

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 20 JULY 1887**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.***Wednesday, 20 July, 1887.*

Warwick Election. — Member Sworn. — Petitions. — Auditor-General's Reports. — Message from the Legislative Council. — Joint Committees. — Address of Congratulation to Her Majesty. — Days of Sitting. — Sessional Orders. — Formal Motions. — Valuation Bill. — Divisional Boards Bill. — Water Bill. — Copyright Registration Bill. — Criminal Law Amendment Bill. — Questions. — Address in Reply. — resumption of debate. — Adjournment.

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

**WARWICK ELECTION.**

The SPEAKER said: I have to inform the House that I have received from the returning officer of the electoral district of Warwick the return of the writ issued by me for the election of a member, endorsed with a certificate of the election of Arthur Morgan, Esquire, as member for the said district.

**MEMBER SWORN.**

Mr. Arthur Morgan was sworn in and took his seat as member for the electoral district of Warwick.

**PETITIONS.**

Mr. ANNEAR presented a petition from Mr. E. B. Corser, of Maryborough, in reference to additional compensation for the resumption of certain property belonging to him by the Railway Department; and moved that the petition be read.

Question put and passed.

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

Mr. ADAMS presented a petition from the trustees of certain allotments in the town of Bundaberg granted for the purposes of a school of arts, to enable them to sell or mortgage the land and buildings thereon for the purpose of building a new school of arts. He also presented the necessary papers required by the Standing Orders of the House, and moved that the petition be received.

Question put and passed.

**AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORTS.**

The SPEAKER said: I have to report to the House that I have received the following letter from the Auditor-General:—

"Audit Department, Queensland,

"Brisbane, 19th July, 1887.

"SIR,

"In compliance with the provisions of the 6th clause of the Savings Bank Act of 1870 (34 Vic. No 10), I have the honour to report to the Legislative Assembly that the Government debentures and other securities

held in trust for the Savings Bank by the President of the Legislative Council, the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, and the Colonial Treasurer, were duly examined, counted, and audited on the 1st instant, and that they were found correct.

"The enclosed Statement shows how the funds of the Savings Bank were invested on that date.

"I have the honour to be, sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"W. L. G. DREW,

"Auditor-General.

"The Honourable the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly."

On the motion of the COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. J. R. Dickson), the Report and Statement enclosed were ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER said: I have also to report to the House that I have received the following letter from the Auditor-General:—

"Audit Department, Queensland,

"Brisbane, 19th July, 1887.

"SIR,

"In pursuance of the provisions of the Audit Act of 1874 (38 Vic. No. 12), I do myself the honour to transmit herewith, for presentation to the Legislative Assembly, the Treasury Statements of the receipts and expenditure of the Consolidated Revenue, the Loan, and the several Trust Funds, for the financial year ended 30th June, 1886, together with my Report thereon.

"I have the honour to be, sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"W. L. G. DREW,

"Auditor-General.

"The Honourable the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly."

On the motion of the COLONIAL TREASURER, the Statements and Report enclosed were ordered to be printed.

**MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.****JOINT COMMITTEES.**

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of a message from the Legislative Council, stating that the following resolutions had been passed:—

1. That the President, Mr. King, and Mr. F. T. Gregory be appointed members of the Joint Library Committee.
2. That the President, Mr. Graham, and Mr. Wood be appointed members of the Joint Committee for the management of the Refreshment Rooms.
3. That the President, Mr. A. C. Gregory, and Mr. Macansh be appointed members of the Joint Committee for the management and superintendence of the Parliamentary Buildings.
4. That the foregoing resolutions be transmitted to the Legislative Assembly by message, requesting that they will be pleased to nominate a like number of members from their body with a view to give effect to the 8th Joint Standing Order.

On the motion of the PREMIER (Hon. Sir S. W. Griffith), it was resolved that the message be taken into consideration to-morrow.

**ADDRESS OF CONGRATULATION TO HER MAJESTY.**

The PREMIER, in moving—

That this House will, to-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, to consider an Address of Congratulation to Her Majesty on the completion of the fiftieth year of her reign—

said: I do not propose on this occasion to say anything in support of this motion, which I am sure will receive the unanimous support of the House. To-morrow will be a more fitting occasion to discuss it.

Mr. MOREHEAD said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. the Premier is, I think, perfectly right in assuming that he will be supported on this question with perfect unanimity on both sides of the House.

Question put and passed.

## DAYS OF SITTING.

The PREMIER, in moving—

That, unless otherwise ordered, the House will meet for despatch of business at 3 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, in each week—

said: The arrangements proposed are those which were adopted last session, and which, I believe, were found to work very well. They were certainly conducive to shortening the session by probably two or three weeks.

Mr. MOREHEAD said: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to offer any opposition to this motion. I take it that it worked very well last session from all I have heard. I assume that, if the business of the session becomes too pressing, Monday will be included.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Oh!

Mr. MOREHEAD: I assume that hon. members are in earnest in their desire to work. I am sure the hon. member for Maryborough, who interjected, is a hardworking man. He always says he is.

Mr. ANNEAR: I did not interject.

Mr. KATES: I did.

Mr. MOREHEAD: The same remark will apply to the hon. member who did interject. The hon. member for Darling Downs is a very hardworking man and a very useful man, and he must think that the sooner we get over the business of the session the better. It may be a loss to some hon. members to shorten the session.

Mr. KATES: Shorten the speeches!

Mr. MOREHEAD: I prefer to call it "session," and I hope the Premier will not shrink from asking hon. members to meet on Monday. I shall not oppose the motion, which I believe worked well last session.

Question put and passed.

## SESSIONAL ORDERS.

The following sessional orders were agreed to:—

By the PREMIER—

That on Tuesday, Wednesday, and after 7 o'clock p.m. on Thursday, in each week, Government business take precedence of all other business.

By the PREMIER—

That Standing Order No. 8, relative to business under discussion, and business not disposed of at the time of any adjournment of the House for want of a quorum, be suspended, so far as it relates to notices of motion, until otherwise ordered; and that it be an Order of the House during the present session,—

1. That remanet motions, instead of being placed at the bottom of the notice-paper for the following sitting day, shall, with the motions for that day, take precedence in the order of the dates for which they were first given; but that they shall not be permitted to displace motions originally given for the day to which such remanet motions go over.

2. That private business under discussion at 7 o'clock p.m. on Thursdays shall, at that hour, stand adjourned until the Government business on the paper for the day has been disposed of.

By the PREMIER—

That it be an order of the House during the present session,—

1. That every motion, or Order of the Day for the third reading of a Bill, to which (on the question being put from the Chair, "Whether there is any objection to its being a 'formal' motion, or Order of the Day," no objection is taken, shall be deemed to be a "formal" motion, or Order of the Day.

2. That, before the ordinary business of each day is entered upon, the Speaker shall call over the various notices of motion, and the Orders of the Day for the third reading of Bills; and, on any such motion or

order being called, it shall be competent for the member otherwise entitled to move it to have the above question put with reference thereto; and such "formal" motions or Orders of the Day shall be disposed of in the relative order in which they stand on the business paper, taking precedence of all the other motions and Orders of the Day.

3. That no debate shall be allowed on any such "formal" motions or Orders of the Day, or upon the further proceedings following the reading of such Orders; but the House may proceed to division thereupon without amendment or debate, as in the case of a motion for the first reading of a Bill.

4. That, in consequence of any such "formal" Orders of the Day having been disposed of as aforesaid, it shall not be held that the House has proceeded to the Orders of the Day upon the business paper, so as to exclude thereafter the asking of questions, the presentations of petitions, or the reception of notices of motion.

## FORMAL MOTIONS.

The following formal motions were passed:—

By the PREMIER—

That it be an Order of the House during the present session that on each Wednesday, when the House is sitting, the Clerk shall read out the titles of all motions for returns agreed to previously by the House and not yet furnished.

By the PREMIER—

That the Standing Orders Committee for the present session consist of the following members, namely:—Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, Mr. Chubb, Mr. Morehead, and the mover; with leave to sit during any adjournment, and authority to confer upon subjects of mutual concernment with any committee appointed for similar purposes by the Legislative Council.

By the PREMIER—

1. That, in compliance with Standing Order 268, a Select Committee be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in all matters which relate to the printing to be executed by order of the House; and for the purpose of selecting and arranging for printing returns and papers presented in pursuance of motions made by members.

2. That such committee consist of the following members, namely:—Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, Mr. S. W. Brooks, Mr. W. Brookes, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Palmer, and Mr. Stevens.

## VALUATION BILL

The PREMIER moved—

That this House will, to-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the desirableness of introducing a Bill to make better provisions for the valuation of rateable land by local authorities.

Question put and passed.

## DIVISIONAL BOARDS BILL.

The PREMIER moved—

That this House will, to-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the desirableness of introducing a Bill to consolidate and amend the laws relating to local government outside the boundaries of municipalities.

Question put and passed.

## WATER BILL.

The PREMIER moved—

That this House will, to-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the desirableness of introducing a Bill to declare and define the law with respect to natural water.

Question put and passed.

## COPYRIGHT REGISTRATION BILL.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. A. Rutledge) moved—

That this House will, to-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the desirableness of introducing a Bill to make provision for the registration of copyright in books and dramatic pieces published in Queensland.

Question put and passed.

## CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved—

That leave be given to introduce a Bill to make better provision for the protection of women and girls, and for the suppression of brothels, and for other purposes.

Question put and passed.

The Bill was introduced, read a first time, and the second reading made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

## QUESTIONS.

Mr. CHUBB asked the Minister for Works—

Is it the intention of the Government to take any steps during the present session towards establishing schools of mines, and more particularly upon Charters Towers Gold Field?

The PREMIER said: My hon. colleague the Minister for Works is unfortunately unable to be in his place to-day, and is not likely to be able to attend for two or three weeks. I hope that the result of his rest will be to completely restore him to health.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I will reply to the hon. member's question on behalf of my hon. colleague:—

The matter is now under the consideration of the Government. They hope to be able to submit during the session a complete scheme for the establishment of schools of mines.

Mr. CHUBB asked the Colonial Treasurer—

1. How many Chinese entered the colony and paid the poll-tax during the year ended the 30th June last?
2. What is the estimated number of Chinese now in the colony?

The COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. J. R. Dickson) replied—

1. Seventy-two.
2. The estimated number of Chinese to the 31st March, 1887, the latest date to which returns are complete, is 9,602.

Mr. CHUBB asked the Colonial Secretary—

1. Has the Gaol Commission completed its work?
2. What is the approximate cost to date of the Commission?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. B. B. Moreton) replied—

1. The Gaol Commission has not completed its work. I expect to be able to lay the papers on the table of the House in a fortnight's time.
2. £438 11s.

## ADDRESS IN REPLY.

## RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

On the Order of the Day being read for the resumption of adjourned debate on Mr. Foxton's motion, "That the Address in Reply to the Opening Speech of His Excellency the Governor, as read by the Clerk, be now adopted by the House"—

Mr. CHUBB said: Mr. Speaker,—The Address which His Excellency delivered to the Houses of Parliament yesterday, and which you afterwards read to this House, is certainly one of the tamest productions—except perhaps in its reference to the Imperial Conference—that I ever read. One does not generally expect much in an opening speech, and certainly there are no startling surprises in this one. Still, however, I think there are a few things mentioned which will afford an opening for criticism, and criticism which I think may be well applied to them and to the matters I am about to refer to. Now, I think no one will dissent from the sentiments expressed in that part of the Address which refers to the celebration of the fiftieth year of Her Majesty's reign. I believe every member of this House, and I believe every inhabitant of Queensland, will agree with those sentiments, and I feel sure they will be re-echoed throughout the colony.

I think that Queensland is quite as loyal as any part of Her Majesty's dominions. Now, there is one thing in regard to the jubilee which has not been referred to, that is the manner in which it was celebrated here. I think we expended £500 or £600 in squibs and a little gas in showing off some very execrable daubs—I suppose they were intended to be likenesses. I think they were extremely libellous; they did no credit to the persons who painted them, and certainly they did not make the individuals who were depicted look extremely beautiful. Now, although I will give place in loyal feelings to no other member of the community, it is a matter to consider whether, small as the amount was, we were justified in wasting £600 under the circumstances in which the finances of the colony now stand. Of course, by itself it is not a very great sum, but we have to add it to many other small things. It is not always one leak that would sink a ship, but many holes, through which the water pours, "Many a mickle makes a muckle," and in the end you have a very large amount which has been lost by bad management. Now, with regard to the Conference, I certainly do not condemn the Chief Secretary for attending the Conference. I believe that under the circumstances it was the right thing for him, as the head of the Government, and as the ablest man in the Government, to attend the Conference. Considering that all the other Australian colonies, and other colonies of the Empire, were represented there, I do not condemn him for going.

Mr. MOREHEAD: We condemn him for coming back.

Mr. CHUBB: I believe it was the correct thing to do under the circumstances. Whether the results attained by that Conference are matters of which we can approve is a question which will have to remain open until we know what was done; at present we are all in the dark. Beyond some statements which have been made by members of the Conference in other colonies, and a few remarks which the hon. the Chief Secretary delivered to us yesterday, and except so far as we may surmise from statements in the Press, we are yet in the dark as to what really took place. I shall therefore suspend my judgment until I have read the report of the proceedings, and am in a position to know what the Conference really did do. It is possible that the holding of the Conference will be productive of highly beneficial results. I hope it will; but until I have had an opportunity of forming a judgment upon the proceedings I cannot endorse the statement as it appears there. There are two things that are referred to in connection with the Conference—the proposed establishment of a fleet for the protection of floating trade in Australasian waters, and the question in regard to New Guinea. These questions will come before the House at a later period of the session, and I shall then have an opportunity of discussing them. Until then I shall not deal with these questions any more than by saying this: With regard to the fleet, I think what we should bear in mind is this: that if a fleet is to be established for the protection "of floating trade in Australasian waters," the cost of that fleet should be borne by the several parties owning that trade in proportion to their interest. I do not know what the extent of the British interest is in shipping and commercial matters in Australia, but there ought to be some means of ascertaining it; and, if the largest proportion of interests which are to be protected are absolutely British, a corresponding proportion of the expense should be borne by the Imperial Government. We should share in proportion to our stake and no more, until the time comes

when we shall be able to have our own fleet to protect our shores, under, as I hope, colonial federation. With regard to New Guinea, of course this colony is more intimately concerned in it than perhaps any of the others, although the whole of Australia is vitally interested in seeing that New Guinea, or the portion of it that we are likely to obtain, does not become the property of any foreign power. With respect to that, I have no doubt that this Parliament will accept such proposals as may be brought forward by the Government, provided that they do not bind the colony to too much. Until, therefore, we have full particulars of what is proposed to be done, I do not propose to refer further to that matter. It may be said that the establishment of this fleet and the other matters discussed at the Conference may have a tendency to bring about the idea which is abroad in the minds of many people at home—namely, Imperial federation. Of course I know that that subject was barred from discussion at the Conference, but there are people at home who are strongly of opinion that Imperial federation is the thing for the Australasian colonies. Well, sir, I believe Imperial federation is a magnificent dream, not likely to be realised for many years to come. What is in the more immediate future is the idea of the federation of the colonies, under which we may unite for general defence, and many other matters of mutual concern and benefit too numerous to mention in detail. There is a paragraph which says—

“The disastrous floods which occurred in the latter part of the year, and which occasioned a lamentable loss of life and property, have retarded to some extent the recovery of the colony from the effects of the long-continued drought.”

No doubt, sir, it is true that this flood did occur, but whether this paragraph is intended to be an additional excuse for the failure of the land policy of the Government I do not know. It appears to me that they will soon have to discover some new excuse for that. For years past the Government have been complaining of droughts—that they had not got enough water; now they complain that they have too much; and next year they will have to get a bush fire or find some other reason to explain why the Land Act has not been the success that they anticipated. Of course if the paragraph is intended to be merely by the way I have nothing to say against it. We did suffer from serious floods, and as stated by His Excellency, the people of this colony did come forward to assist their suffering fellow-colonists as well as they were able, and I am glad to know that material assistance was given. The people of the colony subscribed well and cheerfully to relieve the distress which occurred, principally in the southern portion of it. Next, sir, we have a paragraph which is intended to blow the trumpet of the great measure of the Government, the Land Act. That subject has been already well dwelt upon by the two hon. members who preceded me on this side of the House. The amount of settlement shown by the figures of the hon. member for Carnarvon yesterday seemed to me extremely small in comparison with the time which has elapsed since the Act was brought into operation, the 1st March, 1885. From that time to the present the result of its operations is so extremely small as to prove that certainly it has been by no means an unqualified success; indeed I may go so far as to say that I think a great deal of it has been an extreme failure. I would prefer, Mr. Speaker, a much more simple process than we have with regard to settling people on the land, as they call it; that is with regard to the homestead clauses, which are the ones, if any, that will settle people

on the land. Our terms are said to be liberal enough. I submit that they are not. We tie people down to too many restrictions, make them wait too long in the end for the land, and they often get disgusted, and abandon it. In Canada it is extremely simple for a selector to take up land. For 10 dollars paid down for office-fee, as it is called, a selector can get a homestead of 160 acres, and in three years he gets his deeds; all that he has to do being to reside on the selection a certain portion of the year, and put a certain area under cultivation. There is better land there than there is here for cultivation, the terms are much easier, and if we expect to settle a large number of the farming class on the lands of the colony we shall have to make our homestead terms much more simple and more easy than they are. I do not propose to say much about the grazing farms. That point was dealt with by the hon. leader of the Opposition, who showed that the “successful operations” during the past year were to settle twelve grazing farms at the maximum area. Probably the Minister for Lands will tell us by-and-by how many there are actually. While on this subject, Mr. Speaker, I think reference should be made to that portion of the Speech which intimates that the Government have established a department of agriculture under the charge of the Minister for Lands. That department has been established without the sanction of Parliament. It was done during the absence of the Premier at home; and from the way in which it was done it seemed to me very much like a bid for the two agricultural seats of Warwick and Fassfern. I do not say that it was so, but it looked very much like it, being done at the time it was—just immediately before the elections which were likely to be held there. The hon. member for Darling Downs, as we all know, takes great interest in this matter; it is one in which I believe thoroughly, and it shall have my support; but it seemed as if, under the circumstances, it was a bold bid for these two seats. It might have been established last year. But in addition to establishing it at the time it was established we have the fact that it creates an additional expenditure at a period when the finances of the colony are not in as sound a state as we would wish them to be. Something has been said about the promotion of Mr. McLean, that gentleman having been promoted to the charge of this new Department of Agriculture, and also to the filling of the vacancy in the office he previously held, by the promotion of Mr. Rule. I do not intend to say anything about that matter more than this: that I do not recognise the principle that a man's seniority is invariably to be admitted as entitling him to the promotion. I think it ought not to be forgotten, and that there ought to be very strong reasons for not recognising the rights of seniority. But there are occasions when you must have the fittest officer for an office, and I do not blame this or any Government for appointing to an office the man they deem fittest for the position. The remarks that have been made upon the subject suggest to me the idea that it is about time we had a Civil Service Commission—an independent commission—to inquire into the condition and position of the Civil Service in this colony. I am aware that there is a feeling that a good many officers in the Civil Service do not do as fair a day's work for their pay as they would have to do in private employments. On the other hand, there are a good many who are “willing horses,” and work very hard. I believe that the appointment of a Civil Service Commission would bring to light a good many things which this House would be benefited by knowing, and possibly discover some “Tite Barnacles” in the

service. It would also discover, no doubt, some very old servants whose claims had been overlooked or ignored, and the existence of some inequalities which ought to be remedied. I think this matter is one which might commend itself to members of the House, and I would myself be prepared to bring forward a motion for the appointment of a commission if I received some encouragement from hon. members. The next point to which I intend to refer is the statement in the Speech that this House will be asked during the present session to deal with the question of representation. We do not know what form the proposed measure will take, and consequently are at present in the dark, and cannot express any decided opinion upon the subject. When the Bill comes before us I shall be prepared to discuss its provisions; but, in the meantime, I wish to state distinctly—and I am sure the Premier knows it as well as I do—that the constitutional rule upon the subject is—that when it is found necessary to bring in a Redistribution Bill, or a Bill which materially alters the representation of the people in Parliament, after that has become law, no important legislation should be undertaken. All constitutional writers are agreed upon that. Indeed, there is a general consensus of the authorities that after the passing of such a measure the people should be appealed to to return a new set of representatives to the House. That, I believe, will be insisted upon by hon. members on this side of the House, so far as they are able, if the Bill takes the form I have indicated. I am aware that there are instances where that rule has not been followed, and there is one in this colony, I believe, where, after a Bill of that kind became law, one or two measures of a non-contentious character on which both sides of the House were agreed were really put through. But I think that, going back to our old constitutional precedents, we shall find that the rule is as I have stated it. I make these remarks now for this reason: that when the Chief Secretary was about to go to England to attend the Conference he was entertained at a banquet and received the eulogiums of those who attended, and very well deserved they were. I admire the Premier as one of the ablest public men we have, and am always ready to do honour to him when I think he deserves it. I do not hold the view that one should always endeavour to condemn a political opponent simply because he sits on a different side of the House. At that banquet the hon. gentleman, referring to the subject of the Redistribution Bill—and, if the report was correct, he went rather elaborately into the question—expressed the opinion that the House need not dissolve after the passing of a Redistribution Bill, and said there were instances in which that course had been followed, instances that he quoted, and ones that he himself had condemned on a former occasion. However, be that as it may, I make this statement now for the purpose of intimating that, so far as I am concerned, I propose, if I am able, when the Redistribution Bill comes before the House, to give effect to the constitutional views I have just expressed. I next come to the question which is of vital importance as affecting the interests of the constituency I represent and that portion of the colony of which I am one of the representatives. I refer to the separation question. Being the first Northern member who has addressed himself to this subject, the question not having been previously dealt with from a Northern point of view, I shall take the opportunity of speaking at perhaps greater length upon it than I should otherwise have done on this occasion. The Speech says that—

"A petition for the division of the colony was last year presented to the Administrator of the Government, and forwarded to the Secretary of State for Her

Majesty's consideration. Her Majesty, however, has not been advised to give effect to the wishes of the petitioners."

We had some rather puerile remarks on the subject—I cannot use any other term—from the hon. member for Carnarvon, to the effect that the separation movement has been completely squelched. I think the hon. gentleman also made some other uncalled-for remarks with regard to the collection of the funds raised to maintain the separation cause. Those observations are quite beside the question. The subject is one that lies much deeper than that, and is of far greater importance. It is not a question of money whether separation will be granted or not, but a question of whether the separation of the northern portion of the colony is a proper thing, and whether those who ask for it are entitled to have it. If we believe what the member for Maryborough, Mr. Annear, told us, one of the objects of the Premier's visit to England was to put a stopper on the separation question. That hon. member told the House that, in his opinion, if that was the only thing the Premier managed to do while at home he deserved the thanks of the colony. He stated that we had not seen much about it in the colony; but he was quite certain that the Premier had made it his business when he was in England, as far as he could do so effectually, to put a stopper on the petition for separation. I have read a statement in the public Press—I must do the Premier the justice to say this—to the effect that the hon. gentleman has denied that he did anything while in England. Of course we have not had any statement from him upon the opinion that has since been expressed in the House by the member for Maryborough, but he may give us some information on another occasion. But so far as the hon. member for Maryborough is concerned—and he ought to be in the secrets of the Chief Secretary on this point, seeing that he has been put forward to second the adoption of the Address in Reply—we must assume that he got his information from some authentic source, and, therefore, until it is contradicted in this House by the Premier we may assume that it is correct that the Chief Secretary did succeed, when at home, in blocking the separation petition.

The PREMIER: There is no foundation for it.

Mr. CHUBB: If there is no foundation for it, all I can say is that the hon. member for Maryborough must then have drawn upon his imagination for his statement.

The PREMIER: My communication on the subject is in writing.

Mr. CHUBB: I do not wish to discuss the separation question at length upon this occasion, but I will say this: that if the Imperial Government or this Government or the colony are of opinion that the separation question is dead, they never made a greater mistake in their lives. That question is not dead, and will not die. It is a question of too great moment to be killed by a simple refusal to a petition. Anyone acquainted with the struggle that took place with New South Wales before Queensland obtained separation knows perfectly well the rebuffs that were received, and I am quite certain that the North will not be abashed by having its first request refused. I have no doubt that you will find, sir, that the agitation will become greater than ever. It is possible that the Government may, by wise measures in the meantime, as they profess to be intending, check and retard the movement. But the North will still insist upon self-government. The time may not be now, but it will come in the future, and so far from being "squelched," to use an elegant expression from the other side—

Mr. ALAND: A legal expression.

Mr. CHUBB: It will be like a fire, upon which water has been thrown and has not extinguished it, but made it burn more fiercely than before. You will find, sir, I think, that what I say will come to pass, and that this is a question which will be taken up more vigorously than ever, and that it will be made a test question at the next general election, whether that comes sooner or later; and you will also find, unless I am very much mistaken and misinformed, that no person offering himself for a seat for any Northern constituency will have a chance of succeeding unless he is prepared to adhere to the Northern platform of separation. So far, therefore, for the hon. gentleman who addressed himself to that opinion believing that the question is dead, he is very much mistaken. Certainly when the Premier referred to the question last night, he did, for the first time during his speech, wax a little warm. He trotted out that old Pegasus of his, the black labour question, and made a few *ad captandum* remarks which may catch the ears of a few, that black labour was at the bottom of this separation question. But he qualified his remarks to this extent: he distinguished that, although he claimed that the origin of the question was black labour—which I do not admit—there were many now who were honestly in favour of separation, and who had nothing whatever to do with the question of black labour. He will find, and hon. members will find, that the black labour question will be put entirely on one side in regard to separation, and that the question will be fought out on better grounds than that—on the ground I have formerly stated: the right of partners to dissolve a partnership when circumstances entitle them to do so, and when they are in sufficient numbers to give effect to their wishes. But, while on that subject, it may be *apropos* to refer to a question which cropped up, and to which no reference is made in this Speech, but it was noticed by the Premier. That is the Chinese question, which is one which will have to be dealt with by this House before very long, and in a determined and decided manner. I have noticed that some supporters of the Premier have claimed that he was the individual who prevented the influx of Chinese. I admit that he introduced a Bill in 1884 to further restrict the entry of Chinese into this colony. At that time they had to pay a poll-tax of £10, which was returned upon certain conditions, and they could only come in proportion to the tonnage of the ship. What the Bill proposed to do was to double the amount of the tax.

The PREMIER: Treble it.

Mr. CHUBB: Double it. It was trebled; but in the Bill as introduced it was to be doubled, and that was all, except that the poll-tax was not to be refunded. Hon. members on this side of the House, and particularly the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Macrossan, endeavoured to make the restriction still greater. I remember his proposing that, instead of there being one Chinaman for every fifty tons of the tonnage of the vessel, there should be one for every 250 tons. That amendment was rejected by the Government, and voted against by the Government, for it went to a division, and the Government themselves and their supporters negatived it. The question of the amount of the tax was considered, and the hon. gentleman I refer to proposed that £50 should be imposed. That was also resisted by the Government. It did not go to a division, because, seeing the effect of the division upon the other question, it was hopeless; but after a great deal of discussion the Government accepted an increase of £10, which made the tax £30. That was wholly inadequate. I remember, in one of the speeches

made by the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Macrossan, upon that occasion, he said he was willing to make the tax £200; and the ground upon which the increase was resisted was that there would not be much chance of the Bill receiving the Royal assent if we put such a stringent restriction upon them—the Bill would have to be referred for the Royal assent, and the Imperial authorities would not pass it. But now the Premier says there are no treaties existing with China, and that the Imperial Government would pause before they interfered with any legislation passed on that subject. I hope that when this question is introduced this session, as I am sure it will be, hon. members on the other side will be as ready as they were on this side to put such a stopper on the influx of Chinese as will prevent any serious consequences in future, and I know they will. I will go so far as to say that if they come at all it should be insisted that they shall not come alone. In the interests of decency and morality, a certain proportion of their women should come with them.

The PREMIER: Do you want to breed them here?

Mr. CHUBB: Whether that would be a wise thing from another point of view is another thing.

Mr. NORTON: Keep them out altogether.

Mr. CHUBB: I agree with the suggestion made by my hon. friend the member for Port Curtis. The best thing is to keep them out altogether. I am quite prepared to go to that extent, and I believe there are many other hon. members who would be willing to do so.

Mr. W. BROOKES: Hear, hear!

Mr. CHUBB: The Speech further refers to what are evidently admitted as some inequalities and injustices to the North—

"Your early attention will be directed to measures for improving the administration of public business in the more remote parts of the colony, and ensuring an equitable distribution of public expenditure. I am confident"—

That I understand to be the decentralisation scheme spoken of last session when the separation debate took place, and suggested by the Premier as a cure for the evils the North complained of. There is a tacit admission in the paragraph that the business of the government in the North is not as well attended to at present as it ought to be. All I can say is that the people of the North will accept any amelioration of the present condition of things that may be offered. The establishment of a branch of the Real Property Office has been spoken of, and the establishment of branches of other departments of the Civil Service would not be objected to; but they will not satisfy the North for the separation they expect to get. I will say in passing that the Government will find this a most expensive affair, for, if my information is reliable, the establishment of one item alone—one branch of the Real Property Office in the North—will entail an expense of many thousands of pounds for copies of deeds and records which will have to be made and sent up there. I believe that item alone will involve an expenditure of £6,000 or £7,000. So that the Government in dealing with this matter must face a considerable extra expenditure, and it will then be a question whether the scheme will be satisfactory after all. Amongst the measures mentioned in the Speech we have some which, I daresay, will never see daylight, and some which are, no doubt, of importance. There is a Bill to provide for the protection of workmen and the security of their wages, mentioned, and it is a Bill which is very much wanted; but, while we are protecting the workmen and securing their wages, we must not forget to protect the contractors, and I hope there will be a provision in the Bill, or one inserted

n it before it is passed, to protect the contractors as well. There is a law in America to protect contractors in regard to works they are carrying on. To make my meaning clear I will give a concrete illustration that came under my notice this last year. A contractor was erecting a building in Brisbane, and the land on which it was being erected was mortgaged, the mortgagee advancing the money to erect the building. The mortgagor got hold of the money and became insolvent. The mortgagee having advanced the money once could not be expected to advance it again, and the contractor, instead of being paid for his work, lost a very large portion of his contract price. Under the terms of the contract a large portion of the money was kept back; the balance was to be paid on the completion of the work, and the contractor lost nearly the whole of it because the mortgagor was so hopelessly insolvent that I believe he did not pay 6d. in the £1. If we are going to protect the workmen, on the security, I suppose, of the work they do, we have an instance of it in the Station Wages Act and the Wages Act of 1884; if we are going to apply that principle to carpenters, stonemasons, and bricklayers, and other labourers, I say we must also protect the contractors under the circumstances I have referred to. They have that law in America, where there are to be found many good things which we would do well to adopt here. Then I notice a Bill to deal with natural water. I think a Bill to stop the leakage in the Treasury would be found more effective at the present time. This is a measure, no doubt, of great importance, but it is one that ought really not to be passed this session. We were blessed with very good seasons last year, and at the present time there is not any immediate necessity for making provision for the storage of water. The declaration of riparian rights is a question that ought to be thrashed out in the electorates. The Bill might be brought in, and we might have the benefit of the experience on the subject gained by the Premier while in America and at home; we might have the matter discussed in the House, and it might then be very well left over for the new Parliament to deal with. We do not want to rush hurriedly into this matter and define the rights to natural water until we are sufficiently informed upon the subject. There are many subjects in legislation on which it is well to "hasten slowly," and this, I think, is one. A great deal of the natural water of the colony is alienated, and when we have to deal with the property of other persons we shall do well not to be in a hurry. We should take ample time to consider the matter carefully, and then in the new Parliament introduce such a measure as will do whatever is required to establish rights to natural water beyond all controversy, so as to avoid the expensive and unsatisfactory litigation which has taken place in connection with the subject, not only in England but in America, and in America particularly to an enormous extent. We had a discussion on the Bill to shorten the duration of Parliaments in 1885. A Bill was introduced then upon which there was considerable diversity of opinion. It is not improbable that the Bill may pass this session, although I believe experience will show that three years is too short a period for a Parliament to last. The arguments adduced when the Bill was brought in before did not commend themselves to me at that time for a good reason, that the Government who then proposed it were not willing to agree to it on a former occasion. When the Bill comes before the House we shall have an opportunity to deal with it at a greater length. Another subject introduced into the Speech is the question of a university for this colony. I will say at once that outside the House I have given my approval to the proposal,

and I will give it my support in the House, but I do not think that this is a time when the House should be asked to vote a large sum of money for the establishment of a university. My idea is that we should take the preliminary steps necessary to establish it. I think Parliament might very well approve of the principle of the desirability of establishing a university, and we might go to the extent of setting apart Crown lands in some part of the colony—and the Minister for Lands has plenty—as an endowment for a university; but I shall not be prepared this session to support a large money vote except upon some such terms as the subsidy granted to divisional boards. We have recognised that principle to some extent in regard to grammar and State schools. That is the principle which might be discussed when the university scheme comes forward. I do not say that should be adopted; I mention it now as it is an idea which may be worked upon afterwards. As far as I am concerned, I do not feel disposed this session to go beyond affirming the principle and agreeing that a land endowment should be made by Parliament. I think the fund for the establishment of a university should, in the bulk, come from private benefactors. I think, however, the Government were a little disingenuous in the way in which they have referred to this subject, and I am rather inclined to think that they are depriving a certain gentleman, who has been working for the establishment of a university, of the credit to which he is entitled. The Speech says:—

"My Government have for some time had under their consideration the desirableness of taking preliminary action with a view to the early completion of our admirable educational system by the establishment of a university."

Although those words are put into the Governor's mouth, I beg to doubt it. I am inclined to think that this action is the result of individual action outside of the Government altogether during the Premier's absence in England. If for some time it was under the consideration of the Government, why was it not brought forward last year? I think it is hardly fair to rob the originator of this idea of the credit to which he is entitled. I believe that at this present moment the Premier has in his possession a large number of petitions for presentation to this House, asking the House to affirm the desirability of establishing a university.

The PREMIER: I have not received them yet. They are to be presented to me next week.

Mr. CHUBB: However, the hon. gentleman will have them, if he has not got them now, and the credit for the idea should be given to those who are most entitled to it. I remember that during the debate on the Elections Bill Sir Thomas McIlwraith proposed the omission of that clause which gave a university a member of parliament. My hon. friend the member for Balonne objected to the omission of that clause and voted for its retention, I think more by way of a joke than anything else. At any rate there was a division on the point, and the present Chief Secretary was at the head of the division which deprived the university of its member. So I really think this is rather attempting to take the wind out of the sails of some others who really have been sincerely anxious to see a university started, and who, I believe, will eventually succeed. I believe their wishes will be gratified, and that in time to come we shall have the satisfaction of seeing a university established on the lines referred to by the Chief Secretary—the American system. We do not at present want a university established on the English lines; we want something newer and more suited to the circumstances of the colony. There is another subject on which I will



say a word or two, although it is not mentioned in His Excellency's Speech, and that is the establishment of schools of mines in this colony. I am glad to know that the Government—the Chief Secretary has informed us to-day in reply to my question—have had the matter under their serious consideration, and I trust that that serious consideration will result in something. We were told in 1884, I think, in the Governor's Speech, that the Government would ask the House to take steps towards the establishment of schools of mines, and would ask for a vote for that purpose; a vote was passed, but nothing came of it. Now that the subject is noticed again, I hope it will have some effect, and that we shall see schools of mines established on the larger goldfields of the colony, where they will really be of use. Nothing is said in the Speech with regard to railways, except that Parliament would be asked to sanction some lines of railway for which the money had been appropriated; but it may not be out of place to say that there seems of late to have been unwonted activity in that branch of the Works Department which has to do with railways, and a good deal of it in connection with Northern lines. Whether the separation question had anything to do with it, or whether the desire to keep faith with promises had anything to do with it, the result is that we have had a remarkable activity displayed of late. In five or six cases, I believe, we have the Minister for Works calling for tenders for the construction of railways before the working plans are ready. I hope that that activity will be continued, because I am interested in a line for which tenders have not yet been called, and I hope the Minister for Works, when he comes to deal with that, will treat it in the same way. At any rate he has been extremely anxious to push some of those lines forward, and some that we passed last session are so far forward that tenders are out now for them. I am glad to see that so far, at any rate, the Government are alive to their responsibilities in that direction, and I suppose the Minister will do his best to act fairly to everybody. I wish also to say a word or two on a question which was introduced last night; I refer to Mr. Robb's contract. The Premier claimed that if the Government had done wrong it was an error of judgment, and he also admitted that it was not the usual practice to accept tenders in the way that Mr. Robb's tender was accepted, but to call for competing tenders. We have had two instances in which the Government have departed from the usual practice. In this case it seems that Mr. Robb tendered with the other tenderers, and that his tender was rejected; he was not the lowest tenderer. Afterwards it was stated by the Minister for Works that he had ascertained, either by correspondence or at an interview, that Mr. Robb was prepared to make an offer at somewhere about the Engineer's estimate. What I want to know is—Did Mr. Robb know what the Engineer's estimate was? And if so, how? Or if he did not know what the Engineer's estimate was, how did he arrive at the position of being able to make an offer somewhere about that estimate? Unless the Minister for Works told him in giving him information which he did not give to the other contractors, I do not see how Mr. Robb could be in such a position as to be able to make an offer somewhere about the Engineer's estimate. I believe the Engineer's estimates are supposed to be never disclosed, and I have myself heard the Minister for Works object to state them on the ground that it would be giving information to contractors. It seems to me that the Minister did put Mr. Robb in a more favourable position than he did the other contractors. He does not seem to have said to Mr. Robb, "What will you do it for?" But Mr. Robb must have got information somehow which enabled him to put in a tender at or about the Engineer's estimate, and if he obtained

that information he got a very unfair advantage over his co-tenderers, and the work should have been submitted for fresh tenders. We have the Premier congratulating Mr. Carey on being out of the contract; and he has expressed the opinion that Mr. Robb will lose money by it, that he will make nothing out of it. That, I suppose, is only the opinion of the Chief Secretary, for I read in the Government organ the other day, in a letter from a Cairns correspondent, a statement to the effect that Mr. Robb was going to make a pot of money out of this contract, that the cuttings were so soft that everybody was agreeably surprised, and that he was going to make a very large thing out of the contract.

The PREMIER: Is granite hard as a rule?

Mr. CHUBB: It may not be granite. I was told that a good deal of it was extremely soft stuff that would not require blasting; I give the information for what it is worth. I say that if Mr. Robb is going to make a good profit out of it, that is an additional reason why the other tenderers should have had an opportunity of putting in a price. If railways are going to be made in this way, what is the use of calling for tenders? It is simply a question of the Minister letting a contract to whom he thinks is the most eligible person. I would add this: that the new railways, the railways which are to be constructed out of the ten-million loan, are costing a great deal more than the sums estimated; and that when the whole of that money is spent those railways will not be finished. Several millions will be required to complete those works. Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to what seems to me to be the most important subject for consideration at the present time—that is the state of the finances of the colony. I purposely left that till the last, because I think it is the one question to which the House will have to apply itself. It is true that the Premier, in his *debonnaire* style, followed by the Colonial Treasurer, made little of it. I noticed, however, that although the Treasurer's words were hopeful his tone was rather sad. I thought he looked rather despondent, although he told us we had nothing to fear, and that we should congratulate ourselves that the deficit was not much bigger—making the same excuse that was made by the poor girl who appeared with a baby without having gone through the ceremony of marriage—that it was only a little one. It reminded me of the French story, when a similar thing happened, and the excuse was that it would have been much worse if there had been twins. Now, I do not share the sanguine hopes of the Colonial Treasurer. It is a curious thing that, while Victoria is going to have a large surplus this year, we shall be celebrating the jubilee with a deficiency of close on half-a-million. We shall never forget this Queensland jubilee, landing us in half-a-million deficit; and I believe that next year, when the other portion of the loan is floated, we shall probably see a still larger deficit, unless the affairs of the colony are rescued from the Colonial Treasurer. Now, sir, I am not going at any length through the figures that were dealt with last night. We have this authoritative fact, as admitted by the Colonial Treasurer himself, that at the end of 1883 he had a surplus of £311,000. He says the House appropriated that by common consent, thereby attempting to put on the shoulders of the House the blame that should attach to the Government for proposing an expenditure which was not justified by the circumstances.

The PREMIER: You were one of the previous Government that made just the same proposal.

Mr. CHUBB: If we had been in office we should have been able to provide for it; there is

the great difference. We would have had the courage of our opinions, and, I suppose, sufficient financial ability to have been able to meet our liabilities. That is exactly where we differed from the hon. gentleman's Government. However, they had that surplus; and I will put them in a still better position, because at the end of the following year they came down to the House with a surplus of £366,000. Now, sir, from 1884 to 1887 is only three years, and in that time they have gone to the bad with the whole of the surplus, and about £470,000 besides, which they admit now. In addition to that, they have paid some £60,000 out of loans on account of interest, which they ought to have charged to revenue. This is the result that comes out. They began this year with a credit balance of £45,000, and at the end of it they are deficient in the sum I have mentioned. Of course there were unexpended balances, and so there were before. The Government will say, "Oh, yes, £45,000 was the cash balance we had, but we had outstanding liabilities of more than that." So much the worse for them: then they had no surplus at the end of last year. Be that as it may, there are their own figures to show that from June, 1883, to June, 1887, they have gone backwards to the extent I have stated, and by next year, or when the last portion of the £10,000,000 loan is floated, they will have added to the annual debt-charge for interest £400,000. Of that £10,000,000 loan there is rather more than £2,500,000 yet to be floated, upon which there will be £80,000 to £100,000 interest to pay; that is to be met next year. Now, besides that, there is £130,000 already spent, in anticipation of a new loan, upon lines which have been sanctioned by this House; that has to be met sooner or later. The Treasury Bills Act was passed last year to enable the Treasurer to raise that money, and I think the action of the Government in paying out of loan portion of the interest is to be condemned: it was condemned by the Auditor-General. Although they had an apparent—I will not say apparent, though that is a favourite word of the Colonial Treasurer—a real surplus on one portion of the loan, a gross profit of £80,000, which will be whittled down by the expenses, they lost £100,000 on the first portion of the loan they floated; and by all proper bookkeeping that £80,000 ought to have gone to make up the deficiency on the first portion of the loan. There is that £100,000 of the £10,000,000 loan to be made up yet. All this will add to the debt of the colony, and will add to the difficulties of the Government and of the country. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Chief Secretary was very much annoyed—perhaps I should not say he was annoyed—at a *canard* in one of the Southern papers, which reported that the Government had come in with a surplus of £2,000,000, which they had spent.

The PREMIER: It was a leading article.

Mr. CHUBB: I do not care whether it was a leading article or a sub-leader. It was not true, of course; but it is extremely lucky that the Government had not a surplus of that amount. If they had had, they would have made "ducks and drakes" of it, as they have done with the real surplus and the money they have had at their disposal since we left office. So much the better for the country that they had not that surplus. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Government have attributed the falling-off in the revenue to the drought—a succession of bad seasons. True, they have had some bad seasons, but so had the previous Government. In 1879 when the previous Government took office there was reference to the bad seasons in the Speech. In 1884 the present Government set forth in their Speech that

the serious drought had almost entirely broken up. Now, sir, is it reasonable to attribute to the drought which broke up in 1884, according to their statement then, the failure of their land policy? That was their great policy. When they came into office they were to have two great strings to their bow—the ten-million loan and the Land Act. The whole land tenure of the colony was to be revolutionised. They were going to give every man a farm or homestead on the easiest terms, and they were going to build railways all over the colony. And, sir, out of the enormous revenue from land they were going to pay not only the interest on the cost of construction of those railways, but they were going to do so well as to wipe off, by degrees, the *ad valorem* and other duties; instead of which, Mr. Speaker, they found it necessary in the third year of their office to add 50 per cent. to the *ad valorem* duties. That is one thing, sir, and I shall not be surprised if before long we are asked to increase those duties again. More than half—I believe, about £6,500,000—of the loan has been raised, and I suppose more than half of it—£5,000,000—has been spent; a very small portion of the projected lines have yet been completed; and by the time the other portion of the loan is received and spent we shall be paying, as I have said, £400,000 in interest, and getting very little back for it. We must not look to our railways, Mr. Speaker, to give us much if any assistance out of the difficulty for some time, for, except during the last four months, the receipts have been falling off for the last four years. I have taken the trouble to look up the figures in reference to this, and I find that in 1883, the last year of the McIlwraith Government, the railway receipts in proportion to capital expended upon open lines was 4·280 per cent. In 1884, that is the first year of the present Government, they fell off to 4·042, or 8s. 6d. per cent. less than the preceding year. In 1885 they fell off to 3·121, or 18s. 5d. per cent. less than the previous year; and last year to 2·120—a fall from 1883 to 1886 of over 2 per cent.—even upon the calculations of the Commissioner for Railways, who always endeavours to show that railways are paying interest on the cost of construction. It is true the railway receipts have improved within the last two or three months, but we have to recollect that we are opening a number of branch lines and extensions which do not pay as well as old-established lines. Therefore I do not think that we can look to the railway revenue at the present time as likely to assist in any material degree in providing for the interest upon this enormous loan. The land was to provide the interest, and, Mr. Speaker, the land will have to provide it. I believe, sir, that the Government will find—notwithstanding the opinions of the Minister for Lands and of the Government themselves, who rushed into this House with very immature and impracticable ideas on land legislation and forced upon the country a Land Act on the non-alienation principle—I say they will have to go back to a certain extent to the old lines. I feel satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that they will be compelled to realise a certain portion of our landed estate in order to get out of the difficulties they have got into. His Excellency then says:—

"I have every reason to believe that the colony has entered upon a period of renewed prosperity, to which the largely increased development of our mineral resources that may be anticipated from the favourable attention now bestowed upon them in Great Britain, and the general influx of capital from that country, will largely contribute."

On that paragraph I must remark this: that after all it really seems as if the goldfields were

going to come to the help of the colony; and as the principal portion of those fields are in the North, it is really the North that is supporting the colony.

Mr. NORTON: And Central.

Mr. CHUBB: And the Central also.

The PREMIER: There are discoveries in the South.

Mr. CHUBB: They are only mare's nests in the South. I say the new goldfield of Croydon will probably come to the rescue of the Government at the present time, as the goldfields did in 1866, when there was great depression.

The PREMIER: That was in the South.

Mr. CHUBB: Yes; that was at Gympie. That is the only one—the *rara avis* to which there is no companion. But I say, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot look to the land to enable us to largely increase the revenue and progress of the colony so long as the present Government continue the suicidal policy they are pursuing. They said they were committed to a policy against the sale of land, and they have so far, if we may believe them, acted up to their principles; but, singular to relate, Mr. Speaker, although this year they have not sold anything like the amount of land they sold last year, the demand for land for churches in the country has increased lately. There have been a few church lots sold in the country, where there are a few towns on paper with suburban blocks surveyed around them. I happened recently to take up one of the *Gazettes*—I think it was for May—and I found that at the upset price the lands offered for sale during that month amounted to £30,000, so that the Government are to a certain extent departing from their principle of not selling land. It is true that a good deal of it was town land; but they wanted money, and were selling, as pointed out by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, valuable lands which would sooner or later have to be resumed and paid for by the Government at a much higher price. These are the gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, who not very long ago condemned the previous Government for cutting up and selling reserves. It was said that the city of Brisbane was badly treated, that they were depriving the people of their lands, and that they would sell everything they could get. But now, sir, the Minister for Lands, at any rate, is quite prepared to sanction, on the part of the Government, the sale of £30,000 worth of land at one blow in one month. I ask—Is that eating their own words or not? I, sir, hope that the colony is entering upon a period of renewed prosperity, but I am afraid that it will not be owing to anything that has been done in the way of administration by the present Government. I fear, sir, that we shall see no improvement until we have some change in the administration of the lands of the colony—a new policy, in fact. It is no use sticking to a thing that is found to be a failure, and, if we hope to prosper, we must adopt proper measures to make the land bear its fair share of the cost of the construction of railways; because by selling land to pay for railways we are simply turning one kind of capital into another. We shall still have the capital in another shape, and I think the land may very fairly be called upon to bear its share of the public burden. Until that is done we may not look for much improvement in the state of the finances or in the government of the country.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said: Mr. Speaker,—I think, sir, that the Government may congratulate themselves that in the course of the lengthy speech the hon. gentleman has just delivered he has said so very little that calls for

serious or lengthy reply. He gave us to understand when he rose that he was about to criticise the administration of the Government and the programme they have submitted to the House for the present session. I think hon. members, after hearing the address he has just delivered, can scarcely have failed to come to the conclusion that at all events as regards his speech there was "much cry and little wool." The hon. gentleman commenced his speech by referring to the expenditure incurred by the Government for the celebration of Her Majesty's jubilee in this city, and although he is not averse to the idea of spending money in regard to matters which he himself thinks are of some importance, he is disposed to condemn the Government for the very small expenditure which was incurred in connection with the celebration of the Queen's jubilee. I think that unless the Government had done nothing at all to celebrate this event which has been an occasion of rejoicing throughout the Queen's world-wide dominions, they could not have gone upon a more economical principle in giving some form of expression to the loyalty which is deep-seated in the bosom of Her Majesty's subjects in Queensland. I think it is quite possible to go too far in the matter of illuminations, as was probably the case in New South Wales and Victoria, though it was perhaps much more justifiable in Victoria, where they have a financial surplus, than in New South Wales, where they have a deficit in the public accounts. But I think hon. members ought not to lose sight of the effect which is produced in the minds of the rising generation, at all events, by the exhibition of signs and emblems of sentiments that exist in the minds of the Queen's subjects. I venture to say that of the tens of thousands of young people who paraded this city on the night of the 21st of June not one will ever have erased from his or her memory the effect of the spectacle which was then witnessed. It was more than a mere spectacle, because it was a spectacle illustrative of a deep-rooted sentiment; and those young people could not fail to have become acquainted with the reasons for the display of the illuminations witnessed here, which would tend to strengthen very much what in these days needs strengthening—a sentiment of real heartfelt loyalty to the throne and the occupant of the throne. I do not think, therefore, that any loyal subject of the Queen in the colony of Queensland will seriously begrudge the very small expenditure incurred in doing honour to Her Majesty's jubilee. I ask hon. members whether they would have felt pleased if, while the Governments of all the other colonies were doing something to celebrate the jubilee—some of them on an extravagant scale—the Government of Queensland was the only one that did literally nothing. In fact, if we did nothing, it would have been suggestive to an extent that would hardly have redounded to our credit. The hon. gentleman also addressed some criticism to the paintings which were exhibited—

Mr. CHUBB: They were caricatures.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The hon. gentleman must be aware that the paintings of the several royal personages and others exhibited on occasions of that sort are not supposed to be done with anything like the extreme accuracy of a finished portrait. But, after all, the illuminated figures formed a very small part of the illuminations for which the expenditure was incurred. I ask hon. members who looked at the manner in which the Parliamentary buildings were lit up with the thousands of small coloured lamps hung all round, and the bright gas-jet exhibited on the top of the dome, to say whether

they have come to the conclusion that the figures painted and illuminated were such as to do discredit to all the rest of the illuminations. It would, I contend, have been a disgrace to the city of Brisbane if, when private corporations and private individuals illuminated their buildings—as, for instance, in the case of the Queensland National Bank, which was illuminated in a magnificent manner—the Government of the country, who ought to set an example of loyalty, would not spend a sixpence for the purpose of celebrating Her Majesty's jubilee. I say the Government would have laid themselves open to condemnation if they had not gone to some small expenditure in the expression of the feeling of loyalty to Her Majesty that exists, not only in Brisbane but all over the colony. The hon. member next addressed some observations to the state of the finances, and the failure, as he terms it, of the Land Act. We are almost tired of hearing the statements that have been made as to the failure of the Land Act and the deficit in the finances, and the hon. gentleman has simply taken up the unfounded cry that has been circulated from one end of the colony to the other—namely, that the Land Act has been a failure. That cry has been repeated over and over again by certain persons until they themselves have come to believe the assertions which they have made in a haphazard way. I shall leave the Minister for Lands to deal with the criticisms directed to this question when he addresses the House, and I have not the slightest doubt but that he will give a very good account both of himself and the Land Act. It amuses me to see how easily the hon. member for Bowen can blow hot and cold. He says the Government ought not to have gone to the expense of a few hundred pounds in celebrating the Queen's jubilee, yet although outside he has advocated the establishment of a university, he now states that we ought not to expend any money for that purpose at present. He talks about the leakage in the Treasury, and how damaging to the prospects of the colony has been the method of expenditure indulged in by the Government in the past, and yet is actually prepared to ask this House before the session closes to sanction the appointment of an expensive commission to inquire into the working of the Civil Service. Everybody admits that the Civil Service is not on as absolutely satisfactory a foundation as is to be desired, and that it is capable of amendment in several particulars. The hon. gentleman also wants to know what the cost of the Gaol Commission has been. I suppose he wishes to have that information that he may found upon it an argument against the expenditure incurred by the Government during the recess, and yet he is prepared, in order to give effect to his own ideas, to incur a very considerable outlay in the appointment of a commission to inquire into the condition of the Civil Service.

Mr. NORTON: Could not honorary commissioners be appointed?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Honorary services in a work of this kind are not, as a rule, the most valuable. Such a commission is one that would necessitate on the part of the Government a very considerable expenditure. I am not saying that it is an expenditure which ought not to be incurred at the proper time, nor am I saying that a commission should not be appointed to inquire into this matter, but I complain of the inconsistency of the hon. gentleman who, while he condemns the expenditure incurred for the illuminations which took place on the occasion of the rejoicing at Her Majesty's jubilee, is now willing to commit the House to a large expenditure for the appointment of a commission to carry out an inquiry

into the working of the Civil Service. I shall pass over the observations he made with regard to the Redistribution Bill, and come to his remarks respecting the separation question. The hon. gentleman has become very zealous in his advocacy of separation of late. I remember the time when his zeal, although he was a Northern member, did not burn so brightly on the subject of separation. I, however, give him credit for being a convert to the views of those who think the territorial separation of the colony, and territorial separation alone, will satisfy the just requirements of the North. I believe him to be sincere in making that assertion. But really it is too bad when the Government is asked to redress the grievances that may be said to be complained of, or rather that have been complained of, with regard to the administration of affairs in the North, at the same time to hint that it is no use making concessions; it is a waste of time on their part; that nothing but separation will satisfy the demands of the people of the North; and the hon. gentleman has declared from the knowledge he possesses of the affairs of the people of the North that no candidate in the future will have the smallest chance of being returned as a member of this House who does not pledge himself to go heartily in favour of territorial separation. The hon. gentleman may know more about that sentiment in the North than I do. I am regarded by the "bunch" up yonder as a black sheep, because I do not believe in separation. I know I have incurred a great deal of very unjust odium among many of the advocates of separation in the North because I have consistently taken my stand against separation. I do not say it because I am a member of the Government, but because I could never see the parallel sought to be established between the state of affairs that exists in the North now and that which prevailed in the north of what was New South Wales, before the separation of the north from what was then New South Wales was effected, and the erection of Queensland into a new colony. I am opposed to separation because I never saw any necessity for it. It would, of course, be a good thing for some people. I do not say that the people of the North cannot manage their own affairs if they are left to themselves; but I say they can do better by remaining an integral part of the present colony of Queensland; and the development of the resources of the North, and of the Central district, and of the South, will all go hand in hand, and it will be more likely to be more generally productive of good to the colony as a whole than if the North were now to separate; particularly in the face of what it is idle to deny—that in the first instance a very large number of those who strongly advocated territorial separation did so because they were anxious to secure the introduction of black labour. When the hon. gentleman threatens that those who will go to the Northern constituencies in future and decline to commit themselves to separation will have no chance of being returned, I say I am willing to take my chance so far as I am concerned. The hon. gentleman seems to forget that there is a very large number of persons in the North at the present time who are adverse to separation, and that some intelligent Northern people are not in favour of it, although a large number of them are. It was my privilege to transmit to His Excellency the Governor, during the time the Premier was away in England, a petition from the residents of Charters Towers and the immediate neighbourhood, and signed by 2,000 persons.

Mr. CHUBB: What did Mr. Marsland say about it?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: He took the trouble to go to the other end of the world to say what he did. I wonder if he will say the same when he comes back. He seems to have come under the fascination of those who are determined to have territorial separation, and nothing but territorial separation. I am speaking of this fact, that only a few months ago 2,000 persons, residents of Charters Towers and the immediate vicinity, signed a petition in favour of keeping the colony intact, and that those signatures were obtained in two weeks—not like the 10,000 signatures which it took so many months to accumulate. That goes to show that the feeling in favour of separation, which was so strong some time ago, has become considerably weakened. Probably the North will find during the course of another twelve months that in some constituencies, at all events, those which advocate the maintenance of the colony intact will have by far the best of it. The hon. gentleman made reference to the Chinese; but it is easy, Mr. Speaker, to make capital out of a question of this kind. I agree with what has been said inside the House and out of the House, as to the desirableness of excluding Chinese; and the hon. gentleman ought to have been generous enough to have given the Premier credit for what he is doing and what he has done.

Mr. CHUBB: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I did give the Premier credit. I said that we on this side were more anxious, if anything, than he was.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I accept the hon. gentleman's explanation, but to my mind he conveyed the impression that the Premier was driven to what he did by the efforts of the other side of the House.

The PREMIER: It is not the first time that has been said.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I would point this out: everybody who knows the Premier knows that he has never been addicted to go in favour of extreme measures. He has been always in favour of trying milder measures, as, if they were successful, extreme ones were unnecessary. It is to the Premier more than to any man in the colony that we are indebted for the existence upon our Statute-book of the Chinese Immigrants Regulation Act of 1877. Does the hon. member forget that the Premier was a member of the Government that literally forced the Imperial Government to permit the existence of that Act upon our Statute-book? Is it fair to condemn the Premier as being half-hearted in the matter? He ought to be the first man to receive the credit due for the amount of restriction that exists in regard to the influx of Chinese into this colony. I say that the Premier has done that, and if the hon. gentleman is so sincere about this matter of the Chinese, why was it that it has taken such a time to discover that the coming of Chinese into the colony was an evil? That Act was brought into force before the last Government came into office, and why should the present Government be so severely censured for not having absolutely prohibited the introduction of Chinese? If it was recognised as an evil by the previous Government, why did not they improve upon the restrictions that had been made by the Chinese Immigrants Regulation Act of 1877 when they had the chance? It was, however, reserved for this Government, after all these years, to be attacked and told that they are not doing their duty to the country and preventing Chinese from coming in greater numbers. The hon. member quoted the adage about "making haste slowly"; I say in this matter the Premier has been making haste judiciously. As a matter of fact, we find that, whereas the Chinese

came here in great numbers formerly, last year only seventy-two Chinese came into the colony. Where is the jeopardy then? Where is the peril in which the colony stands if in the course of a whole twelve months, so severe are the restrictions placed upon the influx of Chinese, only seventy-two Chinese found their way into the population of this colony? The honour should be given to whom the honour is due, and I deprecate very much the attacks which have been made upon the Government, and the attempted glorification of those who are opposed to the Government, by making believe that they are patriots who want to take care of the interests of the working man and keep Chinese out of the colony. The hon. gentleman referred to the establishment of a university, but I will not follow all his remarks. I did not intend to take up more than a few minutes of the time of the House, so I shall not follow the remarks of the hon. gentleman; but I must say that, although he is a personal friend of mine, I deeply regret, and strongly deprecate the tone—not the tone so much as the taste exhibited in the remarks he made in reference to the proposed university. I think he ought to know the Premier better than to suppose that he could be actuated by such a despicable intention, as in any measure he submits to this House to come into competition with any person in the community. The hon. gentleman talks of schools of mines. The Premier stated what the views of the Government were in connection with the establishment of an institution, one of whose functions will be to communicate that instruction for which schools of mines exist. The hon. gentlemen must not suppose that the Government have not a little anxiety with regard to the mining interests of the colony. The Government are as fully aware of the importance to the well-being of the community, of the development of our mineral resources, as the hon. member can possibly be. The hon. gentleman twitted the Government with putting a sum of money on the Estimates some time ago, and doing nothing with it.

Mr. NORTON: They left it off last year.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The hon. gentleman forgets that £5,000, after all, is a very small sum on which to found a school of mines of such a character as would be required in order to do the utmost good for the mining interest. The hon. member for Port Curtis brought forward a resolution in favour of the appointment of lecturers on mineralogy in this colony. The hon. gentleman deserves great credit for having brought in and carried that resolution, which met with the warmest support from the Government and the House. The Government are not actuated by any miserable spirit of jealousy by which they cannot see any good in a measure proposed by a member on the other side, simply because it is proposed from the other side. The Government warmly recognised the importance of the hon. gentleman's proposal, and, in accordance with his resolution, two lecturers were advertised for, and both of them were appointed to lecture in the various mining centres on mineralogical subjects, and the money appropriated for schools of mines was diverted to the payment of the salaries of those lecturers.

Mr. HAMILTON: It did not amount to £5,000.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: We cannot be expected to pay lecturers salaries simply for the sake of giving them salaries. The hon. gentleman ought to know that lecturers of the capacity and attainments those gentlemen were required to possess were difficult to discover, and the Minister for Mines was a long time before he discovered a colleague for Mr. Clark,

who, I think, was the first lecturer appointed. I thought the hon. member was going to take warning from his efforts of last year, when he made a speech on the Address in Reply. With regard to the financial question, I thought he would agree with the sentiment I then expressed that he, like myself, was not exactly at home in dealing with financial questions.

Mr. CHUBB: Speak for yourself.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: He might very well have left the criticism upon the financial aspect of the administration of the Government to those who know a little more about finance. All I can say is that the hon. gentleman did not seem to me to afford very much enlightenment upon the subject.

Mr. CHUBB: You made the same statement last year. Why don't you disprove my figures?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The hon. gentleman talked about the deficit, and how wrong it was to incur expenditure. He spoke of the drought as an argument used on the part of the Government and by those defending them as a reason for that expenditure; but he lost sight of the fact that the Government were obliged to incur expenditure of an abnormal character as the result of circumstances over which they had no control.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: And the flood!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It is puerile to argue about the flood. The Government have not founded any excuse for themselves upon the fact of the occurrence of the flood. The Government in referring to the flood have taken an indirect method of paying the people of this colony a compliment, justly their due, for having in the hour of need of those persons injured by the flood come to their rescue so promptly.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Why should they be complimented by the Government?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I say the Government indirectly complimented them.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I knew the Government could not do anything directly.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I say that, in the course of their reference to the flood, the Government indirectly paid that compliment to the subscribers to the relief fund to which they were properly entitled. I have, I think, dealt with the principal points in the hon. gentleman's remarks. I thought he was going to say something in condemnation of the administration of the affairs of the colony during the recess. I can only say I feel glad that a gentleman so capable and competent, and so observant in noticing wrong-doing, if there were any on the part of the Government, has thought it unnecessary to indicate any particular in which it might be suggested that the Government had not done what might have been expected of them in the performance of the duties entrusted to them.

Mr. ADAMS said: Mr. Speaker,—I do not intend to occupy the time of the House very long, but I should not be doing my duty to my constituents if I did not say a word or two upon this Address in Reply. I cannot congratulate the mover of the Address on the speech he made, taking into consideration that he belongs to one of the learned professions. I do not think he has enlightened the House very much as to what the future is to be. As I go on I shall have to deal not only with the mover of the Address, but with other members who have spoken also. With reference to the first paragraph of the Address, everyone, I daresay, in this colony will be very proud indeed to think that Her Gracious Majesty has lived to see the jubilee year of her reign. I am very happy

to think she has done so, and I trust I shall live long enough to see the Premier live long enough to see his jubilee year as a member of the Government. I do not agree with much that has been said with regard to the Conference. Everyone must acknowledge, as everyone who has spoken on the floor of the House has acknowledged, that the finances are not what we would like them to be. I suppose we shall never know what amount of money was spent upon the trip the Premier made to the old country. He has not told us, and I do not know what actual good can come of it. Therefore I, not singly, but with a vast number of my fellow-colonists, protest against that action. If we had a ship almost sinking, what should we say if the captain were to abandon her? The finances of the colony were going down rapidly before the Premier went home, and at the time of his leaving the colony was visited by a devastating flood. He must have been aware of that, as he was stuck up by it on his road to Sydney; and, knowing these facts, it was the duty of the Premier to stick to his country and endeavour to alleviate the suffering that had occurred. But he abandoned the people of the colony, like a captain abandoning a sinking ship. Before the hon. gentleman left for home, I read in a paper—in one of his speeches I think it was—that he had been invited to go home by Her Gracious Majesty herself.

The PREMIER: I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. ADAMS: It is just possible the hon. gentleman may have been misreported.

The PREMIER: It was not even so reported.

Mr. ADAMS: However, I read it, I think, in the *Observer*.

The PREMIER: It was not in the *Observer*.

Mr. ADAMS: It must have been a misreport, for I believe he was only invited home in the same way as the other delegates were. I also saw it stated in a newspaper that the Government was requested to appoint some gentleman who was actually at home to assist the Agent-General at the Conference. There were several gentlemen at home at that time from the colony who could have performed that work remarkably well—I do not say quite as well as the Premier—and yet the hon. gentleman went, carrying with him the key of Parliament in his pocket. And it seems to my mind plain that he has pledged the colony to certain things, and he, of course, expects that he is going to carry them. The hon. member who moved the Address in Reply (Mr. Foxton), when speaking about the Land Act, quoted these words from the Governor's Speech:—

"I am glad to note the large and increasing demand for land for occupation by *bond fide* settlers."

It seems strange to me that a gentleman holding the position of a Queen-street lawyer should know very much about the settlement of the people on the land and the operation of the Land Act. I can inform the hon. gentleman that the Land Act is a perfect failure. The hon. gentleman who seconded the Address in Reply (Mr. Annear) said he had had some conversation with the Minister for Lands about something, but did not tell us what that something was. But he told the people of Bundaberg, when he was up there, what he had said to the Minister for Lands, and that was that the *bond fide* selector who wished to settle on the lands of the colony would not do so because the restrictions were so great; they did not care about taking up land on such terms. If a man takes up his 160 acres, intending to make it a home for himself and his family, he has to work on it until his money is nearly exhausted, and he cannot cut a stick of

timber upon it until he has obtained the permission of the Minister for Lands; and we all know what red-tapeism is. And the hon. member, Mr. Annear, who is acquainted with the facts, knows that very well; and that for that reason men will not settle on the land. The same hon. member said that the Act would prevent dummyming. Will any hon. gentleman tell me whether it is not really a dummier's Act?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It is not.

Mr. ADAMS: If I was a man of capital, and had five or six sons, I could go myself and select 20,000 acres of land, picking the eye out of the country. If I did not get all the good land in that 20,000 acres, my son of twenty-five could select 20,000 acres adjoining; and my other sons who were old enough to select could each do the same, until we got amongst us a whole countryside. Does the hon. gentleman not call that dummyming? It seems to me that before very long we shall have a change in our land laws. This is seen by the dummies, and they have the idea that they will have the first right of purchase. I have said it on the platform and inside this House, and I maintain it, that if the Government wish to settle people on the land they will have to materially alter the Act of 1884. Then we are told that—

"The public finances have, however, not escaped the natural consequences of the long-continued adverse seasons, but I see no reason to doubt that with careful administration they will shortly exhibit their usual satisfactory condition."

I do not wish to repeat what has already been said on this subject, but when we take all things into consideration we must admit that a more disgraceful state of our finances than that we now witness could not be imagined. It has been mentioned before that when the present Government took office the Colonial Treasurer had a surplus of £311,000. However, even this £311,000 was not sufficient for them, and it was not long before there was a deficiency—I believe last year it was some £60,000. At that time it was thought that we would be able to make that up by imposing fresh taxation upon the general public, and an additional 2½ per cent. *ad valorem* duty was imposed, making 7½ per cent. in the place of 5 per cent. Even that was not enough. In thickly populated districts, where the people came under the provisions of the Health Act, the endowment was taken away, thereby giving the Government a large amount of money. Even this is not sufficient. We were told last year that this £60,000 would be wiped off by the 2½ per cent. additional *ad valorem* and the taking away of the endowment to boards of health, but in place of that we have at the present time nearly half-a-million of a deficit. I do not know what is meant by the expression "I see no reason to doubt that with careful administration they will shortly exhibit their usual satisfactory condition." I do not know what the "satisfactory condition" will be, unless it is that the present Government goes out of office, and another Government takes the reins of power and gets the Treasury full with another £311,000 of a surplus, and for them to go back and handle it again. Whether that is what is meant by the "usual satisfactory condition" or not I cannot say. I do not wish to take up the time of the House very long, but I must say a word or two in reference to this university. Now, sir, I intend to do all in my power to prevent a vote for that purpose; not that I do not feel even myself the want of a better education, but because I am perfectly satisfied that the Treasury, in the present state of the finances, would not stand the strain. We must first of all do what we possibly can to give an education to our children, and if we give them the education that they can get in the primary schools and the

grammar schools, I think we are going quite far enough. It is all very well for people living in the southern portion of the colony, particularly in Brisbane, to say that if they had a magnificent building here, with professors and all that sort of thing, they would be able to send their sons and daughters to get a university education; but the pioneers of the colony, who have gone out to subdue the forest, cannot get an education for their children without paying for it. It is taxing the pioneers to pay for a luxurious education for people living in luxury in and around the suburbs of Brisbane. I am very proud to say that the educational system at the present time is very much appreciated by a vast number of people; but I do think that instead of the few helping the many, the many ought to help the few. For instance, in my district if we want provisional schools we have to build them ourselves, and then we are supplied with a teacher, and then if we have a complaint to make to the department against that teacher—I have done it myself—they write back to say that I may be able to interpret one clause of the regulations, but I am not able to interpret another. That other was that the parents are supposed to assist in paying the teacher after they have erected the building at their own cost, while people in Brisbane and the towns of the colony get their education free. Education is a grand thing, and wherever there are railways people ought to be encouraged to send their children to school. The children ought to have a railway pass year by year to take them to the schools a distance of say two to seven miles away. It is impossible for any man to send families of children four or five years of age four or five miles to school; and yet, while the pioneers of the colony are taxed, others can send their children to school free of any cost whatever. Therefore I do not think it is wise in the present state of the finances of the colony that a vote should be given for a university. Those who wish their children educated to such a high standard should put their hands in their pockets and show the public they are in earnest; and then, I daresay, they would be able to come to the House when the finances of the country have improved and get a small grant for the purpose of paying professors. I find here a paragraph in the Ministerial organ published to-day, where my friend the hon. member for Maryborough (Mr. Annear) has a slur cast upon him simply because he has not that flow of eloquence and has not been educated up to that standard which many have been here. I have known that gentleman for the last twenty years, and I consider he is a credit to the Assembly. He has got his education by hard work; it is experience that he has got, and that is as good an education as he could possibly bring into the Legislature. It is not very creditable to the editor, whoever he may be. He says:—

"Temperance orators produce the shocking example and the reformed drunkard."

I suppose they want to make it appear that the hon. member for Maryborough is one of these fearful examples.

"If the Government wanted an example of a man who offers a splendid subject for the very highest education in mechanics, they could find at least five or six on their side of the House, but they could not find a better than Mr. Annear is, nor a better example of the personal and public loss suffered through neglect. Had Mr. Annear been blessed with that mental development which a good university education brings about, and had his special powers been trained in a congenial profession, Mr. Annear would have been one of the first men in this country."

Now, I have known that hon. member for over twenty years, and I have known that man stand up before the public and speak for the benefit of his colony, and I have known gentlemen educated

in colleges who have stood even on the floor of this House, and who, when they got up to speak, could only say "Hear, hear!" and sit down. Now, I say that any hon. member who has worked his way up as Mr. Annear has done is a credit to himself and a credit to his country. There is one thing more that I had forgotten when speaking on the lands. Some three or four years ago I happened to be one of a deputation that waited on the Premier to try and bring out some sort of Act to prohibit people from building their houses too close together, and to regulate the width of streets. At that time he promised that he would bring in such a measure. Well, sir, I was extremely puzzled about four or five weeks ago to see that the Government had actually sold sixteen-perch allotments.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Twelve.

Mr. ADAMS: Why, sir, the very reason given by the Premier to that deputation was that he wanted if possible to bring in a Bill that would prevent persons from building their houses in such a way that it would interfere with the public health and the lives of the people. And here we find the present Government have actually gone and sold sixteen-perch allotments.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Twelve perches.

Mr. ADAMS: Twelve! worse and worse, Mr. Speaker. However, we will take the sixteen-perch allotments, leaving the other four perches out, and I should like to know what sort of a building could be erected thereon; or if one was erected on each allotment close together, what chance there would be in a climate like this to let fresh air through and around them. Therefore, sir, no matter in what aspect we look at it, we find the Government saying one thing to-day and actually doing another to-morrow. I trust, sir, that the anticipations of the present Government will be realised, not that I expect the usual prosperity will arrive just now. Possibly it may come in the way I have mentioned before. I anticipate that they will go out of office and others will get into power who will fill the Treasury for them and get a surplus of £300,000 or £400,000, and they will come in and enjoy it. Perhaps that is what is meant by this usual state of prosperity, and if it is I hope to goodness it will come very soon.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. B. Dutton) said: Mr. Speaker,—I have not risen at an earlier part of the debate to answer some of the criticisms, or rather denunciations, that were made concerning the Land Act and the working of it, because really there was nothing of importance stated by any of the hon. members who have spoken, and I waited expecting that something of really serious importance requiring refutation would have been stated, but up to the present time there have been nothing more than a few bald assertions—nothing else—a general condemnation of something; and some of the hon. members who have spoken, and who ought to know better, have really shown their utter ignorance of the Act.

Mr. PATTISON: They are backed up by facts.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: When I say that, I refer more particularly to the hon. member for Port Curtis. The way in which he blunders and misstates and misrepresents the meaning of the Act is something to me perfectly incomprehensible. However, I shall first deal with the statements made by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, and I shall not refer to anything except his

remarks on the Land Act. The other parts of his speech were effectually dealt with by the Premier and others on this side of the House. In the first instance he pointed to the fact that in the first year after the Act came into operation there was a certain number of grazing farms taken up, a very small number admittedly. But he did not refer at all to the agricultural farms. It was not necessary to do that to carry out his view of things. He referred only to the small number of grazing farms taken up during the first year after the Act came into operation—a year distinguished by one of the severest droughts we have ever experienced. Of course no one cared to look for land—agricultural or grazing farms or anything else—at that time. There was no possibility of settlement being carried on under the then existing circumstances however willing people might be. But in the next year a very marked change had taken place. Rain had come, and in the year 1886 there was a larger area of land taken up in those parts of the country where there was any population likely to settle upon the land than has ever been done in any year since Queensland has been Queensland—double that of any previous nine years.

Mr. PATTISON: Name the districts.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Are Mr. Foxton's figures correct?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. gentleman can refer in confirmation of my statement to the report of the operation of the Land Act which was laid on the table yesterday. If he does that, he will be able to see that what I say is quite correct, and if not he will be able to refute it. I assume, and every hon. gentleman in the House will admit, the statements made in that report to be correct.

Mr. PATTISON: Mr. Speaker,—I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is referring to papers laid on the table of the House which hon. members have not seen and know nothing about. I shall be pleased to listen to the hon. gentleman, but I want the same information that he possesses. I want those papers placed in my hands so that I shall be able to criticise them. I therefore move that the papers be read.

Mr. W. BROOKES: I rise to a point of order. I do wish, Mr. Speaker, that you would sit upon the hon. member for Blackall, because he interrupted hon. members several times yesterday. He is on the verge of contracting a very bad habit. There is no point of order at all in what he says.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Mr. Speaker—

The PREMIER: There is no point of order.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I suppose even if there was a point of order, Mr. Speaker, there is no necessity for you to sit upon the hon. member for Blackall as suggested by the hon. member for North Brisbane.

The SPEAKER: Since this question was raised yesterday I have taken the opportunity of looking up the authorities on the subject, and I find that according to the practice of the House of Commons when a Minister of the Crown is addressing the House, and alludes to a public document which has not been placed upon the table of the House, and which is not accessible to hon. members, he is bound, if desired by the House, either to read it or lay it upon the table; but that privilege does not apply to private members of the House when addressing it. In this instance the hon. the Minister for Lands is alluding to a document which has already been placed on the table and ordered to be printed, and I therefore think the hon. gentleman is perfectly in order in referring



to it. The fact that he paper has not been circulated amongst hon. members is of course a point with which I cannot deal. The document in question having been laid upon the table and ordered to be printed, the hon. gentleman, as a Minister of the Crown, is perfectly in order in referring to it.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** The statistics I refer to are part of the material in the Lands Office with which I, of course, am conversant. I suppose hon. members will have to wait until they are printed before they get them; they will then have an opportunity of seeing whether they are accurate or not. To show how far the contention of the leader of the Opposition was right in quoting the area of land selected in the first year of the Act, I shall refer to a few figures. That year was distinguished by fearful drought, and I admit that little or nothing was done. The Act was not fairly in operation that year. But in the second year, 1886, rain came; the Act was in fairly good working order, and in that year 1,122 agricultural farms, embracing an area of 222,837 acres, were selected, giving an average of about 199 acres for each farm.

**MR. PATTISON:** That is only assertion.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** Those are facts which can be verified.

**MR. STEVENSON:** How many were selected?

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** 1,122 agricultural farms, embracing an area of 222,837 acres, or about 199 to each farm.

**MR. MOREHEAD:** These are freeholds.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** They may be made freeholds, in spite of the statements made by the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Port Curtis, that the Act admitted only of leasing—that the fee-simple was ignored entirely.

**MR. MOREHEAD:** So it would if you had your way.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** I am speaking of what it is, not what it might have been. Of grazing farms in the same year sixty-six were taken up, embracing an area of 242,140 acres, or an average of about 3,668 acres to each grazing farm. This class of grazing farmers are nothing in the shape of the large graziers at all. They are small grazing farmers settled in country that at present, and for as far ahead as these leases will last, will not be required for any other purpose than grazing; and a more valuable class of graziers as settlers in the country than these small farmers the colony could not have. No more desirable class of men could be established in this country, and there will be a great many more of them as soon as the lands best suited for them can be brought within their reach. At present we have not been able to get much of that land open for selection. I would also draw the attention of hon. gentlemen to the average area of the agricultural farms which have been taken up in 1886—199 acres each. That shows that close settlement is gone in for on these agricultural farms, and it may be said that that 1,122 selections represents 1,122 *boni fide* farmers; that is very much more, I think, than can be said for the operation of any other Land Act in Queensland since Queensland has been Queensland; and the same thing would be in operation in all parts of the colony, even as far north as Cooktown, had not the available land there not been permitted to be entirely absorbed by speculative selectors under the Act of 1876. Nine-tenths of the richest lands of the North are owned by men who are not in the colony at all. They did only what

1887—E

was absolutely necessary to enable them to obtain their certificates and get their deeds, and there the land is now, in the same state of wilderness as it was first found. That is the case in every small centre of population in the North. Selectors will have to go a long way into the back country now, a long way from market, and incur great danger from blacks and every other difficulty. Even the lands around the railways that have already been started there are in the hands of men who are making no use whatever of them, unless grazing stock upon them, which is very often not their own, but actually belonging to the lessee out of which the selection was taken. The operation of the Act during the six months of the present year has been as successful as that of the whole of last year. When hon. gentlemen consider how little land there is in the populous districts of Queensland that is so situated as to be a desirable acquisition to small settlers, I think the amount taken up is something wonderful within the last twelve months.

**MR. DONALDSON:** Have you the figures for the last year?

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** Yes; for the six months ending on 30th June last, there were 523 agricultural farms taken up, embracing an area of 97,420 acres.

**MR. PATTISON:** In what districts?

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** That means an average of 186½ acres.

**MR. PATTISON:** In what districts?

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** All over the colony. I will have a return prepared if the hon. gentleman requires it. As I pointed out in the first instance, the selection has taken place in those parts of the colony where there is a population.

**MR. PATTISON:** Springsure, I suppose?

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** For instance, there have been 25,000 acres taken up in the Brisbane district in agricultural farms. In the Ipswich land agent's district there were 81,000 acres. In the Toowoomba district 20,000 acres were taken up, and in the Warwick district 21,000 acres were taken up. Those are the large figures.

**MR. PATTISON:** How many in Rockhampton?

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** Two thousand eight hundred and eighteen acres. I may tell the House that in those districts very little land has been taken up, which is due mainly to the fact, as I have already stated, that the lands are in the hands of large owners and acquired under the Acts of 1868 and 1876, and that has absolutely barred settlement. Unless intending settlers choose to go outside they cannot get land, and that applies to nearly every district in the colony from the southern border to the North. During the same time, the first six months of the present year, fifty-two grazing farms were taken up, comprising an area of 256,911 acres, giving an average of 494 acres to each farm. It will be seen that the average is slightly greater than that of last year, but it is of such a moderate amount that no hon. member can say that the selections were taken up by grasping 200,000-acre men. I must now refer to what the hon. gentleman said in regard to the appointment of an Under Secretary for Agriculture. Some remark has been made as to the way in which that department is to be worked. The Under Secretary for Agriculture is intended here to work in a more practical way than is generally understood by the work that a department of that kind would perform in older and more settled countries. That is, it will not be so

purely scientific, or so generally scientific in its application or working, as it would be in older and more settled countries. The Lands Department has always been under a very great disadvantage in that respect. There has never been any man connected with it whose sole duty it has been to acquaint himself with the general character of the lands open to selection and who could give intending selectors that distinct and minute direction and information as to the lands open for selection and their position, and the ease or difficulty of getting to them, which is necessary to enable men to determine whether it is within their means to go on it or not. It is intended that this Under Secretary for Agriculture shall especially have that duty under his control, and that he shall make himself thoroughly acquainted with the character of all the lands that are open. He must have maps and plans and every information which can be possibly required by any selector—to be able to put his hand upon it at once and point out what he can select, and what difficulties there may be to contend with in settling upon that land and making it a paying undertaking. He will also have to collect such information as may be necessary to assist agriculturists in their ordinary occupations. If it is necessary to get seed or plants from other parts of the colony, or of the world, he will be prepared to give all the information that is necessary as to the advisability of introducing them, and to assist in their introduction. In fact he will be of general assistance, and give advice to all agricultural settlers. I wish to impress upon hon. members that the idea is to give all the information that may possibly be required by intending settlers.

Mr. NORTON : A clerk in the office could do that.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS : The hon. gentleman talks about agriculture, and I suspect he does not know one end of a plough from the other. From what the hon. member said about the Yeulba farm I have not a very high opinion of his knowledge of practical agriculture or of anything else.

Mr. MOREHEAD : What about the Yeulba mansupial district ?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS : I admit the hon. gentleman scored one there, but he has not heard the last of that matter yet. The hon. gentleman did not seem to be in favour of Mr. McLean being appointed to the office of Under Secretary. I am responsible for making the selection, and I am satisfied, from my knowledge of him since he was appointed, that he will be able to carry out the duties of the office as they ought to be carried out. He has got his heart in the work, and he is an earnest, hardworking man. There is not a harder-working man in the Government service this day than Mr. McLean, and no man has a higher sense of the importance of the duties he has to perform. I am sure he will be able to carry out the work of his office very efficiently indeed. The leader of the Opposition objected to the appointment of Mr. Rule in his place.

Mr. MOREHEAD : I do.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS : He said he was put over the heads of lots of older men—he did not say better men. Age does not, I think, determine a question of a man's fitness for particular work. A man might live to be as old as Methuselah and yet be unfit for the work he was at the whole of the time. My idea is to put the most efficient man in the office, whether he is in the service or out of it. I shall not scruple at any time to go out of the office to get a better man than can be got in it.

Mr. STEVENSON : Why did you not appoint the other man who applied for the position ?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS : The hon. member will have an opportunity to talk presently if he will only leave me alone. The running fire of interjections by which I am continually interrupted is certainly in very bad taste. I never interrupt any hon. gentleman. I formed a very high opinion of Mr. Rule as a Crown lands ranger, and I looked upon him as the most efficient ranger we had, and the most reliable man we had in the service. That is saying a great deal for him, because there is a good deal of responsibility attached to that office, and I got an opportunity at the same time of obtaining some knowledge of his character for fairness. He also distinguished himself as a dividing commissioner, in which position he acted with great delicacy, tact, and judgment, and his duty was very difficult to deal with as he dealt with it. I do not know that it is necessary for me to speak of the appointment to another office of Mr. Thompson. I do not know how he performs the duties of his office, and I have no doubt if the question is asked of the Minister for Works it will be very fully answered. The Minister for Works is not the sort of man to have any man forced upon him against his wishes or his judgment. What I do know is that, whether his decisions as arbitrator be good or bad, the Government were wofully and shamelessly plundered in railway arbitrations before he went into office. For years and years, to my certain knowledge, any man who did not get double the value of land resumed from him by a railway passing through it, showed that he was a very great fool indeed.

Mr. MOREHEAD : The late railway arbitrator was appointed by the party now in power.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS : I do not care who the late railway arbitrator was or by whom he was appointed. I was very much amused by the hon. member's denunciation of the system of education in this country. He said it was carried too far and people were over-educated and rendered unfit for their positions. That is perfectly consistent with the opinions he has always expressed in this House. He is the representative of a class, the owners of property, who I admit are of fair intelligence in this country, but as the representative of that class he does not like to see the possibility of a class educated sufficiently to tread too closely on their heels. The same spirit that prompts the hon. gentleman's objection to higher education also prompts his denunciation and objection to the Land Act, for it gives opportunities to men, who would otherwise remain labourers, of getting out of that position and establishing a home and independence for themselves. I do not say they have always been denied that, but the Land Act gives them greater facilities for so doing than they ever had before ; and that of itself is quite sufficient to explain the hon. gentleman's objection to that Act. He has never explained it in any other way. We have the charge about Mr. Golden brought up every session in the House. Every session we are treated to a dose of it specially to damage me, as we know the hon. members who make it are animated by personal animosity to me, and they try to discredit Mr. Golden in that way to get at me. Why do they not go straight for me without trying to hit me through another man ? That is a sort of cowardice I can have no sympathy for. I think that finishes the whole of the hon. gentleman's tirade against the Lands Department.

Mr. MOREHEAD : Deal with Mr. Paul,

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I have dealt with him often enough, and I leave the hon. gentleman to deal with him now. The most serious charge made by the hon. member for Port Curtis against the Land Act was that some man in his sparsely populated district, somewhere about Raglan, applied for a forfeited selection and had some difficulty in getting it. It must be a very serious charge in a district where the hon. gentleman could only get thirty people together to hear him expound his political views. I always endeavour to meet even a question of that kind, but this probably could not be met.

Mr. NORTON: The man has waited six months for an answer and has not got it yet.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I do not think the charge is sufficiently serious to warrant my dwelling upon it longer. There is a more serious matter than that. The hon. gentleman in all his speeches endeavours to enlighten the public. In his speech at Mount Morgan, and in his speech here last night, he said that the Act of 1884 does not admit of a fee-simple being obtained.

Mr. NORTON: I did not say so.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I will quote the hon. member's words. The hon. gentleman, speaking of the Act, says:—

"An Act which does not deal with the fee-simple but which simply leases."

Mr. NORTON: Hear, hear!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Is that true?

Mr. NORTON: Generally speaking.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It is absolutely untrue. If the hon. gentleman asserts that then, he must either be so obtuse as not to be able to understand anything, or he intends to say what is untrue.

The SPEAKER: It is quite contrary to Parliamentary practice to refer to, much less to read, the debates of the present session. An hon. member may incidentally refer to them, but it is quite contrary to practice to read them.

Mr. NORTON said: Mr. Speaker,—I hope you will allow me to say that I do not object to the hon. member referring to anything I have said, particularly when the discussion has not yet finished. What I say is that leasing is the main principle of the Act. I do not say a man cannot get a fee-simple under any conditions.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—Surely the rule you have quoted does not apply to a debate that is not concluded.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Mr. Speaker,—Even admitting that you are right, or that the Premier is right, we always allow the Minister for Lands any amount of latitude. No objection is taken on this side of the House. The further he runs, the more we get him.

Mr. CHUBB: Mr. Speaker,—The Chief Secretary is quite right in his contention. The restriction cannot apply to a debate that is actually unfinished. The 85th Standing Order is quite clear on that point. It says that—

"No member shall allude to any debate of the same session, upon a question or Bill not being then under discussion, except by the indulgence of the House for personal explanations."

The SPEAKER: It is quite possible I may have interpreted the rule in too rigid a sense. I have no wish to do anything that will interfere with the rights of a member replying in a debate which is not yet finished. The 86th Standing Order provides that—

"No member shall read from a printed newspaper or book the report of any speech made in Parliament during the same session unless such report refer to the debate then proceeding."

That is the rule adopted in the House of Commons, and the object is to prevent interminable discussion on matters not relevant to the question under consideration. But as the Minister for Lands is speaking in defence of his own department, I think the rule may be extended to the hon. member. The House will see that if a constant reference to *Hansard* were permitted it would give rise to a needless amount of discussion.

Mr. W. BROOKES: Mr. Speaker,—I may just say a word with reference to the matter we are now talking about. It seems to me that if you rule that the *Hansard* of yesterday, containing a report of the debate now going on, cannot be referred to, you put a stumbling-block in the way of debate. I really cannot come to any other conclusion. If the hon. member for Port Curtis had said he did not think he used such an expression—if he had done as the leader of the Opposition did when he came yesterday and claimed the indulgence of the House—it would have been perhaps better. First the leader of the Opposition said he never used certain words, and then that if he did use them he did not intend to do so. We let that hon. member off very easily, because the hon. members on either side of me heard him use the word that he first said he did not use.

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker,—I must rise to order. To introduce fresh matter into a discussion on your ruling will lead to no end of confusion.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Mr. Speaker,—Speaking to the point of order, I think—and I say it with all due deference to the Chair—that your ruling is not in accordance with Standing Orders 85 and 86. I think the Minister for Lands was perfectly in order in reading from the report of a debate that is still proceeding. Your first ruling was in my opinion scarcely correct, and in endeavouring to modify it you have left a doubt which it would be better to at once remove. As to the remarks of the hon. member for North Brisbane with reference to myself I made no speech yesterday as he said I did, and when I did speak I did not use the language he has put into my mouth.

The SPEAKER: I have no desire to restrict the rights of hon. members. My only wish is that the rules of debate should be strictly adhered to, and the rule I read has been laid down by some of the best Speakers in the House of Commons. It is quite clear on further consideration that under the 86th Standing Order the hon. member was not out of order in reading the extract from the *Hansard* report of the present unfinished debate.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I am quite content to confine myself to my memory of what occurred last night. I have pointed out what the hon. gentleman said, and it is not the first time the same thing has occurred. The hon. gentleman has referred to it constantly and consistently in this House, and his words have a certain effect upon outside people who read his speeches, and who look upon him as an authority, to a certain extent, for the interpretation of the law. The hon. gentleman went on to say last night that a gentleman from Stanthorpe came to him, who wanted to take up a selection there, and asked him why he could not get the freehold of an agricultural farm.

Mr. NORTON: I hope the hon. member will not misquote me. I did not say the gentleman spoke of an agricultural farm. I did not use the word "agricultural" at all.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There is nothing else but agricultural land open in the neighbourhood of Stanthorpe, as a matter of fact,

and such being the case I could only conclude that an agricultural farm was what the hon. member referred to. At all events, I accept his word that it was not an agricultural farm; but taken in connection with what he said, it was a very reasonable thing that I should have associated it with agricultural farms.

Mr. NORTON: You forget what I said about agricultural farms. You omit that altogether.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I do not know what his name was, and therefore I do not know what his application was.

Mr. NORTON: The hon. gentleman mistakes me entirely. I did not say that this gentleman referred to a farm of his own; he was speaking in general terms, not of a selection of his own, but of the leasing principles of the Act.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The gentleman must be ignorant of the Act when he does not know that he could get a freehold. The hon. gentleman, however, is continually making remarks of the same nature. However, to pass on from that. The hon. gentleman pointed out last night that when he made a speech at Mount Morgan he misled the people there in what was not a very serious matter, but in another that was serious he misled them, and that was with regard to freeholds, when I made an interjection—the only interjection I did make. I do not like doing it, but I could not help interjecting, “That is not the only mistake.” Now, I should expect the hon. member, of all men in the House—being a quiet, contemplative man—to reflect upon what he intended saying. It was only a matter of fact, and yet he did not state the facts. I now refer to the Timber Regulations. I am only speaking from memory, but I think that at Mount Morgan he told them that the royalties cost more to collect than they amounted to. Now, I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman said that. I believe he did.

Mr. NORTON: Not exactly. What I said was that the collection of royalties probably cost as much as the royalties amounted to.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Now, I wonder what the hon. gentleman meant when he said that. If he had even the faintest idea of what was being done under the Timber Regulations, he would have known that there was not one iota of truth in it. I assert that the collection of those timber royalties has not involved an extra cost of £100 to the country since the regulations came into force. That is a fact, and the hon. gentleman can call for the papers and prove it for himself. All the bailiffs and rangers must be employed under the Land Act, or under the Act of 1876, as well as under the existing Act, and it is necessary that they should be employed wherever land is selected. These men are employed in collecting the royalties, and when they have nothing to do they may as well be employed in that work, as they must be kept to carry out the requirements of the Land Act. As a matter of fact I say that last year the cost to revenue was not £100 for the collection of royalties, whilst the royalties amounted to about £10,000, and that is a very great deal more than was got under any other system of working. Even then we have not got anything like the amount there ought to be, as the bailiffs and rangers are not able to prevent themselves being circumvented by people sometimes. The hon. member, in reference to the appointment of the Under Secretary for Agriculture, said we wanted a scientist. I do not think the time has arrived yet when a scientist in that position would fulfil all the requirements of the country. There will be a time, probably, by-and-by when the post will be filled by a scientist, but at the present time what

we want is a thoroughly practical farmer, who knows land when he sees it, who knows what difficulties the selector has to overcome, and who will be prepared to give all the information to a man before he goes on to the land. The hon. gentleman also referred to the Yeulba farm, and condemned the action of the Government with reference to it. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has ever visited the Yeulba farm.

Mr. NORTON: No.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I am sorry to say that after I became Minister for Lands I was about eighteen months or two years in office before I visited it; but as soon as I did go to look at it I shut the thing up as quickly as I could, for the man who selected that with any hope of instructing anybody in farming or anything else must have been a born idiot. Such a hole no man ever saw in which to attempt to start agriculture. It was the most hopeless place I think I was ever in. I never saw anything like it.

Mr. STEVENSON: Was it as bad as brigalow scrub?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It was worse—there was nothing good about it. Well, that was a legacy from the last Government, and I regret very much that I did not visit it sooner, and so save the country considerable expense. The hon. gentleman also referred to the pine and other plantations on Fraser Island. Well, I have never visited them, but I have read the reports of the scheme, and I shall have the report laid on the table of the House. I believe very fair work has been done for the amount of money expended there by Mr. McDowall and a ranger who lives on the island. That man and his son are stationed there in charge of the plantation, and they are doing good work in extending it. However, I do not think there is any necessity for expending money in carrying out such a scheme as was proposed when it was initiated. There is plenty of timber on the Burnett Ranges to supply the country for the next fifty years.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is looking a long way ahead.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The supply is being continually replenished, for, as soon as a reserve is shut up for three, four, or five years, the young timber is sufficient to keep the market supplied without anything like a systematic cultivation or preservation of the young trees throughout all the scrubs of the colony. I am referring to pine; cedar is slower growing. I think that covers all points of importance brought forward—if any of them can be said to be of much importance—by members of the other side of the House. With reference to the working of the Land Act, I think every independent and impartial person will admit that the working of the Act has been very satisfactory indeed. I am very well satisfied with it at all events. Of course continuous misstatements are made from the other side of the House. I may refer to the statement made by the hon. member for Bowen, who said that the Government when they started their railway policy stated that the lands of the colony under the new system would meet every possible demand.

Mr. MOREHEAD: The Minister for Works distinctly said so in the House.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I never go outside my own department. The only member of the Government who made reference to anything of the kind was my hon. colleague, the Minister for Works. He said it in this way—it is an easy thing to turn a statement so that it will bear a

very different complexion to what was desired—it was to this effect; that in time, many years hence, when these lands by increasing population had increased in value, they would represent such an income to the country that they would meet all the interest on the construction of railways. That is what he said. I never went so far myself, and I do not think any member of the Government did; but I do claim that where the land is leased the State has the increasing value of the land. The land can be made freehold outside the homestead selections. Of course they have to pay a fair price to make it freehold, and they have very easy terms so long as it continues leasehold. I feel perfectly satisfied that with the increasing value, if the leasing system is adhered to in all large areas, the country will benefit by it immensely in years to come.

Mr. STEVENSON said: Mr. Speaker,—I should think the latter part of the hon. gentleman's speech would be the most pleasing part of it to his colleagues; he said he never interferes outside his own department. I should fancy his colleagues must be very pleased to hear that he is not going to interfere in any other department, because they know perfectly well that he has done quite enough damage in his own. Now, sir, I think hon. members on this side of the House are rather at a disadvantage in talking in this debate at all. Almost every member who has spoken on the other side of the House has referred to documents that are not in our possession—documents which were laid on the table yesterday and which we have had no opportunity of seeing. I say it is most unfair that the debate should be conducted on those lines. Hon. members on the other side ought to know better than allude to documents that the members on this side have had no opportunity of getting particulars of. Now, sir, like several other hon. members, I will commence and go through the Speech, though I do not intend to allude to every detail in it. Like other hon. members, I have no objection to the first paragraph, nor to the second congratulating Her Majesty on the fiftieth year of her reign. There is one point in the next paragraph I do wish to allude to, and that is in regard to the Conference. I think it is very hard lines indeed, after the Premier has taken the trouble to tell us that the Conference was of so much importance, that invitations had been sent to the colonies to send home their very best men, and that, as he said in his speech at the Town Hall the other night, the very best men had been chosen from Queensland to go home and take part in this Conference—I think it is very hard indeed that we do not know what our best men did there. Now, I find we were promised by the hon. gentleman himself that the whole of what took place at the Conference would in due time be disclosed, but from the London telegrams this morning I see that is not to be the case. I will read what the hon. gentleman said himself when he arrived in Brisbane on the 1st of July:—

“When the invitation from Her Majesty's Imperial Government first came to the colonies to send representatives to the Conference proposed to be held—the first Conference ever suggested in the history of the British Empire—it occurred to him at once that it was a very desirable thing that the Australian colonies at any rate should be represented by the very best men available to go there. (Applause.) That opinion was confirmed by all those whose opinions he valued in this colony—and he had the opportunity of getting the advice of those who were best qualified to judge.” I do not know whether he went all over the colony to find those qualified to judge; he seems to have been satisfied with a very few around him. He was satisfied that he had the intelligence of the whole colony around him. I suppose when he consulted himself he thought he

had consulted the whole colony, because I believe that is really what he does think—that he is the I Am of Queensland. We know perfectly well he does think it; is not he always telling us what a good boy he is? No doubt he is the best man in Queensland by comparison with those alongside him. The hon. gentleman takes very good care never to get a man alongside him that he does not compare well with. It is a contrast, not a comparison, that the hon. gentleman looks out for.

“He was sure that from that time to this he had no reason to change the opinion he had then formed; on the contrary, he felt he was justified in saying that the success that had attended the meeting of that Conference—of which the people of Queensland had received very imperfect information, but would receive all before long.”

Now, last night the hon. gentleman told us that we were not to receive all, but that so much was to be expunged as the gentlemen sitting at the Conference thought fit. Well, what are we going to know about it? and if we are not to know all, what is the good of knowing anything? What is the use of our going to the expense of sending home the very best man Queensland can produce—according to his own idea—if we are not to have the advantage of knowing what he did there? I have not the exalted idea of what was done at this Conference that a good many people have; but I think that whether little or much has been done we ought to know it. The hon. gentleman did not give us any information as to what was going to be done in New Guinea. I believe that some great changes are going to take place there. I have heard that the Imperial Government are going to take New Guinea out of the hands of the Australian colonies altogether; the hon. gentleman did not tell us anything about that. I have heard that the Hon. Mr. Douglas is to be recalled, and some other person put in his place, and that he is going back to Thursday Island; the hon. gentleman did not explain that. Now, sir, I come to the next paragraph—

“The disastrous floods which occurred in the early part of the year, and which occasioned a lamentable loss of life and property, have retarded to some extent the recovery of the colony from the effects of the long-continued drought.”

As has been already said in this House, we find that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have always got an excuse for any maladministration or whatever reverses may happen to the colonies during their administration. Now, as these floods have been put here as an excuse for the way the colony has gone back, I would point out that the floods were simply confined to a very small part of the colony indeed—to one district—to the Logan district alone, you may say.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, no!

Mr. STEVENSON: Will any hon. gentleman tell me where the floods did any real material damage, with the exception of the Logan district and two or three miles around Warwick?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Bundaberg.

Mr. STEVENSON: I challenge any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House to point out where any real damage was done at Bundaberg.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Wide Bay.

Mr. STEVENSON: Or in Wide Bay. I simply say that it is no excuse at all, because the floods were confined entirely to one part of the colony, and the people not only of Brisbane, but of the country generally, came to the rescue and recouped the sufferers for any losses they had sustained; so that the Government had nothing whatever to do with it. If, sir, the hon. the Premier had put in the

Governor's Speech that the disastrous condition of the colony had been caused by the drought, there would have been some excuse for it. I admit that the drought did a great deal of harm. I admit that the Ministry are not to blame for everything; but I say that at the very time the drought was doing the greatest amount of harm to Queensland, placing the colony in a position it could hardly bear up against, when the people generally were suffering most from it, when squatters had to do every possible thing they could, when they were at their wits' end to try and keep things going—at that very period the Premier allowed his Minister for Lands to bring in a Bill calculated to disturb existing interests and put heavier burdens upon the people. I say, sir, that the Ministry have been greatly to blame for bringing forward that Land Bill at that time. I do not care how much they believe in it, or how much the Minister for Lands believes in the Georgian theory; I say the Premier is to blame for allowing his Minister for Lands to introduce a Land Bill disturbing existing interests all over the colony in the way he did. There is no doubt that before the drought commenced, and even when it was at its worst almost, we had capital pouring in from the other colonies and going into the pastoral industry; but the moment this Land Act was brought in it stopped, and since then we have had no outside capital coming in from the other colonies. Not only that, sir, but the Minister for Lands boasted at the time that he would prevent capital from coming in. Victorian capitalists had largely invested in our country, but he said he would bring in an Act that would prevent them from bringing any more capital into the colony. Do we not all remember, sir, that when the schedule was brought in it left out the southern part of the colony; and do we not also remember that the hon. gentleman, when he was asked and made under pressure from this side of the House to say why he did bring the southern portion into the schedule, gave as an excuse why he had not done so that he did not want New South Wales men to come in and take up the country? That is nice encouragement for settling people on the land. I do not suppose that we want to keep people from the other colonies from coming here. I always understood that it would be a good thing to induce people to come into the colony and invest their money here so that they might make some for themselves and do good to the colony as well. But admitting that the long and disastrous drought has done great harm to the colony what have the Government done to try and make things better? Have they tried in any possible way to lighten the burdens of the people during that time? I say no, sir. Instead of endeavouring to do so they brought in a Bill which made those burdens a great deal heavier than they were before. I shall allude to one measure, sir, which is quite sufficient to show how the Premier and his Government tried to lighten the burdens of the people during the time of that severe depression. They brought in a Payment of Members Bill, reimbursing, as they called it, them their expenses—giving the fifty-five members, except the eight Ministers who were not to be paid anything, payment to the extent of £200 a year. At any rate it was a matter of some £7,000. That, sir, may look a very small thing, but I look at the principle of it. I know that some hon. members looked upon it as such a monstrous thing at the time that they did not appropriate to themselves the money that was due to them, but spent it in another way—gave it to hospitals and other institutions, so that the Government had to pay double, £2 for every

£1, of the sums that were paid in those instances for the expenses of members. I simply say, sir, that at the time of the great depression to which reference is made in the Speech the Premier might, at any rate, have left that measure alone until a more convenient season. Now, sir, we come to that part of the Speech which deals with the Land Act—the great success of the Land Act. I am very sorry the Minister for Lands is not here. He is always cur enough to run away after he makes his speech, because he never can face anyone opposed to him.

Mr. ALAND: Mr. Speaker,—I rise to ask your ruling, whether the hon. member is in order in calling the Minister for Lands a cur. I should not have noticed it if the Minister for Lands had been present.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is certainly not in order in doing so. He must address a member of the House by the constituency he represents.

Mr. STEVENSON: Even if it is true, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: That is a question the Chair cannot answer. To address a member of the House as a cur is decidedly unparliamentary. The rule is that a member must address another member by the constituency he represents.

Mr. STEVENSON: I did not say he was a cur. I said like a cur he always left the House when he knew anyone was going to refer to any speech that he had made. If it would have the effect of bringing him into the House, I would call him a cur again, sir, if you would allow me; but I will not. I think, at any rate, when a Minister of the Crown gets up in this House and makes a speech, he ought to have the courtesy to listen to those who have to reply to him. I am sorry to say that the Minister for Lands is not the only culprit in that respect. I was very sorry to see the Premier last night, after he had made his speech, when the late leader of the Opposition, the member for Port Curtis, got up to reply to him, deliberately walk out of the House, and he never came into it the whole time the hon. member was replying. I think it was most discourteous. There may be only a few of us on this side; but I do not see why we should be treated with marked disrespect, and I consider in regard to the Premier's action—I do not care about myself—in treating the late leader of the Opposition as he did it was treating the hon. gentleman with contempt, and no Premier has any business to do that, however high he may be, or whether he has seen the Queen or not. I must refer to another part of the Speech, which says:—

"I am glad to note the large and increasing demand for land for occupation by *bona fide* settlers. My Ministers are deeply sensible of the importance of encouraging agricultural settlement, by giving increased facilities to intending selectors for acquiring full information as to the nature and quality of land open for occupation, and by assisting in the collection and diffusion of practical knowledge as to the profitable cultivation of the soil. With this object, I have, in anticipation of your sanction, authorised the establishment of a Department of Agriculture, under the charge of the Minister for Public Lands."

As I said at the commencement of my speech, we members on this side of the House are certainly at a disadvantage in replying to hon. members opposite, through their having more information than we have. We have to debate this question from figures we get from the other side of the House, and I do not think they will do much good. Even taking the Minister for Lands' figures to-night, we know perfectly well when he brought in his Land Bill that the

principle was purely leasing; that the land was not to be alienated in any possible way; that nobody was to get freehold under any circumstances whatever. But under pressure from this side of the House—

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No, no!

Mr. MOREHEAD: And assisted by those on the wing of the Government side.

Mr. STEVENSON: Yes, and assisted by a few independent members on the other side of the House, certain facilities were afforded for those who wished to acquire freehold. Now, the Minister for Lands gets up and, knowing well that he does not believe at all in anyone in the colony acquiring freehold, he tells us that the number of selections under the agricultural clauses is 1,122. Those 1,122 selectors, as you know, Mr. Speaker, have the opportunity of making their areas freeholds. Under the leasehold clauses how many selectors have we? We have sixty-six. Those are the figures of the hon. Minister for Lands—this Georgian man who does not believe in freeholds at all. He has admitted to-night that under the clause forced upon him by this side of the House he had 1,122 selectors. Does not that disclose a nice state of affairs? I see the Treasurer smiling. I know perfectly well that he only wishes that the Minister for Lands had been at Kingdom come or had had a seat in the upper circle before he came into the Lower House. We all know perfectly well that the great inducement to pass the Land Act was that we were to get revenue from it to pay the interest on the £10,000,000 loan. It was to be raised at once too; but we have had nearly four years at this business now, and where is the revenue? The Treasurer says, "Where, oh! where?" That hon. gentleman has a very different idea about it now. This is what the Treasurer said at the time:—

"It may therefore be freely admitted that the rapid progress made by the country in the past will be largely augmented and stimulated by the present loan policy, and as with the encouragement of immigration and land settlement, population and production must largely and rapidly increase, the augmented charge for interest distributed over four or five years hence will, I am assured, be provided without any appreciable pressure."

We know perfectly well what the Minister for Works said; we know perfectly well he went to Warwick and told them that if they did not return members who would pass this Land Act they would never get that £10,000,000 loan, and there would never be any money spent. That hon. member said in the House:—

"I am very sanguine that if this Bill becomes law, we shall in the beginning get at least four times the amount of rental we are getting now, and it would be hard to tell what the amount is likely to be in five years' time."

It is nearly four years now, and what have we got? The Treasurer has got an empty exchequer. There is an empty Treasury, nearly half-a-million deficit, and the hon. gentleman has to live on the overdraft now. However, I believe that they are looking to the future and are preparing to meet bad times—to meet this deficiency. They are preparing a new Insolvency Act, which, I think, is wanted. Going on further, about the land business, we are told by the Minister for Lands to-night that we were to hear a great many things about misstatements made by the hon. member for Port Curtis and the leader of the Opposition. I did not hear that the hon. gentleman contradicted very much. He referred to a certain farm at Yeulba; but he knows as well as any member on either side of the House that that farm was merely an experiment which was brought into existence simply

by the people of that part of the country, who wished to test what the country would do. The Ministry were told over and over again that the country was fit to grow this, that, and the other, and the Minister for Lands at the time simply wished to find out for himself what the country could produce. Notwithstanding what the Minister for Lands said about that particular country last night, there are hundreds of thousands of acres of the same class of country which, if this had been a success, might have been brought under the same class of cultivation. The hon. gentleman told us to-night that whoever evolved the idea of that farm out of his mind was a born idiot. Why, sir, the present Minister for Lands is not fit to blacken the boots of the man who was Minister for Lands at that time. The Minister for Lands who caused that farm to be brought into existence had more knowledge of Queensland and of every industry connected with it than the present Minister for Lands, notwithstanding the fact that the Premier appointed him because he thought he had a fine knowledge of the country. Concerning this new department that has been created, we have been told that the Under Secretary appointed to it has great experience. The Minister for Lands told us he wanted a real bushman, who knew every bit of the country, and who would be able to give information to every man who came for it. I have a very great respect for Mr. McLean, who, in a position he is fitted for, would no doubt be a very good man and an honest man, but I do not believe that he has any such knowledge as is claimed for him by the Minister for Lands. How can any man, unless he has visited the whole of the colony, give such information to anyone who may call upon him? There seems to be a difference of opinion on this subject, even on the other side. The hon. member for Carnarvon told us that Mr. McLean had done his best to sit on every selector who applied for land. He said:—

"A certain amount of dissatisfaction has been expressed about the working of the Land Act by persons who really did not know what they were talking about. I am not alluding to hon. members on the opposite side of the House, but to persons outside, who have lately had business to do with the Lands Department. I venture to say that a great deal of that can be traced to the unpopular and indiscreet way in which one officer in the department—"

Mr. MOREHEAD: The Minister for Lands?

Mr. FORTON: No; Mr. McLean has been in the habit of dealing with selectors. He is probably an excellent officer, but he has an unfortunate knack of falling foul of everybody with whom he comes in contact.

This is the man who, we are told, is fit to give every information that may be asked of him, and to point out to an intending selector the very spot he wants. However, there is no necessity for us to ask what the hon. member for Carnarvon thinks about it. We know very well that Mr. McLean has no experience of the country. Beyond the Logan and Moreton districts he knows nothing. I believe his name is a by-word in the district around Ipswich, where he is simply called "Dutton's detective"; consequently, I do not see any very great advantage that is going to accrue to the colony by the appointment of Mr. McLean as Under Secretary for Agriculture. The Minister for Lands also alluded to his friend, Mr. Golden. I have pointed out a good many times already in this House that Mr. Golden has been a very expensive and inefficient officer for the Government. I remember a case I conducted myself in the Land Court, where I made that gentleman admit in the witness-box that he simply arrived at his decisions from what he was told by the lessee of the run and what he saw on the maps. That is a fact. There was a certain place marked off as "scrub"

on the map, and I asked him if he knew how much scrub there was, and whether he went through the scrub. He said he had never gone through the scrub; and then I asked him, "How do you know how much scrub there is then?" He said, "I took what the lessee said, and I saw what was marked on the map." To show the incompetence of that gentleman, in the case I spoke of—which was Rosalie, of which the Hon. J. F. McDougall is lessee—the recommendation of the commissioner was certainly reversed by the Land Board. What did the Minister for Lands do in that case? After a certain time he gave notice that the case should be reheard before the Land Board. Mr. McDougall had to come down country again, and he asked me to appear again for him, which I did. Mr. McDougall brought down his witnesses, the Land Court sat at a certain hour, and on a certain day; we were all waiting for some one to appear on behalf of the Minister for Lands, and at last Mr. Hume, the Under Secretary, appeared, and informed the Land Board that the Minister for Lands declined to go any further with the case. That was all that was said, and the happy thought occurred to me that often occurs to lawyers, to see whether I could not get expenses on behalf of Mr. McDougall. I did so, and the Land Board granted expenses, amounting to some £14 or £15. That was because the Minister for Lands summoned witnesses to come down, and then sent the Under Secretary to tell the board that he declined to go any further in the case, showing that the hon. gentleman had himself come to the conclusion that Mr. Golden was wrong and the Land Board right. That is the kind of man whom the Minister for Lands has appointed to an important office in the State. I say it is disgraceful. He declined to tell us anything at all about another officer, Mr. W. S. Paul, another friend of his, who was recalled to Brisbane to explain his conduct up-country and was allowed to go back again. Now he is obliged to go altogether. We are not to have any information about this; we are simply told that Mr. Paul is to go. These are the men who have been appointed by the hon. gentleman to administer the Land Act. I do not know that I need say anything further in regard to the Lands Department. I am only sorry the Minister for Lands was not present to listen to the remarks I made before he came into the House, and I hope that in future he will not be so thin-skinned as always to run out of the House when any member gets up to reply to him. The paragraph about the state of the public finances is closely connected with what I have been commenting upon; and I have no hesitation in saying that the present unsatisfactory state of the public finances is owing to the failure of the Land Act, and I daresay the Colonial Treasurer knows perfectly well that he would have been in a much better financial position if that unfortunate Act had never been passed. When special attention is drawn in the Governor's Speech to the unsatisfactory state of the public finances it is disappointing to find that we do not get the slightest intimation, either from the Speech itself or from the Colonial Treasurer, how the deficit is to be made up. The Treasurer ought certainly to tell us before making his Financial Statement; indeed, he ought to have given us some idea, in his speech last night, how he intends to meet the deficit. There is another paragraph in the Speech, which has been alluded to by several hon. members, and on which I need not dwell at any length. I refer to the paragraph with regard to separation, and which runs as follows:—

"A petition for the division of the colony was last year presented to the Administrator of the Government,

and forwarded to the Secretary of State for Her Majesty's consideration. Her Majesty, however, has not been advised to give effect to the wishes of the petitioners. I believe that the measures to which I have just referred will be found to remove all reasonable grounds for any renewal of this movement."

Although I do not myself believe in separation, and am not likely to support it, I say that this is a distinct admission that the northern portion of the colony has not been fairly treated in comparison with the southern portion. Where is the necessity for a paragraph like this if due justice had been meted out to all parties of the colony alike? But it is a fact that the northern part of the colony has been very badly treated by the present Ministry, and I sincerely trust they will bring in some measure which will effect an alteration in that direction. The Premier last night, as usual, told us how good he had been, and so forth, and how he had always tried to do everything to satisfy the intelligence of the people of the colony as far as the Northern question was concerned. Of course he raised his old cry about black labour. We know perfectly well that he lives on that cry. He is in power at the present time, entirely through the black labour question.

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. STEVENSON: I repeat that he is in power at the present time through the black labour question, and he never speaks in this House, in any important debate, without bringing it in. He lives on it, and makes the people believe that he is entirely opposed to this black labour. So he may be, but I am perfectly satisfied that if he is it is simply to suit his own purposes. However, he knows perfectly well that at the present time it takes a little more than that to keep him in power, and that in many portions of the colony besides the North people are not so very enthusiastic about him now. He has to bring a good many influences to bear to keep himself in his present position. Many of his supporters are getting rather luke-warm, and he has a great deal of trouble to keep some of them alongside of him. I notice there have been a good many cross-bench members lately; they are moving down. To show some of the influences he has had to bring to bear I need only remark that he has had the Woolcocks, or Bulcocks, and the Isamberts, and all the others running up and down; and even the Kelletts. But they hunted that gentleman at Warwick; they would not have him.

Mr. KELLETT: They were frightened of him.

Mr. STEVENSON: But the hon. gentleman has not only brought Lower House men into play, but some of the Upper House men as well. I have always understood, and I believe it has been accepted as a principle both at home and in the colonies, that members of the Upper House should not interfere in elections. We are supposed to look up to them to a certain extent, and they are supposed to have no prejudices and to take no sides in politics, and to confine themselves to correcting mistakes that may have been made in the Lower House. I am going to read a letter written by a member of the Upper House. It is supposed to be a private letter, but the gentleman to whom it was addressed sent it along with a request that I should make what use of it I might consider necessary. It is as follows:—

"Wickham terrace,

"Brisbane, 17th July, 1887.

"DEAR PAT,

"I see that your name is attached to the requisition asking Mr. Allan to stand as member for Warwick, and presume that you have carefully considered how his return as an Opposition member is likely to affect the passing of the Railway Bill, which was thrown out



by the Council last session—I mean the Bill authorising the construction of the railway from Warwick to St. George. As you are doubtless aware, this Bill only passed the Assembly by *one* vote, the members of the Opposition voting against it, and some of the Government supporters also. The difficulty experienced by the Government in getting the Bill through the Assembly goes to show pretty clearly that it was principally the *personal* influence of the Ministry who carried it. If an Opposition member is returned for Warwick the hands of the Ministry will be much weakened, as their supporters will feel free to act as they choose in the matter. Under such circumstances, therefore, the *Bill* will inevitably be thrown out, and the Warwick and St. George Railway, with the *via recta*, relegated to the dim future. Such being the case, I think you will clearly see which course would best serve the interests of Warwick and district.

"Yours sincerely,  
"W. F. TAYLOR."

This is the man who moved the Address in Reply in the Upper House yesterday. Now there is a postscript:—

"P.S.—If it was a *personal* matter only, I would prefer Mr. Allan, but, for reasons stated, Morgan is decidedly the most likely to advance the welfare of the town and district.

"Keep this private."

"W.F.T."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who received this simply said: "Darn Dr. Taylor and his private notes; take it and make what use of it you like." Now, it seems to me that this is written at the dictation of some Minister.

Mr. GRIMES: Mr. Speaker,—I rise to move as a question of privilege that the letter be laid on the table.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Mr. Speaker,—The letter has been read now. If the hon. gentleman had taken that exception in the first instance, before this very interesting revelation had been finished, I could have understood it. It has been read now, and the name has been given of the writer; and the person to whom it is addressed, no doubt, would not object. I do not see why it should be laid on the table of the House; if I were the hon. member I would tear it up.

Mr. KELLETT: Mr. Speaker,—I am sorry that a letter of that description should have been read out in this House—

The SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman can only speak on the point of order.

Mr. KELLETT: I was about to ask whether it was advisable that it should be laid on the table of the House. A letter of that description—a private letter—was never read in this House since I have been a member.

Mr. W. BROOKES: It is a breach of confidence.

The SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman having read the letter, it will appear in *Hansard* to-morrow morning. It rests entirely with the hon. member whether he lays it on the table of the House or not.

The PREMIER: The rule is that a document must if required be laid on the table of the House—if any hon. member claims it.

Mr. MOREHEAD: With all due deference to the Premier, that objection should have been made earlier. I think myself that the letter having been read without objection, and the question not having been raised before the letter was concluded, and the House being fully seized now of all the information contained in that letter, the House should have nothing more to desire. I think it was a very interesting letter, and one which redounds very little to the credit of the gentleman in another place who wrote it.

Mr. KELLETT: Mr. Speaker,—We could not raise the objection till we heard the letter read; but after having heard it, I think there is

a most serious objection to its having ever been read. I hope such another letter will never be read in this House while I am a member of it.

Mr. GRIMES: Mr. Speaker,—I think it is our privilege to have the letter laid on the table. I am anxious to see it, and other members around me are anxious to see it. We cannot tell whether the hon. gentlemen read that letter fairly; he may have intended to read from the paper, and really not have read what was in it. I think we ought to have the privilege of looking over that letter to see if it was read out correctly.

The SPEAKER: I have already said that the letter being a private document it is entirely in the option of the hon. member to lay it on the table or not. I will read what "May" says on the subject:—

"A Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a despatch or other State paper, not before the House, unless he be prepared to lay it upon the table. This restraint is similar to that rule of evidence, in courts of law, which prevents counsel from citing documents which have not been produced in evidence.

... On the 18th May, 1865, the Attorney-General, on being asked by Mr. Ferrand if he would lay upon the table a written statement and a letter to which he had referred on a previous day in answering a question relative to the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, replied that he had made a statement to the House upon his own responsibility, and that the documents he had referred to being private, he could not lay them upon the table. Lord R. Cecil contended that the papers, having been cited, should be produced; but the Speaker declared that this rule applied to public documents only."

I do not think I could quote anything more strongly in support of the ruling I gave. It is a matter entirely within the hon. member's own right whether he lays the letter on the table or not.

Mr. W. BROOKES: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Unless the hon. member wishes to dispute the ruling of the Chair, no further discussion can take place on the subject.

Mr. W. BROOKES: I was only going to support what was said by the hon. member for Oxley. We have been told we ought not to have allowed the letter to be read, nor would that letter have been allowed to be read if we had known it said at the end "Keep this private." There has been a breach of gentlemanly honour somewhere.

Mr. KATES: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: There can be no further discussion. The hon. member for Normanby has possession of the Chair.

Mr. STEVENSON: I have simply to inform the hon. member for Oxley that I will gratify his suspicious nature so far as to tell him that I have read the letter exactly as it is written, and if he thinks that I have made a mistake in reading it, and that he can read writing better than I can, I am quite willing to show him the letter. As far as keeping it private is concerned, I think the gentleman who got the letter was perfectly right. He declined to have his independence interfered with even by a member of the Upper House; and he sent this letter round and said, "Make what use you like of it," simply to show the influence at work to keep the present Government in power; to show the influence the ten-million loan had had in the country; to show that the electors are frightened to put out a supporter of the Government, and are frightened to put in members who will oppose them, simply because they are afraid they won't get the money spent that was voted for their railways. Now, sir, how was that railway not passed by the Council? Simply by the action of the very member who wrote that

letter, who failed to appear at the time he was wanted. I am not very sure that he was not bribed to stay away to prevent that railway from being passed.

Mr. W. BROOKES : Mr. Speaker, is that in order?

Mr. STEVENSON : I am simply expressing my opinion.

Mr. W. BROOKES : Is the word "bribed" a parliamentary term?

Mr. STEVENSON : Well, I will withdraw the word "bribed," because the hon. gentleman does not like it; and I will say this, Mr. Speaker, that I am not very sure it was not by arrangement that that hon. gentleman was not there to pass that railway. Now, sir, I shall tell the House and the people of Warwick, through *Hansard*, what likelihood they have of getting the Warwick to St. George railway, notwithstanding that they have been frightened into putting in a supporter of the Government. I have no doubt he is a very good man; I do not object to see him in his place here to-night, not the slightest. I feel sure that he will make a very good member; I have no feeling against him whatever. At the same time I shall tell him and the people of Warwick what chance they have of getting the Warwick to St. George railway, and I have no doubt that you, Mr. Speaker, fully appreciate the remarks I am making. In the absence of the hon. member for Balonne in England, I was asked to introduce a deputation to the Postmaster-General, for the purpose of asking him to grant a bi-weekly coach between Warwick and Goondiwindi, and what do you think the reply was from that hon. gentleman? He said he did not think he would be justified in granting it, as the present traffic would not warrant him in doing so. Now, sir, that is the very route over which we were asked last year to construct a railway, and yet we find one of the members of the Government actually stating to a deputation that he would not be justified in granting a bi-weekly mail.

Mr. KATES : I rise to a point of order. Are we discussing the Warwick to St. George railway? There is nothing about it in the Governor's Speech.

Mr. MOREHEAD : I think, sir, you have already ruled, no later than last night, that in the debate on the Address in Reply a great deal of divergence may be allowed to hon. members. The point to which the hon. member for Normanby is speaking is one of the greatest importance to the colony. It is concerning the past policy of the Government—a question that is bound to be discussed when the Address in Reply is before the House.

The SPEAKER : As I said last night the question of the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Opening Speech opens up very wide ground for discussion. I think that the hon. member is perfectly in order.

Mr. STEVENSON : I do not object, sir, to the interruption of the hon. member. I simply say that if the country will return members to the House for the purpose of passing the Warwick to St. George Railway after what the Postmaster-General told that deputation—that he would not be justified in granting a bi-weekly coach because the traffic there was not sufficient—we have come to a pretty pitch indeed. If they return members simply for the sake of getting the money spent I am afraid they won't get it.

Mr. KELLETT : They have returned one already.

Mr. STEVENSON : They would not listen to you. You went off next morning by the train quickly.

Mr. KELLETT : I did all my work before I left.

Mr. STEVENSON : The hon. member, Mr. Kellett, tried to speak at Mr. Morgan's meeting, and they howled him down.

Mr. KELLETT : Of course, the curs on the other side.

Mr. STEVENSON : They would not listen to him, and he went off next morning, leaving the Bulcocks and others to look after the business. He was not game to speak any more.

Mr. KELLETT : I am always game. I never found a man of your crowd who could put me down. You tried it.

Mr. STEVENSON : Notwithstanding what Dr. Taylor did in the Upper House, and all that the hon. member for Warwick, Mr. Morgan, can do, I am afraid there is not much likelihood of the Warwick to St. George railway passing for a good many years to come. I was called to order by the hon. member for Oxley and the hon. member for North Brisbane for using the word "bribery" in connection with Dr. Taylor. Well, sir, I am not going to say he was bribed, but I will now ask the Premier—considering the prominent position this hon. gentleman takes in electioneering matters, and the prominent position he occupies in the Upper House—how much he got for that health report he wrote—for that trip to England? Will the hon. gentleman tell us that? We cannot find it by figures, or in the Estimates. It was not shown in the Estimates last year, and I think the hon. gentleman refused to give us the information before. I should like to know from some member of the Ministry whether Dr. Taylor was paid for that report or not.

Mr. DONALDSON : He is trying to make up for lost time.

Mr. MOREHEAD : Oh; he's only the ninth part of a man.

Mr. STEVENSON : I think I have said enough, Mr. Speaker, about the Warwick to St. George railway. I see that even the hon. member, Mr. Aland, looks pleasant about it over his spectacles.

Mr. ALAND : All right.

Mr. STEVENSON : I am not going to take up the time of the House any longer. I am sorry that I have given hon. members the trouble of getting up and interrupting me so often, but I cannot help it. I hope that the times of prosperity alluded to in the Speech are in the near future for us, and that we shall have no more drought and no more floods for many years to come.

Mr. ALAND said: Mr. Speaker,—I have very few words to say, and in the first place I do not think the House can congratulate the hon. member who has just sat down upon the speech he has made.

Mr. PATTISON : The country will.

Mr. ALAND : I think the hon. member for Blackall is rather too fond of these interruptions.

Mr. PATTISON : That is a matter for myself, sir.

Mr. ALAND : The hon. member says that is a matter for his own consideration.

Mr. PATTISON : Yes.

Mr. ALAND : I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that it is a matter for the consideration of the House and for you, sir. When the hon. gentleman has been in the House as long as some hon. members here assembled, perhaps he will learn some good manners.

Mr. PATTISON : Not from you; certainly.

Mr. ALAND: I trust, sir, that before the session is closed someone who is perhaps able to teach him manners, if I am not, will do so. I was saying that the hon. member for Normandy is not in good form to-night. I do not know that I ever listened to him with a greater feeling of uneasiness than I did this evening. Generally he is pretty sparkling, but I suppose it was the absence of his enemy, the Minister for Lands, that seemed to throw him out of his usual form this evening. The hon. gentleman has made reference to one or two matters that I shall take a little notice of. First I should like to express my opinion of the conduct of the hon. gentleman and his friends in bringing a private letter before this House. I do not think it reflects credit upon "Dear Pat" or upon the hon. gentleman who read it. If "Dear Pat" did not like the advice Dr. Taylor gave him, the best thing he could have done was to have torn the letter up and taken no notice of it. Dr. Taylor must have been on very friendly terms with this person to address him as "Dear Pat," and certainly "Dear Pat" might have returned that friendship by keeping the letter to himself. The hon. gentleman has also seen fit to make certain remarks in reference to the Warwick election. He did not say anything about the Moreheads and the Stevensons taking part in the Warwick election; he could talk about the Bulcocks and the Kelletts, and the rest of them; but he said nothing about himself and his partner, Mr. Morehead, going to Warwick armed with a whole posse of *Courier* newspapers that contained that garbled account of the welcome that was given to the Premier on his return from England, and scattered them throughout the country.

Mr. STEVENSON said: Mr. Speaker,—That is untrue. I tell the hon. gentleman that I took no part, nor did Mr. Morehead, in the Warwick election. I never distributed a paper with any speech of Sir S. W. Griffith's or anything else. I never took the slightest interest in the Warwick election from the day I heard Mr. Horwitz had resigned. If the hon. gentleman does not like to take my word he has very little idea of what the word of a gentleman ought to be.

Mr. ALAND: Of course, when the hon. gentleman talks in that way, I am bound to take the hon. gentleman's word, and I believe now that the report which was furnished to me was not true. But the report that I had was to the effect that the *Courier* newspapers were distributed through the agency of Messrs. Stevenson and Morehead.

Mr. STEVENSON: Whoever told you that told you a downright lie.

Mr. ALAND: The *Courier* contained the report of the welcome received by Sir S. W. Griffith in Brisbane, and the expression accompanied by the distribution of the *Courier* was, "There, you see what Griffith is thought of now." Of course I have to accept the statement of the hon. gentleman because I did not know it of my own personal knowledge.

Mr. STEVENSON: Why do you not accept the statement then, and say no more about it?

Mr. ALAND: The hon. gentleman wishes to give credit to his side of the House for an alteration which was made in the Land Bill, making freeholds possible as well as leasing lands. That has been denied by this side of the House before, and I am going to deny it again to-night. I say more than that; the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that the Bill as it was first presented to the House contained the principle of the sale of the freehold; he knows perfectly well that in the Bill as at first intro-

duced agricultural farms could be made freeholds. It is true that the Bill then contained no provisions for the homestead selector, and I am willing, Mr. Speaker, to give that side of the House part of the credit for the introduction of those homestead clauses; but I am not going to give them credit for the whole of it. I will say this, Mr. Speaker; that the Government were made acquainted with the wishes of members on this side of the House on that point long before Mr. Black, who, I think it was upon the other side, drew attention to it.

Mr. NORTON: No; I did.

Mr. ALAND: The object of the Act of 1884, I take it, was to provide for settlement upon grazing areas. It had long been the acknowledged weakness of the former Act that persons coming here with a little money, more or less, were not able to go into the pursuit of pastoral occupation. It was always acknowledged that the pastoral tenants of the Crown had a real monopoly of the lands, and that anybody wishing to engage in the same pursuits had not the slightest chance of doing so. The Land Act of 1884, I am glad to know, has at all events thus far provided for that deficiency. We find that there have been sixty-six grazing selections taken up, and that there are sixty-six selectors which it was impossible for us to get under the Act of 1876. I am a considerable admirer of the Act of 1876, but to me it was always a weakness that a person wishing to engage in pastoral pursuits could not do so under it. The hon. gentleman has also referred to that paragraph in the Speech concerning the redress of supposed grievances in the northern parts of the colony, but he has forgotten to tell us that if there were grievances existing in the northern part of the colony they were existing during the time the previous Ministry held office, and that ever since this Ministry came into power the northern part of the colony has received a far larger apportionment of the public money, both loan and otherwise, than it received before. Running my eye through the Governor's Speech, I see the first paragraph alludes to the fiftieth year of Her Majesty's most happy and prosperous reign, and the Governor's gratification at observing the hearty manner in which the people of Queensland joined in the general rejoicings. Rightly or wrongly, I am one of those who take exception to the money which was expended by the Government over the illuminations. It is true that it was only £700; but when we have an empty exchequer, I think we ought to take care of even so small an amount as £700, because I couple this expenditure of money with another action of the Government which took place just about the same time. A proclamation was issued ordering two days' public holiday to all Government employes. They dismissed them, I might say, from their work on those two days. *Notens volens* they had to take a holiday upon those two days. They were not allowed to enter upon any work in which they were engaged. So far as the Civil servants were concerned, it made no difference to them. They got their holiday and they got their pay too. But take the case of the working men in the colony in the employ of the Government. Men who were receiving 6s. 6d. or 6s. 8d. per day were compelled to lose two days of their work at the time of the jubilee. Now I think that was rather hard. It is making the working men pay for showing their sense of loyalty, and it would have redounded more to the credit of the Government if, instead of spending this money in the illumination of this building and other public buildings, they had allowed these men to have had two days' holiday, and have paid them for it. When a man is only

earning 36s. a week, and has to support a wife and family, it is hard to tell him to take two days' holiday and have two days' pay deducted. It strikes me that it is possible that a man's loyalty might be rather diminished by such a proceeding as that. I do not think that loyalty is to be gauged by the spending of money on outside show. After all loyalty is a feeling of the heart, and is not to be gauged by the amount of money which is spent in any ostentatious manner of that sort. I admire the way of keeping the jubilee adopted by one of the private firms. They did not illuminate their buildings, but spent a great deal more money in relieving the wants of some poor people. If we go down to Melbourne we find that a number of warehousemen, instead of illuminating their premises, subscribed some £600 or £800 for the relief of the poor. I hope the Government will see that those men are paid their wages for those holidays, for I do not see why the wages of a man earning 6s. 8d. a day should be stopped any more than those of a man getting £600 or £700 a year. If one is paid the other should be paid also. I fully agree with the action taken by the Premier in going to the old country to attend the Conference, and I am content to wait to know what the Premier did whilst there until the documents are received from home. When we do receive them I think we shall find that the Premier's ability shone in the old country quite as much as it shines in this colony. I hardly like to express an opinion upon "the establishment of an additional squadron for the defence of the floating trade in Australasian waters at the joint expense of the colonies," but I confess to a feeling of this sort: that we are at the present time paying too much for gold lace, silver buttons, and all the pageantry and pomp of war. I cannot but feel that in a small colony like this, not likely, I think, to be interfered with by hostile powers, to keep up the pageantry of the Defence Force is almost more than the colony should do. At the same time I dissent from the views put forward by hon. gentlemen opposite when they say that seeing that the trade between the colonies and England is something like £17,000,000 a year—I think that is the amount mentioned—

Mr. NORTON: It is more than that.

Mr. ANNEAR: £17,000,000 is the value of the imports in 1885-6 from Great Britain to the colonies of Australasia.

Mr. ALAND: It does not matter whether the amount is £17,000,000 or £70,000,000 for the purpose of my argument. If I import a parcel of goods from home it is certainly to the benefit of the person from whom I order them, but it is also to my benefit to order them from that person or I would not do so. I do not expect the persons sending me goods to insure me the safe delivery of them; they insure the goods at home but they charge me with it. We do our trade with the old country rather than with other countries, not from a feeling of love and loyalty for the old country, but because we believe by so doing we are doing the best we can for ourselves. What did the Government do the other day? They sent to Germany to Krupp for iron because they could by so doing make a better bargain for the colony than by trading with England for the same article. So that if we trade with England it is for us to see that we protect the goods coming to us, and if it is deemed advisable that we should have a squadron for our protection we should certainly pay a fair share for its maintenance. It appears to me that the Opposition will ignore the real cause of the depression which has existed, and which has hardly yet passed away from the colony. The depression is due largely to the

drought of some two years ago, but we had coupled with the drought the fact that the value of pastoral produce had sunk to such a price as it had not reached for many years before. That was the secret. It was not the Land Act, and it was not really so much the drought as it was the serious depreciation in the value of pastoral produce which caused the prevailing depression. That value is now increasing, and hence we are having somewhat of a return of prosperity, and I trust to see the hope expressed in that direction in the Opening Speech fulfilled. It is of no use members on this side of the House ignoring the fact that the colony owes much and will do for many years yet to the pastoral interest for its prosperity, and if the pastoral interest suffers the whole colony will suffer very materially indeed. The Government have promised—

Mr. DONALDSON: The Warwick railway.

Mr. ALAND: Have they?

Mr. MOREHEAD: Yes, and you will vote for it, I expect.

Mr. ALAND: This is the paragraph I wanted:

"The public finances have, however, not escaped the natural consequences of the long-continued adverse seasons, but I see no reason to doubt that with careful administration they will shortly exhibit their usual satisfactory condition. In the meantime strict economy will be necessary, and the Estimates of Expenditure have been framed on that basis."

I do hope that this is more than a mere expression, and that it is not merely put into the Governor's Speech because it is generally done; and because every Speech has something in it about economy. I trust that this really means that the Estimates have been framed upon a strictly economical basis. I do not know exactly where the pruning-knife could be put in. I was taking the trouble to-day to look over the Estimates for the last seven or eight years past, and it is astonishing to see how they have gradually risen from year to year. There are, of course, several things which may be expected to rise in the Estimates, such as the endowments to divisional boards and municipalities. As the colony increases these endowments grow larger, but the time is coming when these endowments will have to be considerably reduced, but I trust not this session. I think, and I have always thought ever since I had a seat in this House, that the Civil Service of this colony is considerably overmanned. I went into one office not very long ago, and as the head of the office was not in I waited. I saw two clerks there for a whole half-hour doing nothing. I do not know whether there was no work for them to do, or whether they were not disposed to do it. Certainly it was near luncheon time, although I believe that under the existing regulations only the heads of departments are supposed to leave the office during the luncheon hour. There is a good deal in what the hon. member for Bowen said about this Civil Service commission. I think something in that direction might be done, and that a considerable weeding of the Civil Service might take place. There are no doubt several merchants in the colony whose returns in a year are over half-a-million of money, and if they were to carry on their business on the same principle that the Government carry on the government of the colony, they would very soon find themselves in a state of bankruptcy. I think the service of the colony can be carried on in a far more economical manner than it has been. I do not know whether the Attorney-General, in his speech, said a word in favour of himself. I do not suppose he did. I was rather pained to hear the leader of the Opposition make the remark he did with reference to the Attorney-General, although, of course, the leader of the Opposition does not mean a good deal of what he

says; and he has been out of the colony, and does not know whether the Attorney-General has tried to do good or whether he has tried to do harm during the last twelve months. I am sure that the Attorney-General, as long as he has been a member of this House, has never tried to do any harm. He has tried to do good, at times with success, and at other times unfortunately perhaps with failure.

Mr. DONALDSON: That is very qualified praise. The Attorney-General may well say, "Save me from my friends!"

Mr. MOREHEAD: Does the Attorney-General remember what he said about me? I do not forget it.

Mr. ALAND: But the hon. member should forget it. I maintain that the colony has not had so good an Attorney-General for many years past. We have had some very ornamental ones, but we have never had one for years past who has done his work in so conscientious and thorough a manner as the gentleman who now occupies that office. He has not let the work slide; day by day the work that comes into the office is attended to. He does not stay in Brisbane and pay a barrister so much to attend circuit. He goes himself and does the work which he thinks he conscientiously ought to do, seeing that the country pays him for his services; and it was a very unkind remark for the leader of the Opposition to make. But then he has attacked the members of the Government all round, and spoke of the leader of the Government in not very complimentary terms. But as I said just now we all know the leader of the Opposition, and he does not mean half he says.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS on the Government side: Question! question!

Mr. MOREHEAD: Mr. Speaker,—I know I have no right to speak—

The PREMIER: Order!

Mr. STEVENS: I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

The PREMIER: As far as I can understand there is no desire on the part of hon. members to prolong the debate.

Mr. NORTON: You should ascertain the wishes of hon. members.

The PREMIER: I have endeavoured to ascertain the wishes of members on this side, and I have consulted with the leader of the Opposition, and the result we arrived at was that there was no desire to prolong the debate. I believe that to be the feeling of the House, and I therefore trust that we shall be able to finish the debate to-night.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Mr. Speaker,—I rise principally to say that there are several members on this side of the House who are anxious to speak, who represent large constituencies, and who have a right to have their opinions ventilated and spread throughout the colony in the same way as those who have been more fortunate in speaking earlier. Every consideration ought to be given to them by the Premier. I will also take the opportunity to comment upon a certain remark personal to myself made by the hon. member for Toowoomba (Mr. Aland) with respect to the late election at Warwick. That hon. member, I have no doubt, is an admirable lecturer, and certainly as a phonetical speaker I have never listened to anyone better in this House, not even including the Colonial Treasurer. He has been kind enough to say of me that I took an active interest in the Warwick election. Now, there is not one scintilla of truth in that statement of the hon. member. I left for Sydney the morning im-

mediately after the hon. the Premier arrived in the colony. I passed through Warwick, and stopped at a place I have near Stanthorpe, and went on from there overland. I remained in Sydney some few days, and came back here by sea. I never had any communication with Mr. Allan either in writing or by telegram from the time he started as a candidate for Warwick to the time of the election. Neither directly nor indirectly had I any communication with that gentleman, nor up to the present time have I had one word or line from Mr. Allan. I think the hon. gentleman ought to be sure when he gets up in his pharisaical way to thank God, as I have no doubt he does in his Jireh, that he is not as other men are; he should, at any rate, ascertain whether the statements he makes are facts, not that I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that it would interfere very much with any statement the hon. member might make.

Mr. ALAND: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. member for Balonne always spoils himself before he sits down. If he, in a temperate manner, had just denied what I have said, I should have accepted his statement. However, sir, I pass over any other remarks he chose to make. Pharisaical or not, I think myself to be as good a man as he. I do not go any further than that; in every possible way I think myself as good a man as he.

Mr. KATES: Mr. Speaker,—There has been so much said to-night about the electorate of Warwick, that I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without making a few remarks. A letter has been read to-night by the hon. member for Normanby, written by Mr. Taylor. I think it was a very sensible letter, and gave the people of Warwick sensible and good advice.

Mr. STEVENSON: Do not ask the Speaker's ruling on that subject.

Mr. KATES: Whether Mr. Taylor as a member of the Upper House was justified I cannot say. The letter itself was a good one. In the interests of the country it was desirable that Warwick should return a Ministerialist. I myself gave the electors that advice from the platform. Mr. Allan in his address touched upon nothing else but the Warwick to St. George line. He said, "If you return me, I have enormous influence on both sides of the House—in the Upper Chamber and the Lower Chamber—and I can get you the railway." I told them on the platform, that from the remarks that had been made by the gentlemen opposite last year, they were not likely to change their minds, they were not likely to eat their words, and he most likely would not get one of them to support him in connection with the Warwick to St. George line. But Mr. Allan said his influence was so great on both sides that he was quite sure he had only to make his appearance in the House and the Warwick to St. George line would pass. I cannot say anything about the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I assume the hon. member will take my word.

Mr. KATES: I take the hon. gentleman's word, because I do not think he is in the colony at all. Whoever this "Pat" is, I do not think it was very discreet on his part to send down the letter. I should like to know from whom the hon. member for Normanby got the letter—whether he got it from "Pat" or somebody else.

Mr. STEVENSON: I will tell the hon. member from whom I got the letter, and that is from a man who refused to be under the influence of a member of the Upper House, a man who has some political independence and who refused to receive a letter trying to influence his vote, but

put in a private way so that he could not disclose the writer. But the gentleman who received the letter took it as a political letter and not as a private one, and, therefore, handed it over to his friend to treat it as he liked. I am not going to tell the House who received the letter, but he was a gentleman, at any rate, who refused to have his political independence interfered with.

Mr. KELLETT: Mr. Speaker,—I do not know what countryman the hon. member for Normanby is, but usually he would be thought to be an Irishman by his speech—not in any other way I hope. When he says that he will tell us who was the writer of the letter, and then sits down without telling us at all, it is an Irish bull. But then some of these Highlanders have a little bull about them, but it is very little, and this was an exceptional case. There is not much fun usually with a Scotchman, but this was about as funny an entertainment as I have heard for some time. With reference to that letter, I am glad to have an opportunity of calling attention to the fact that during the short time I have been in Parliament I have always thought that we in this House should not allude to gentlemen in the higher Chamber in that way.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Higher?

Mr. KELLETT: I do not say it is higher, but it is supposed to be higher. We are not supposed to allude to them in the way they have been alluded to this evening in this Chamber—such as having received bribes. I was most astonished that our Speaker, who, I believe, has been as good a Speaker as we have had in this House as far as knowledge of his work goes, did not call the hon. member to order for alluding to members of the other Chamber as having received bribes. I sat here and I seemed glued to my seat. I was trying to get up, but I was astonished that you, in your position as Speaker, did not call attention at once to this most unusual thing—a thing which I do not believe was ever done in this Chamber before.

Mr. NELSON: Mr. Speaker,—I rise to a point of order. Is it constitutional for an hon. member to get up and impugn the Speaker on a motion upon which we can move no amendment? If he impugns your ruling, sir, I think there ought to be a motion to that effect. I simply do this to assert your right, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is not impugning my ruling; my ruling on that question was not asked. When the hon. member for Normanby charged a member of the Upper House with bribery, the question of order was immediately raised by the hon. member for North Brisbane, Mr. William Brookes, and the hon. member withdrew the remark at once.

Mr. STEVENSON: I never charged a member of the Upper House with bribery.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member did not make a charge, but he made use of the word "bribery," and that was challenged immediately by the hon. member for North Brisbane, Mr. William Brookes. The hon. member at once withdrew the word, so there was no necessity for the intervention of the Chair on that occasion. The Standing Order is pretty clear, and I would have put it in force at once:—

"No member shall use offensive words against either House of Parliament; nor against any statute, unless for the purpose of moving for its repeal."

That is clear, and I would take care that such a charge as that should not be made.

Mr. NELSON: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, but my point of order was this—that the hon. member was impugning your conduct. He said that you, as Speaker, ought to have

intervened. He was finding fault with yourself; he said he was astonished that you did not interfere to prevent some remarks being made. I think he had no right to say that unless he was prepared to bring forward a motion that the House disagreed to your ruling or your conduct. There was nothing at all with reference to the Upper House, or anything of that sort, the important point being that the remarks were applied to yourself.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I coincide with every word that has fallen from the hon. member who has just sat down. The hon. member for Stanley distinctly stated that he was glued to his seat—that he was so astonished at your not rising, sir, that he himself could not rise to the occasion. You yourself, sir, said you would take care that no insult was offered to any member of either House if you knew it, and yet what did the Minister for Lands do to-night? He most grossly insulted a member of the other Chamber, by using language I never heard used in this House before, and you did not, sir.

Mr. KELLETT: Mr. Speaker,—I am sorry if I have in any way offended the dignity of yourself, which I certainly did not intend to do. I am sure that I used no words that would lead any sensible man to think that I intended to do so, but there are members so obtuse that they really do not understand "Queen's English." Sometimes they do understand it, and at other times they do not wish to understand it, and they would like in that way to make a disturbance, if possible, on this side of the House. I am usually very mild in my statements, as you, sir, know, but there are some things that strike men as not advisable in an assembly, where we are called upon to discuss such matters as we are to-night. I did allude to this matter of a member of the Upper House being mentioned, because I was led to believe that we were not to speak disrespectfully in this House of any hon. gentleman of that Chamber. What my opinion personally may be about that Chamber is quite another matter, sir, and if the time comes when I have to express that opinion, I shall do so in a very distinct and clear manner; but to-night is not the occasion. With regard to the letter that was read to-night, I do not think that any gentleman who understood propriety—I am trying to put it in a very mild way—would have attempted to read such a letter. A remark was made by an hon. member to the effect that when a statement was made by a gentleman it ought to be accepted. Now, sir, I think that if we did away with the use of the word "gentleman" it would be very advisable. There are many persons who do not know what "gentleman" means; and in the same way we use the word "ladies" too often. If we go to a registry office the lady there will tell you she has several "ladies" who will act for you as housekeeper, or cook, or in any other position. In the same way not nineteen-twentieths of the people of Queensland know what a "gentleman" means, and I hope for the future we will not use that name at all. We are "men and women." There are some good men here, but plenty of them were not reared up in my time to understand what "gentleman" means, and consequently I have thought for many years that we should not use that term at all. We are sent to Parliament whether we are free selectors, or ploughmen, or farmers, or pick-and-shovel men, to represent men of that class, and we are all men here; there are no "gentlemen."

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. KELLETT: There may be some, but it is not always the man who has been born and bred a gentleman who is a "gentle-

man." Some of the greatest scoundrels and blackguards were born and bred "gentlemen," and there are others who were not so born and bred, but who have used the brains given to them and soon found their way about and established themselves as gentlemen. Here we are all free men sent to this House to represent certain districts, and we do not want any of these remarks about being considered "gentlemen." With regard to the adjournment of the debate, I think every hon. member who wishes to speak on the Address in Reply should have an opportunity of doing so, and therefore the debate should be adjourned.

Mr. NORTON said: Mr. Speaker,—I think, notwithstanding what has fallen from the hon. member for Stanley, that I shall be following the usual practice of the House if I speak of the Chief Secretary as the hon. "gentleman." With regard to the use of that word—there are a great many gentlemen who are not ordinarily spoken of as such. I have found among the working classes men who are distinctly gentlemen, and I do not shun the use of the word. The question before the House is the adjournment of the debate, and I understand that there are three or four hon. members on this side who wish to speak. I do not know what took place between the leader of the Opposition and the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, but I am quite sure that the hon. gentleman will see the advisability of adjourning, rather than leave out members who have any desire to address themselves to the Speech. It has been usual upon occasions like this, when there are large subjects to discuss, to allow the fullest freedom in connection with the debate. I think, therefore, that the Premier will not be departing from any practice if he acquiesces in the proposal made to adjourn.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I ask the permission of the House to speak again. I am surprised to hear that several members on the other side of the House want to speak. I had a conversation with the leader of the Opposition, and we came to an understanding, as far as we could, that the debate should close this evening. I myself communicated personally with every member on that side of the House, except one, and they informed me that they had no desire to speak.

Mr. NORTON: They may have changed their minds.

The PREMIER: Well, in that case, there is no desire on the part of the Government to close the debate abruptly, but I regret that no communication was made to me of the desire not to do so. I took the only means in my power to see if we could finish the debate to-night; but if there is a desire on the part of some hon. members to speak—of course, I do not think we ought to adjourn for one only—there will be no objection on the part of the Government.

Mr. PATTISON said: Mr. Speaker,—I differ from the Premier. I did want to know for other reasons whether this debate was to close to-night. I put a question to the hon. gentleman and received no distinct reply, but was told that it might close to-night. It is not only one member; there are a number of us upon this side of the House who want to speak. Therefore I see no reason for closing the debate. For myself, I shall have a few words to say. I will not take up the time of the House for very long with the remarks I wish to make; but they will be to the point. I am not going to be put down, as was attempted to-day, first by the hon. junior member for North Brisbane, who requested the Speaker to "sit upon me," to use the hon.

gentleman's own term; and then afterwards by the hon. member for Toowoomba, Mr. Aland, who delivered a lecture to me. I will have a word or two to say to those gentlemen to-morrow.

Mr. W. BROOKES said: Mr. Speaker, I take the earliest opportunity I have had of expressing to the hon. member for Blackall my regret for having said what I did. It conveyed my meaning, but in a rude manner, I admit; therefore, I trust the hon. gentleman will not bear me any animosity.

Mr. NELSON said: Mr. Speaker,—I think the request is very reasonable. I do not intend to address the House myself. I never had any intention of doing so. There have been quoted to us some documents, by the Minister for Lands and others, that we have never received, and some hon. members may possibly want to consider them. In that matter the Government have taken a very unfair advantage of us. Had we had these papers before us we might have finished the debate to-night. I think the request of my friend, the hon. member for the Logan, is very reasonable, on that ground alone.

The PREMIER: I have already said the Government have no objection.

Question—That the debate be now adjourned—put and passed.

The PREMIER moved that the resumption of the debate stand an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

Mr. MOREHEAD said: Mr. Speaker,—I think it is only fair to the Premier if I endorse all that has fallen from him. My own idea was that we would finish the debate to-night; my intention was that it would be finished to-night; and I hope that those gentlemen who have something to say will get through it before dinner-time to-morrow. There have been a large variety of new matters introduced into the debate since I spoke to the Premier, which have protracted it; but at the time I, as it were, arranged matters with the Premier, I did so, fully in the belief that the debate would be finished to-night.

Question put and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I move that this House do now adjourn. After the formal business to-morrow we think it will be more convenient to conclude the debate upon the Address in Reply before we proceed with the Address to Her Majesty.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at sixteen minutes past 10 o'clock.