peculiarly fitted for carrying them on with success. In selecting the branches more especially entitled to the public adoption, a preference is obviously claimed by such as will relieve the United States from dependence on foreign supplies, ever subject to casual failures, for articles necessary for the public defence, or connected with the primary wants of individuals. It will be an additional recommendation for particular manufactures when the materials for them are extensively drawn from our agriculture, and consequently impart to that great fund of national prosperity and independence an encouragement which cannot fail to be rewarded."

These were the sentiments that prevailed with the founders of America. I could quote several other passages from this pamphlet, but hon. members are well aware of the rapid strides and the great advancement that country has made. In 1790, when the population of the United States was less than 200,000, their progress had begun to excite the jealousy of English manufacturers. I quote this authority; and if I am incorrect I hope the junior member for Enoggera will correct me. Bishop, the historian of America, says:—

"It was supposed to be an object worth large sacrifices on the part of the English manufacturers to break down the formidable rivalry of growing manufacturers in America by means of heavy consignments of goods to be sold by auction upon the most liberal terms and credit to the merchants. That this policy had the approval of eminent English statesmen is shown in the remarkable words of Lord Brougham, soon after the peace of 1815, in reference to the losses sustained by English manufacturers in these transactions—that it was even worth while to incur a loss upon the first exportation in order, by the glut, to stifle in the cradle these rising manufactures in the United States, which the war had fore-d into existence contrary to the natural course of things."

We have all seen what has been the result of adopting that policy in America; and it has been stated by hon. members of this House that that was the policy adopted by our forefathers in England. At one time England was a protectionist country—until she brought her manufactures into prominence before the world, and then she adopted

what is now called a freetrade policy. In speaking on this motion the Minister for Works stated that there would have to be a monopoly in the colony in the construction of locomotives. Well, sir, I do not think that. I know there are several firms in this colony who have already tendered for and constructed bridge-work in this colony; and should tenders be called for locomotives they will construct them also. I do not take much notice of what was said about the three small locomotives already constructed in the colony. Though they were not as great a success as they should have been, the contractors entering into this undertaking will be fully prepared to carry it out, and will be under Government supervision. In the construction of locomotives at Ipswich the Government were both manufacturers and supervisors; but if contractors take the work, I am sure there is sufficient ability in the railway department of this colony to see that we get as good work carried out here as the Government of Victoria have got performed for them by the Phoenix Foundry at Ballarat. The hon. member for Burke referred to the Hawkesbury Bridge in New South Wales. He said that tenders were called for that bridge and a tender was accepted outside the colony. I am aware that tenders were called in England and America, and in New South Wales, but there was such a vast difference between the tenders that it was impossible for any Government to accept the colonial tender; and I am sure that if colonial and English tenders for locomotives are out of proportion in the same way, no Government would be justified in accepting a tender when it would be so disadvantageous to the taxpayers of the colony. But an American firm got that bridge to construct over the Hawkesbury River. The Colonial Treasurer saw with me in Victoria in January last a large bridge over the Werribee River, a tressel bridge which came from America. That was the first of the kind imported into the Australian colonies. They now have a similar bridge on the same line of railway, but it was constructed in the colony. They called tenders for the second one, and they accepted a Victorian tender. By the introduction of the first one they could see what class of bridge it was, and were able to copy it. We have seen that the Parliament of Victoria has lately had before it a Bill for the construction of £300,000 worth of rolling-stock, and they have passed it through all its stages. The Victorians are a far-seeing people, and although some hon. members have tried to underrate Victoria I can assure them that it is the wealthiest and the most progressive of all the Australian colonies. The policy adopted there is a policy by which the people are in a state of affluence and contentment. Now, the hon. member for Townsville (Mr. Brown) said he hoped that no Government would give 100 or 50 per cent. more to have work done in the colony, and I am quite sure every hon. member hopes the same. The hon. gentleman also used the words, "to have them constructed in Brisbane." Well, why can locomotives not be constructed in Townsville? If there had been a foundry in Townsville, why could the Ross Creek Bridge not have been constructed there? When tenders were called for the cylinders for the Burrum Bridge on the railway line from Maryborough to Bundaberg, Messrs. Smith, Forrester, and Co. obtained the contract, but the cylinders were transferred to and made by John Walker and Co., of Maryborough, in 7-foot lengths, the circle 7 feet in diameter, and all in one piece. All the cylinders we import from home come out in segments, but these cylinders were made in one piece. I have seen cylinders made in Maryborough with planed flanges, beautifully made, and 50 feet in diameter. It is not

impossible. There is no machinery which we require for the public service of the colony that cannot be made in the colony. Now, the hon. Colonial Treasurer made a peculiar speech on this motion. He seemed to say one thing and mean another, but he used these words: "It cannot be expected that the Government at all times will find work to keep the shops going." Does this resolution of mine ask the Government to do that? Does it ask the Government to make an effort to do one single bit of work that is not required? Do we not require locomotives on our railways? Don't we require rolling-stock for our railways; don't we require iron bridges not only for our railways but for our roads and rivers? And we are at the present time getting them from England, Belgium, and America. This motion simply asks the Government, seeing the number of skilled mechanics we have in the colony, to see that they are kept properly employed. There is one other very good reason in favour of passing this motion, and that is the severe seasons we have passed through. Notwithstanding those seasons, what has been the result? We have increased the population of the colony by 100,000 in five years. Is the Parliament of this colony not to advance with the times? Are we to remain dormant? Are we to do nothing to establish factories, or foundries, or shops, so that the youths who are growing up in our schools may have places to go to in which to learn a trade? The hon. member for Townsville (Mr. Macrossan) said I might have given some information as regards the number of men employed in the construction of rolling-stock, and in the iron trade throughout the colony. Well, I have tried to get that information, and although I am not prepared to say that the figures are absolutely accurate, I think they are pretty nearly so. I find that there are about 3,000 men and boys employed in the iron trade throughout the colony. I may remark that at the present time we are constructing rolling-stock 100 per cent. cheaper than when we first began. That is perfectly true. The first 100 waggons that were tendered for were made by Mr. Benjamin Babbidge at £69 per wagon, and his sons have since taken a contract to supply twenty waggons of a similar class at £34 per wagon; and I venture to say that the same result will follow if we encourage the construction of locomotives and other rolling-stock. We are now making rolling-stock in the way of waggons, trucks, and hoppers for the carriage of coal, cheaper than they are made in any other of the Australian colonies, but if we had followed out the system that some hon. members now advocate there never would have been any rolling-stock made here. By giving it a fair start—by the Government fostering the industry to a small extent now—we will be able to turn out all classes of rolling-stock in the future 100 per cent. cheaper than we do now. The hon. junior member for Enoggera (Mr. Bulcock) used these words: "If we adopt this motion it is protection to one class. How will the adoption of the motion benefit the carpenters and bricklayers?" And he further said that working men would look upon the giving of such work to them as a matter of charity. Well, if a factory has to be erected, bricklayers have to be employed, carpenters and various other tradesmen have to be employed in the erection of the buildings. Supposing some of our important buildings are burnt down they have to be re-erected, but the work I speak of is new work. Only the other day the meat-preserving works at Lake's Creek were destroyed by fire and had to be rebuilt. Was that not work for carpenters, bricklayers, and various other mechanics? In my opinion, when we

talk about freetrade and protection, there is no comparison between England and these colonies. The hon. the junior member for Fortitude Valley made a speech on this question. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not here, but he will read what I have got to say. My opinion is that his speech was the speech of a bookworm. The matter it contained was as bald as things were in the days of Noah; and the little nursery rhymes and children's tales which the hon. gentleman gave us would, in my opinion, have been better kept for the children. They do not come within the range of practical politics. The hon. gentleman last Saturday week went up to Bundamba to address the coal-miners there; I refer to this in connection with the doctrine laid down by that hon. member. They say they are freetraders. Well, the hon. gentleman made a speech to the coal-miners, and he said—and I quite agree with him—that the coal-miners should not work more than eight hours a day. No man should work more than that in this colony. How does the hon. gentleman uphold that by the doctrine of freetrade? If he wanted 100 tons of coal and found that in New South Wales, where the miners work nine and ten hours a day, he could get it 3d. a ton cheaper than here, he would go to Newcastle for the coal. That was very inconsistent. If the Government of this colony were to adopt the same principle we should have no work for coal-miners; there would be very little profit for coal proprietors. But by the adoption of the principle embraced in my motion what do we do? We add largely to the consumption of coal, find plenty of work for the miners, and add largely to the dividends of the coal proprietors. The hon. member for Mackay (Mr. Black) referred to the great depression at the present time in the iron trade. No doubt there is a great depression in the iron trade, and there will be a still greater depression when we see the work now coming to a completion which has been carried on in various places for the Harbours and Rivers Department of the colony. I have seen in Maryborough two foundries engaged almost exclusively in the manufacture of machinery for our sugar industry. But at the present time, owing, I believe, to the low price of sugar and to the depression that exists, that industry is much depressed. They are giving no fresh orders for machinery, and I believe that there is plenty of sugar machinery for sale in different parts of the colony. Such being the case, it is the duty of the Government and of Parliament to do all they can to assist the iron industry, at the same time paying due regard to the rights of the general taxpayer. I would not ask any Government to do anything without a due regard for the interests of the general taxpayers. But I have my own way of thinking about that. Some say that unless the engines could be manufactured here within a shilling of what they would cost in England we should go to England for them. But I say we should go beyond that a little bit to encourage the commencement of this industry. The hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Salkeld, made a most convincing remark after having just returned from a visit to England. That hon. gentleman referred to the position occupied in the Colonial and Indian Exhibition by Canada and Victoria. Canada is represented there as a manufacturing country with exhibits of manufactures in every branch of trade. Victoria is the same. Queensland did not show much machinery; but one firm in the colony showed a quartz-crushing plant which was so much admired that they received an order from England to send quartz-crushing machinery to that country. I must say I do not believe in going to a vote on this question without what I call

finishing it in a proper and manly manner. I do not believe in any cringing way of doing things. If this question is defeated, I shall know that I have done what I considered to be my duty. I have been very much surprised during this debate to see the opposition which this motion has received from hon. gentlemen who outside this House tell their constituents especially that they are the representatives of the labouring and mechanical classes. If they are the representatives of the labouring and mechanical classes truly—truly believing in doing all they can for their interest—I am sure they can have no objection to vote for my resolution. What does my resolution contain? It merely says “that the time has arrived when an effort should be made”—there is nothing definite in that, Mr. Speaker—“that an effort should be made by the Government to encourage the manufacture within the colony of locomotives and all rolling-stock.” I am sure, Mr. Speaker, if the present Government went out of office next week, and the Opposition came into power, that they would make the same effort, at the same time having due regard to the interests of the general taxpayer. I do not think I need detain the House any longer. I have no intention to withdraw my motion; but I have no objection to adding to it the words, “having due regard to the interests of the general taxpayers.”

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. member has endeavoured to make out that I stated that to encourage the manufacture of locomotives here would lead to a monopoly. I said nothing of the sort. What I stated was this: That the plant required to do this particular work, I understood, would cost about £20,000, and that it would be necessary in order to encourage any firm to begin building locomotives that they should have a monopoly—that is, that they should have an order for forty locomotives. Since that time I have had an opportunity of meeting a gentleman who is manager of the ironworks at Ballarat, and I got some information from him. He assured me that it would require about £20,000 for the plant to enable any firm to commence the manufacture of locomotives. He assured me that they do now and could turn out locomotives at about 10 per cent. over the English prices. Now, I am quite sure that not only this Government but any other Government would be very glad indeed if they could manufacture locomotives at a cost of not more than 10 per cent. over the English price. I am not going to follow the apostle of protection—Mr. Annear—but I have come to this conclusion, and it has been brought very strongly under my observation lately by the daily applications for employment in the Railway Department, and chiefly from farmer's sons. The other day application was made to me for employment in the Railway Department, and I said, “Why do you not follow the occupation of your father—that of agriculture?” The reply was to the effect that they were educated above it! I think something will have to be done to encourage the establishment of manufactures in the colonies so as to be able to find these young fellows employment. I do not care whether it is called protection or anything else, but I believe it would lead to the benefit of the colony if we endeavoured to get firms to establish manufactures in the colony so as to find employment for these young men to go into. I do not think there would be any harm in voting for the amendment of the hon. gentleman, the junior member for Enoggera, because I myself would be very loth indeed to pay from 20 to 80 per cent. more for the colonial article, and that



is exactly what it comes to. The Government have endeavoured to do all they possibly can to encourage local firms to tender for bridges or for the supply of plant for railway carriages. We called for tenders for lamps, and there was a difference of from 20 per cent. to 80 per cent. in favour of the imported article. Since that time we have again invited tenders for the material for the iron bridges which will be required on the South Coast Railway; so that, at any rate, the Government have endeavoured to give every encouragement to local firms; but I do not think we would be acting fairly and justly with the public if we gave 50 per cent. or 60 per cent. over and above what this material can be imported for.

**THE HON. J. M. MACROSSAN:** The hon. gentleman who has moved this motion says he does not intend to withdraw it. By taking that course he puts several hon. members in this House, who would be inclined to vote for it, in the position that they will be compelled to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Enoggera; but at the same time he says that he is quite prepared to endorse the amendment moved by that hon. gentleman—"due regard at the same time being paid to the rights of the general taxpayer."

**THE PREMIER:** He accepted the amendment.

**THE HON. J. M. MACROSSAN:** I understood him to say quite the reverse—that he did not. If it comes to a division I shall certainly vote for the amendment.

**MR. ANNEAR:** I just merely wish to add these words to my motion, "due regard at the same time being paid to the rights of the general taxpayer."

Amendment put and passed.

Question, as amended, put and passed.

#### FREE EXCHANGE OF PRODUCTS BETWEEN THE AUSTRALASIAN COLONIES.

On the Order of the Day being read for the resumption of the debate on Mr. Donaldson's motion—

"That in the opinion of this House the time has arrived when free exchange of products should exist between the Australasian colonies"—

upon which the Colonial Treasurer had moved "the previous question"—which stood adjourned (under sessional order of 14th July last) at 7 p.m. of Thursday, the 9th instant—

**MR. FOOTLE** said: Mr. Speaker,—I was speaking upon this motion last night, when the House rose at 6 o'clock, and I had not quite finished my remarks, and I have been called upon rather unexpectedly to do so this afternoon. When the House rose, I was just alluding—or had just alluded—to the fact that there was a great quantity of goods manufactured in Victoria, that colony being a producing colony, and a colony which was now producing a great deal more than it could possibly consume, both by way of manufacture and also from natural growth. I also pointed out that the colony of Victoria must of necessity find markets for her surplus produce, and that it would be very convenient to her to find a colony like Queensland, which could not produce what it required, in scarcely any form. There is another point, Mr. Speaker. The Victorians are known to be very smart men of business, and it was shown some few months ago that there had been some—if not frauds—at any rate

some very sharp practice, in connection with drawbacks on goods that had been manufactured in that colony and sent to New South Wales and elsewhere. If the proposition were carried out, that there should be an intercolonial tariff, and all those articles which were read out by the Treasurer last evening were included in it, it would necessitate this colony altering the whole of its tariff system; and not only so, but whilst we are prepared to give freetrade on one side, we would be taking away the whole of our revenue on the other. Therefore, taxation would have to be raised in other directions. It would simply be taking money out of one pocket, as it were, and putting it into the other, with this very great difference, that we should be undermining the resources of the colony of Queensland. There would be nothing, Mr. Speaker, to prevent sharp men of business from importing all that we require from England or Europe, and receiving it in bond in Victoria, and sending it to Queensland, thereby diverting the trade that Queensland has now with England, and in fact underselling us in every respect. It would do away with, I may say, almost the whole of our revenue, because we are in the habit of importing all those articles read by the Colonial Treasurer last night from time to time. I certainly do not see my way to support the hon. gentleman's motion. I have my own ideas of an intercolonial tariff, but at the present time I do not see that Queensland is in a position to go into it. We have very little to offer to them in exchange for the very great abundance which they profess to have, and which they require us to take. As the Treasurer has already remarked, it appears to be a very one-sided bargain. The subject of wines, Mr. Speaker, was referred to, and that is certainly an item which can be accepted. There are some things which we can exchange in a very limited degree, if the House thinks fit, and wine would be one of those things which we might exchange, with perhaps some degree of profit to ourselves, as well as to the colony of Victoria. I am not one of those who think that the wines made in Queensland are generally bad. There are some very good wines made in the colony—notably, at Ipswich, and a few years ago there were some very good samples made at Warwick; but I have been told since that the quality of these wines has deteriorated considerably—that they have not maintained their prestige, and have altogether lost ground. There is another vineyard which I believe is one of the best in Queensland, and that is at Roma, which is a very fine wine-growing district. If this could be carried out, although these wines would be brought into competition with other wines introduced at a cheaper rate, I think it would have a very beneficial effect. Competition in this class of trade would cause persons to be particular about their wines, and to strive to produce a good article. They would have to do so because, if they could not compete in quality as well as in price, they would be placed at a very great disadvantage. There is another point to be considered in reference to wine, and that is that wine is a very much better beverage than either malt liquor, whisky, or any other of the beverages used in the colony of Queensland. I think that from climatic reasons; and I believe that if wine was as cheap as beer, the people of Queensland would use it instead of beer. That would be a very great advantage, as we should not have anything like so much drunkenness in the land as we have. It would have a very beneficial influence from a teetotal point of view, as there are many persons who cannot be cured of their habits of drinking altogether who might be induced to lessen them in a great degree. There is another article which

this colony might exchange with Victoria. We might take wheat from Victoria without duty, and it would be of very considerable advantage to Queensland to do so. That subject was very fairly discussed the other evening, and I think we had all the solid argument on our side. The discussion went to show that the duty is simply prohibitory to this extent: It simply means that we say we will not have the wheat ground in the colony of Queensland, and that all the labour of the grinding of wheat into the flour we use shall be done outside the colony. It is really of no advantage to this colony; it does not protect the farmer or, indeed, any other persons, with the exception of a few solitary millers. Those are the only persons it benefits—persons who, I believe, keep their constituents, the farmers, in a state of semi-slavery. They will do that until the farmers' eyes are opened to the position they are in, and they will wonder when they wake up that they have been so long deceived. Upon the whole, though I should like to support the hon. member in his motion, I cannot see my way clear to do so at the present time. We are placed in this position at the present time in Queensland—that we should have all to lose, and Victoria would be the gainer by such a system. If, by introducing such a system, there would be equal advantages on both sides, I could support the motion most heartily; but, at the present time, so far as my lights lead me to see, the introduction of such a system would not be of advantage to the colony of Queensland.

Mr. KATES said: Mr. Speaker,—I did not intend to speak upon this particular motion, but I must take exception to the remarks of the hon. member who has just sat down. The hon. gentleman is going too far altogether. He is forgetting himself, and talking a lot of rubbish about a matter he does not understand. He has brought up the question of wheat again to air his eloquence upon a subject he knows nothing about. He has had the impudence to say that the millers of the Darling Downs keep the farmers in slavery.

Mr. FOOTE: Hear, hear!

Mr. KATES: I deny it. I have been returned by the farmers of Darling Downs four times, and if I really kept them in slavery they would not send me here.

Mr. FOOTE: Their eyes will be opened yet.

Mr. KATES: I have done more good for the Darling Downs farmers than the hon. gentleman ever did in his life for the Ipswich farmers; and if the hon. gentleman doubts that let him come up to the Darling Downs. I can tell him, if he does, he will get a very hot reception from those same farmers. It was not my intention to discuss this question, but the hon. gentleman takes every opportunity of rising in this House to attack the millers and insult the farmers of Darling Downs. I pointed out when the subject was last discussed that taking the duty off wheat would be a great benefit to me personally; I should make a lot of money by it; but I will not in the face of the wishes of the farmers agree to it this year or perhaps next year, though what I may do thereafter I do not know. The hon. gentleman also attacks the wine-growers of Warwick, and said the wine there was no good. The wine made there is excellent. One man there named Kircher, who makes the "Asmanshausen" brand of wine, cannot supply the demand of the Brisbane market for it. He cannot get the wine aged enough. That is the best brand of wine made in the colony of Queensland, and is even better than the wine made at Ipswich. The hon. gentleman

should keep himself entirely to Ipswich and work for Ipswich and Bundamba, and leave the Darling Downs members to do their own work. We are responsible to our own constituents, and we are not afraid to meet them. I can assure you, sir, that so long as I like to have a seat in this House I can get it from the Darling Downs farmers. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman can say the same thing.

Mr. FOOTE: I would be sorry to go to the Darling Downs.

Mr. PALMER said: Mr. Speaker,—I do not think there has been much light thrown upon the subject by the war of words we have just listened to between the hon. members for Darling Downs and Bundamba. It has been perhaps a little advertisement for them. That wine "maketh glad the heart of man" did not appear to be generally received with such favour in Warwick as it was in Ipswich. To return to the question before the House, I was much pleased to hear the hon. member for Warrego say several times he was a freetrader, because I can assure him that from his speech I would come to the opposite conclusion. There is not the slightest doubt that his speech favoured a policy quite distinct from a freetrade one. For instance, he said that a freetrade colony, situated in the midst of other colonies committed to a protective policy, would suffer in trade and prosperity. I came to the conclusion that the very opposite would be the result. The freetrade colony would receive the products from the protective colonies over and above their production at a much less rate than would pay in the other colonies. It is a fact that such is the case. For instance, goods produced in New Zealand, where they are very highly protected, are sold in Sydney at a far lower rate than they are sold to New Zealand consumers, consequently the New Zealand consumers are actually paying to provide the New South Wales people with cheaper goods; and the same is the case in Victoria. Now, it is always with great suspicion that I see a colony like Victoria, which has always, in pursuance of what I consider a selfish policy, endeavoured to prevent the produce of other colonies coming in free—it is with great suspicion that I see her throw out feelers, as it were, to get the trade of the other colonies. They have tried it with Tasmania, and I look upon this almost as a feeler from Victoria, for the hon. gentleman who moved it is a Victorian. I cannot see what advantage Queensland would gain by it. Look at the exports from this colony; take the tables connected with the Colonial Treasurer's Financial Statement, and let hon. members look down the list on page 17 and see in what way Queensland would be benefited if Victoria passed special tariff regulations to receive these goods. With all our main productions we deal outside Victoria—we deal with the outer world. Take gold first, which is a very large export; we are not sending any to Victoria or to any other colony. Silver-ore likewise, copper-ore, tin-ore—all these are very large exports, and our market for them is outside Victoria—outside Australia altogether. Following the list down—pearl-shell, preserved meat, tallow, timber—we come to wool, the largest of all, £1,779,000. No matter what alterations Victoria makes in her tariff, it would not affect our exports; we stand in a superior position to Victoria in that regard. The only exception is sugar, £720,000. Now, suppose the Victorian tariff were altered so that Queensland sugar was admitted at a differential rate; by-and-by the Victorian consumers would be satisfied, and the gap would be filled up with Queensland sugar. Then the planters would be in just the same position as they were before; they would have

to look afield for a further market. Now, looking at our imports, I cannot see anything produced in Victoria that would benefit Queensland; our trade is with the outer world. Since we have dealt through the B.I.S.N. Company direct with Europe, we are superior to the inter-colonial trade. Now, this motion refers to inter-colonial freetrade, but it should have been called intercolonial protection—that is about the sum-total of it; that we should trade between ourselves and shut out all European produce. I cannot see why we should favour the manufacturer in Geelong, and disregard the claims of the manufacturer in Manchester, or Leeds, or anywhere else. I think the one has as good a claim on our market as the other. New South Wales stands in the same position as Brisbane does; 85 per cent. of her produce finds a market outside the colonies altogether. Ten per cent. of the remainder is made up of coal, gold, and stock, and these are articles that Victoria must receive; and the other 5 per cent. is very small. That is the reason it is not worth while for New South Wales to enter into a commercial treaty with Victoria; and Queensland stands in the same position. Our Queensland stock is taxed to go into Victoria, and so is everything else we produce; but the Treasurer's tables show that it is a matter of indifference to us whether they are taxed or not. Whether the time has arrived or not for entering into a reciprocity treaty, or whether it has passed, it does not seem to our advantage to enter into it now; unless it should come in this way, that all the colonies should combine and extend the same to Great Britain. There would be some force in it if Great Britain and her colonies were to combine in a freetrade policy. If the revenue were to suffer then, of course we would have to do as New South Wales is doing now, and as Great Britain does—resort to an income-tax and a land-tax; and the day that will see that arrive and our ports free to the world, will, I am certain, be a day of prosperity to all the colonies. The fact that the reciprocity treaty between Victoria and Tasmania fell through should be a warning to us to look well to the terms of any agreement that might be offered to us. If they have established a selfish policy, I do not see why we should not in such a matter as this look after ourselves, and even if the bargain were made, see that we got the best of it.

Mr. NORTON said: Mr. Speaker,—For my part I am inclined to favour the idea of freetrade between all the Australasian colonies; but I would much prefer to see it established between Great Britain and her colonies, as was mentioned by the hon. member for Burke; and I would still further prefer to see it established between all English-speaking people. But I do not see that this motion of the hon. member for Warrego could do any practical good even if it were carried. If we consider the position of the Australasian colonies at the present time, we must see that there is no possibility of a free interchange of goods such as the motion suggests. We have just raised our taxation scheme here with the consent of a majority of the House; in New South Wales they have just put on an *ad valorem* duty of 5 per cent.; in Victoria they are protected up to their eyes, and they are always calling out for more protection, and getting it; in South Australia they have also gone in for a protective policy like that of Victoria; in New Zealand they are protected up to their eyes also—the South Australian policy, by the way, is taken more from New Zealand than from Victoria. Now, what possibility is there of a motion like this having any practical effect, when we find that all the colonies—at any rate this colony, New South Wales, and South Australia—have increased their

tariffs within the last year? Victoria in some respects has increased hers also. I do not know if there have been any changes in New Zealand recently; at any rate, her tariff is very high, and there is very little prospect of its being reduced. I think, therefore, it is unreasonable to suppose that there is the slightest prospect, even if a motion like this were carried, of reciprocity being agreed to. With regard to that proposed reciprocity treaty between Victoria and Tasmania, there was no free interchange of goods there, except in the narrowest sense. There was to be free interchange up to a certain point. Tasmania was to send certain of her goods free into Victoria, and Victoria was to send ten times as many of her goods free into Tasmania. Victoria was to have the lion's share of it; and I am certain that if a treaty really came to be considered between Victoria and this colony, or any other colony, she would want exactly the same large proportion for herself as she did in the treaty drafted with Tasmania. Much as I should like to see a free interchange of goods, it is quite beyond our hope at the present time. At any rate, if it is not, all the colonies that have been increasing their tariffs will have to retire from the position they have lately taken up and confess they have made a mistake. With regard to the matter of wines, I think the difficulty respecting wines made in Queensland arises from the fact that those who are engaged in the industry do not really understand how to make them. The hon. member for Bundamba spoke about the Roma wines being the best. Within the last twelve months I had a conversation with an expert—a man who had been a wine-grower all his life, and his father before him—who had been examining the vineyards about Roma, and also some near Ipswich; and he told me that, although in some vineyards—he particularly mentioned Mount Abundance, near Roma—although a great deal of money had been spent in really trying to make a good wine, there was not one where the art of successfully making it was thoroughly understood—those engaged in the business had not the requisite knowledge. We ought to make as good wine in Queensland as in any of the other colonies. In all of them it was just as bad at first as it is with us now; and even in New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia at present, although there is some excellent wine made in those colonies, there is a lot of it that is awful rubbish. I can hardly support the motion, because it cannot have any practical result, and I would advise the hon. member to withdraw it. All the advantage likely to be derived from it will be by the discussion which it has provoked.

Mr. ISAMBERT said: Mr. Speaker,—I have only a few words to say on this motion. The hon. member for Warrego ought to see by this time that his motion is merely the embodiment of a dream which may never be realised. To have reciprocity there must be some similarity of tariff; and before entering into such a treaty with Victoria this colony must protect her industries as Victoria protects hers. Otherwise we shall be heavily handicapped, and Victoria will have greatly the best of the bargain. The motion is chiefly brought forward in the interests of the sugar industry. Those who are interested in the sugar industry may as well make up their minds at once that we shall not sacrifice other industries for the sake of bolstering up that one industry. The sugar industry can be, I have no doubt, greatly benefited by sensible legislation, but not in this direction. However much some hon. members may denounce the system of giving bounties, they must not run away with the idea that the rulers of the countries where that system prevails are such fools as not to know what they are doing. They are simply

taking the money out of one pocket and putting it into the other. The system enables the sugar-grower to sell his produce and get cash for it in return, but the money paid as bounty never leaves the country. To men who do not think deeply upon this system of giving bounties, it seems to be a ruinous one; but those who examine into the subject thoroughly see that, at no real cost to the country, it places the sugar industry in a flourishing condition, and enables it to compete successfully with other sugar-producing countries which have the assistance of servile or slave labour. Sugar produced by cheap labour can never compete successfully against sugar protected by the system of State bounties. Hon. members ought to treat this subject with less levity than they usually exhibit when it is brought under their notice. It is painful, also, to see with what levity they speak about our wine industry. The wine-growers are not to be blamed because their wine is not so good as it ought to be. Even in those countries where good wine has been produced for centuries, it has been found necessary to establish agricultural colleges, to investigate the causes of that excellence, and to study how to make that excellence more general. If hon. members would advocate the establishment of an agricultural college, some encouragement would be given to those who are engaged in the wine industry. And then if—at the end of a long series of inquiries and experiments—good wine could not be produced in the colony, let the industry be abolished. We harass the vigneron with duties which are not imposed for protection but for revenue, and the vigneron does not follow up his avocation with the heart he would otherwise do. In Victoria they never dreamed of disturbing the wine industry in such a way. On the contrary, wealthy men took the wine industry in hand and greatly assisted its development. If we had a more paternal and more careful Government, when such difficulties arise through the depression of any industry as have occurred here, instead of taking mere negative measures they would adopt positive steps, investigate the true cause of the depression, and also devise means to alleviate the depression. It cannot be expected that Parliament or members of this Chamber should know all about it. On the Continent, where they have perhaps abler men than we have here and statesmen with a greater pedigree, they do not think themselves above taking the advice of those who know most about the subject. They seek the advice of people who are interested in the industries which are depressed, and endeavour to find out proper remedies for the depression. But if we have merely negative measures introduced we shall be landed in such a state of depression that we shall not be relieved by many such seasons as the present. The sooner hon. members understand that the present depression is not to be attributed to dry seasons alone the better. The cause lies much deeper. All our industries are depressed, complaints come from every direction, and there is no confidence. Ordinarily speaking, with such fine seasons as we have now, confidence should return; but it has not returned. Our markets are overstocked with importations, our productive industries are lying dormant, and, instead of encouraging our industries, our fiscal arrangements rather operate against them; they encourage foreign industries to the detriment of our own. I contend that Queensland is producing good wine, though not in such large quantities as the other colonies are producing it. Perhaps our neighbours produce a superior article, as they have had a longer experience. Wine-making is a very difficult subject, and many experiments have to be made to find out the proper kind of

grapes for wine purposes, and the proper soil for their culture. It would be far better to encourage this industry than to endanger it every year in the way we have done hitherto.

Mr. DONALDSON said: Mr. Speaker,—I have no intention of going over the whole of this question again. I find that the feeling of the House at the present time is not in favour of intercolonial reciprocity, either on a freetrade or a protection basis. From the speeches that have already been made I believe that is the feeling of the House, and for that reason I have no wish to argue against the opinions now held by hon. members. I believe, however, that this question will receive a great deal of consideration in the future, and I hope to see the day when reciprocity will exist between the different Australian colonies. I certainly cannot allow the present occasion to pass without making a few remarks with regard to the speech delivered by the Colonial Treasurer last night. The hon. gentleman said that I announced myself as a freetrader and made a protectionist speech. I think that wherever I touched on the two questions I distinctly stated that, although I was personally in favour of freetrade, I had not the slightest objection to a certain amount of protection where I thought it was for the benefit of the colony. I may have failed in making that clear, but such was my meaning. The hon. gentleman announced himself as a freetrader, but I think he is a most inconsistent one. He is a member of the Government which has consented to increase the duties on the people to a considerable extent since it has taken office. Where does the freetrade come in there? I will go a little further and say that he actually spoke to hon. members sitting behind him, and announced himself as a protectionist in favour of certain industries in this colony. He travelled altogether beyond the question that I introduced, and although he had been in communication with the Melbourne Chamber of Commerce and brought forward a list of certain articles which they were in favour of having introduced into the colony free, and said that by the introduction of those we should lose a revenue of £200,000 or £250,000 annually, he actually did not tell us how he arrived at those figures. It is an easy matter to make a statement of that kind, but it is sometimes more difficult to prove it. I think with the assistance at his command it would have been easy for him to lay before the House our exact position, and show what we would have gained or what we would have lost by a transaction of the kind proposed. Admittedly my argument was strongly in favour of sugar-planters, and I will take this occasion of pointing out why it was so. Simply because it happens to be our only exporting industry at the present time. I am, however, in favour of giving this assistance to other agriculturists as well as the sugar-planters, but unfortunately they are not yet in a position to be exporters. If they were it would be very different. The motion has been discussed on a far wider basis than I intended. I gave a list of articles—of natural products—of the different colonies which I thought might be admitted free, but hon. gentlemen went far beyond that, and went into all the manufactured articles as well. I certainly had no intention of going as far as that. The list that I submitted was a short one, and I thought it would have narrowed down the matter considerably, and that it would have been a matter for consideration between the different Governments what articles they might adopt and admit free into their colonies in exchange for the free admission of our sugar. I also argued the question whether it would be possible for two colonies to enter into a treaty by which there would be a certain amount of

differential duty. I argued on those two proposals. I did not care which was adopted so long as some step was taken in the direction indicated by the motion. I believe it would be the first practical step towards federation, and I believe also that this question will yet receive further consideration from this House. I really do hope to see the time when we shall appear as one people and not be separated as we are now by different tariffs, and be as distinct from each other as we are from any foreign nation. With the permission of the House, I will withdraw the motion.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: As the hon. member wishes to withdraw his motion, I will withdraw my amendment.

Amendment and motion, by leave, withdrawn.

#### BRIDGE OVER THE BURNETT.

Mr. ADAMS said: Mr. Speaker,—This motion was set down for Friday last, but I postponed it at the request of the Minister for Works, who said he would endeavour to meet the wishes of the petitioners. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that a bridge would have to be erected across the Burnett for railway purposes, and that it should be erected of sufficient width, and planked, in order that vehicles might pass over. It is said that the Government wish to do justice to all parts of the colony alike, and I think, taking into consideration the state of the colony, it would be wise to make the concession asked for by my constituents. I know it will be carrying out the policy the Government are working out at the present time—a policy of retrenchment and economy. It is admitted by both sides that this particular line from Bundaberg to Gladstone, which this bridge will serve, is to become one of the main trunk lines of the colony, and, therefore, I anticipate that before many years it will not only necessitate one set of rails across the bridge, but two sets of rails. Therefore, by erecting a bridge of this description at the present time, I believe the Minister for Works will be practising economy. Being under the control of the Railway Department, he will have full control over that bridge, and at some future day when the necessity arises he will be able to take the bridge and lay his rails across. It is hardly worth while to discuss the merits of the case, because the hon. gentleman has already told me that he grasps the subject in all its phases. Taking that into consideration, and believing that the hon. gentleman intends to erect a bridge of sufficient width for vehicles to pass, I am prepared to allow the motion to go without further discussion. I now move—

That, a petition having been presented to this honourable House from the inhabitants of Bundaberg and surrounding district on the 23rd of July last, praying for better means of crossing the Burnett than at present exists—either by the erection of a traffic or a combined railway and traffic bridge—it is the opinion of this House that the prayer of the petition should be granted, and that the Government be requested to give effect to this resolution.

Hon. members will notice that what I have embodied in the motion does not commit the Government to one kind of bridge in particular; therefore, I think that what the Minister for Works has already promised will meet the case.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said: Mr. Speaker,—I have had a good deal of communication with the residents of Bundaberg in connection with this bridge across the Burnett. They have made application from time to time with the object of having added to the bridge to be built for railway purposes across the river, provision for wheel traffic. I do not

believe in these combined bridges. Instances of very great risk and danger come to my notice almost daily in connection with the bridge across the Bremer at Ipswich; and I am only surprised that there has not been some serious accident with trains going backward and forward while carriages and waggons are passing to and fro. I shall be no party to building a bridge that is likely to lead to some very serious accident. Though I am not so sanguine as the hon. member for Mulgrave as to a double line, I have a very good opinion of the district; but I believe a single line of rails will suit all purposes for many years to come. I am prepared to make this proposition—that the Railway Department will construct a bridge, deck it, and make it suitable both for railway trains and wheel traffic. I have consulted the engineer on the subject, and he says there will be no difficulty. There will be gates at each end of the bridge, which will be closed for wheel traffic at a certain time before the arrival and departure of trains. That may delay traffic for ten minutes or a quarter of an hour. If the hon. member is prepared to accept that proposition, I shall be very glad indeed to meet his views. But he will have to withdraw his motion, otherwise I shall oppose it. I give the hon. gentleman my assurance that the railway bridge will be decked so as to be suitable both for wheel traffic and railway traffic, and I hope he will accept my assurance.

Mr. NORTON said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. member for Mulgrave the other day mentioned to me that he had had a conversation with the Minister for Works, and that in consequence of that conversation he had agreed to postpone the motion. The conversation which he related to me is much the same in effect as the statement of the Minister for Works. I think the hon. member will be quite prepared to withdraw the motion, and accept the offer of the Minister for Works. The bridge at present is large enough to accommodate all the traffic, and, of course, when a train is expected it is quite right that it should be closed, but the delay will not be very great. I should therefore advise the hon. member for Mulgrave to accept the offer of the Minister for Works.

Mr. ADAMS said: I understand from the hon. gentleman that the roadway will be sufficiently wide for all traffic, and under the circumstances I will withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn accordingly.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER said: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn. On Tuesday the Government business will stand in this order:—Gold Fields Act Amendment Bill in committee, Mineral Lands (Coal Mining) Bill in committee, Marsupial Bill, and Divisional Boards Bill. The other business will follow in its present order.

Mr. NORTON said: I do not see the Colonial Treasurer here, but perhaps the Premier will inform us when we will go on with the Estimates. It is a long while since we began work, and we have done a great deal.

The PREMIER said: We hope to go on with the Estimates next week or the week after. We will see how the business goes on. It is a matter for consideration whether we should go on with the Estimates now or wait until after we have made some progress with the Divisional Boards Bill.

The House adjourned at eight minutes to 6 o'clock.