

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 6 OCTOBER 1887

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 6 October, 1887.

Questions.—Lady Bowen Lying-in Hospital Land Sale Bill—second reading.—Cooneana Railway Bill—second reading.—Queensland Trustees and Executors Society (Limited) Bill—Report from select committee.—Phillips's Patent Sleepers—Esk and Maryborough Railway.—Order of Business.—Electoral Districts Bill—committee.—Adjournment.

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

QUESTIONS.

Mr. PALMER asked the Colonial Treasurer—
If he will place a sum of money on the Supplementary Estimates this year sufficient to construct an hospital on the Croydon Gold Field?

The COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. Sir S. W. Griffith) replied—

Tenders have already been invited for the erection of an hospital at Croydon. The Government propose to place the necessary amount on the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. McWHANNELL asked the Chief Secretary—

When is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the erection of the telegraph line from Boulia to Birdsville?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. Sir S. W. Griffith) replied—

The matter is now under the consideration of the Postmaster-General. I am unable to give a definite answer to the hon. member's question.

Mr. McWHANNELL asked the Minister for Works—

1. Has the Government any intention of expending the balance of Loan Vote, £120,000, providing for the extension of railways from Townsville to Hughenden, and extensions westwards?

2. If so, have they any intention of ordering the survey of a railway line from Hughenden to Winton?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. C. B. Dutton) replied—

Not at present.

Mr. GRIMES asked the Minister for Works—

Has the trial survey of the branch line of railway from the Indooroopilly Station, on the Southern and Western Railway, to Brookfield been completed?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied—

Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON asked the Minister for Works—

Have the Government instructed the Chief Engineer to cause an examination to be made of the country between Herberton and Georgetown, and to report as to the best route to be taken in surveying a line of railway from Georgetown to Herberton?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied—

Yes.

LADY BOWEN LYING-IN HOSPITAL LAND SALE BILL.

SECOND READING.

Mr. W. BROOKES said: Mr. Speaker,—In moving the second reading of this Bill, I think it will be of advantage if I shortly explain how the Bill has come into existence. Almost all hon. members are aware where the Lady Bowen Hospital is in Ann street, between the School of Arts and the Masonic Hall. Between the old Masonic Hall and the institution we are dealing with at the present time there is a temporary church. At the time the building was erected for the purpose of an hospital, it was a suitable and very convenient site; but the growth of the city has now made it a place quite unfit for the purposes of the institution, because neither the privacy nor the quietude are such as the institution must possess. For some time the ladies who manage the institution have been dissatisfied, as will be seen in the evidence given by the lady who has acted as honorary secretary for the last five years, and who has been cognisant of all that has taken place during that time. The object of the Bill is to enable the trustees to sell that site and to procure a more eligible one somewhere else. Hon. members will see by the evidence that the trustees have entered into arrangements for the purpose of obtaining a new site, which they regard as very much more eligible, and which the ladies who manage the institution consider more eligible, as also do the doctors who attend the institution. The evidence as to the present site not being at all suitable is supported by the opinion of six medical men. The select committee, I may say, have been careful to maintain all vested rights, and see that the original intentions of the deed of grant have been complied with in every respect, and they are distinctly of opinion that they can

safely recommend this Bill for the approval of Parliament. I do not think I need say any more. I therefore move that the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. CHUBB said: Mr. Speaker,—I wish to say a few words on this Bill, as I was one of the select committee to whom it was referred. The hon. member who moved the second reading has referred to the evidence given—very valuable evidence, especially that of the medical men, who all agree—as to the unsuitableness of the present site. The evidence of Mrs. Love, the honorary secretary, shows that the average number of patients in the institution is eighteen. Two of the doctors say that number is too large. Dr. Hill says the number should not be more than from eight to ten, and Dr. Hardy says twelve. Dr. Love, Dr. Tilston, and others, say that in consequence of the small size of the building and the crowding of patients the risk of disease is rendered very great. All hon. members know that patients of this kind are liable to communicate diseases of a very serious character, which may sweep away a great many people. I think nothing more need be said now, and I hope the Bill will receive the assent of this House, in order that the trustees may have an opportunity of providing a more suitable and convenient site.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put and passed.

Committal of the Bill made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

COONEANA RAILWAY BILL.

SECOND READING.

Mr. DONALDSON said: Mr. Speaker,—In moving the second reading of this Bill it is my intention to be very brief, because there is nothing at all new in its principles, other Acts of the same nature having already been passed in this colony—namely, the Gulland Railway Act and the Urangan Railway Act. The Acts that are already in existence are very much the same as this proposed Bill, but from it some objections that exist in the Gulland Railway Act, for instance, have been eliminated. Whatever discussion there may be on the Bill, it is better, I think, that it should be deferred until we come to consider it in committee. It is necessary that the Cooneana Company should have the railway constructed to connect their property with the main line, otherwise it will not be possible for them to profitably work their mines. The length of the proposed line will be 3 miles 21 chains. It will start from the Southern and Western Railway beyond Redbank, and will pass through certain blocks of land, the owners of which have raised no objection to the railway going in that direction. I may say that the company ask for the powers of deviation, which the committee refused, on the ground that it would be quite possible, if such a clause were inserted in the Bill that a deviation might hereafter take place outside the allotments not provided for in the petition. For that reason the committee thought they were doing quite right in preventing the company having the right of making a deviation to such an extent as a quarter of a mile. I believe the line has been surveyed, and its exact position indicated. As I remarked before, whatever objection there may be to any particular clause in the Bill is a matter of detail and not one of principle, and it will be far better that it should be discussed in committee. I beg to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir S. W. Griffith) said: Mr. Speaker,—The only doubt I have about this Bill is whether it contains sufficient provision for the protection of the rights of the public who

may be entitled to use the proposed line. There is a provision that owners of land adjoining the railway may make collateral branch lines to connect with this railway.

Mr. CHUBB: That is in clause 7.

The PREMIER: I think that requires a little attention. The powers given there will enable other persons to bring their lines to the railway fence, but it is not so clear that they can go past the fence to connect with the railway. I know there has been some difficulty on other lines on that point, and I was appealed to two or three years ago to bring in a general Bill dealing with these private lines, to prevent the proprietors using the privilege given to them by Parliament on the understanding that others might use it, entirely for themselves and to the exclusion of others. And then I am disposed to think that there ought to be some provision as to their running powers, and for settling any disputes as to them. At present the Bill provides that persons using a branch railway may pass over the proposed line with their locomotives and waggon, "subject to any regulations that shall be made by the company." They may make regulations that trains should run after 11 o'clock at night and before 2 o'clock in the morning. In all cases of that sort, where the power is given to one railway of running over another company's line, there should be some provision for settling any disputes that may arise. The provisions of the 13th section would do very well for that, I think. So far as I know, those are the questions that have arisen under Acts framed in similar terms to those of this Bill, and I think they ought to be considered fully when the Bill is in committee.

Mr. DICKSON said: Mr. Speaker,—I think one of the principal matters in connection with this Bill is the time allowed for the construction of the line. It seems to me that three years for the construction of a line of railway three and a-half miles in length is too long a time. At any rate we have a warning before us in the Urangan line, and we ought to be very chary in giving such an extreme time for making such a railway. Considering the extent of the transaction, I think three years is too long a time, and that it should be reduced to one or two years at furthest.

Mr. DONALDSON: That can be considered in committee.

Mr. DICKSON: The hon. member says this is a matter that can be considered in committee, but I think we should direct attention to such matters on the second reading of the Bill. In the case of private lines I think the Government ought to have full power of resumption. These private lines, which are constructed for the development of coalfields, may sooner or later become of such importance to the public as to require to be taken over by the Government in order to form a main line to give approach to other properties which may be beyond. I do not see anything in the Bill which gives the Government power to purchase. Our coalfields are in a primitive condition at the present time. The proposed line when constructed may be a great benefit to the Cooneana Company. I hope it will, but there may be properties lying beyond, to be developed hereafter, which may require to be rendered equally accessible by railway, and it is possible that the rates imposed by the directors of the Cooneana Company, notwithstanding that they are based on the rates of the Government line of railway, may be too high, and the traffic may be of such a character, and develop to such an extent, that the time may come when it will be desirable that the whole of these coal lines should be in the hands of the Government. I certainly think there ought to be a clause inserted in the Bill to the effect that the Government,

at a future time, shall have the power to take over the line. That should be, to my mind, one of the principal features of the Bill. I shall support the second reading.

Mr. CHUBB said: Mr. Speaker,—While I agree with the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, that the Government ought to have power to purchase these private lines, I do not think it is a wise policy to put such a provision into this Bill in particular, because we have already passed three or four Bills without a clause of that kind, and it would be somewhat invidious to make an exception in this case. What I would prefer to see would be a general Bill introduced by the Government affecting all private lines, and reserving to the Government the powers of purchase; and the conditions mentioned by the Premier with respect to the running of trains might also be included in such a Bill. I should like to see a measure, similar to that which is in force in England, and which I hope will be introduced here before very long, regulating all gas companies passed by Parliament, introduced to regulate private railways; and then it would not be necessary to insert a lot of clauses in a private Bill. A few sections giving authority to make the railway would be sufficient, and the general statute would cover all other matters. I do not think we should single out this case for any different treatment from the others which have passed this House.

Mr. NORTON said: Mr. Speaker,—I quite agree that it would be desirable that all private railways should be brought under a special Act, but as we have not such an Act we are bound, in considering a Bill of this kind, to put limits where they are found to be necessary. When we find faults in the making of other lines it is time, when a Bill of this kind is brought forward, to impose restrictions which we find are wanted. So that, until we have a general Act, it is desirable that limits should be imposed. Now, the limit spoken of by the hon. member for Enoggera as to time is, I think, a very important one. In considering this case we have to think, not only of the proposals made to the House now for the construction of this line, but of others which may come on afterwards. I do not see why the company should be allowed three years in which to make a pottering little line like that, which ought not to take six months in construction; and the evil is that if we grant a long time like that, other companies may be formed for the object of disposing of pieces of land for mining purposes, with a right to construct a railway within a given time. They will get a Bill brought in to enable them to construct a line in order to enable them to sell some property for mining purposes. I do not think that that is desirable, and am therefore quite in favour of reducing the term of three years to something considerably less. The power to connect other lines with the railway is also a very important question, and one which I know has led to a great deal of difficulty in connection with those lines which are now in existence. That is a subject that ought not to be neglected, now that we are asked to pass another of those Bills, until a general Bill dealing with the whole subject is introduced. I do not intend to oppose the second reading of this Bill, but I hope to see some amendments made in it when it gets into committee.

Mr. GRIMES said: Mr. Speaker,—I quite agree with what has been said by the hon. member for Enoggera in reference to the time allowed for the completion of the railway. I think it is too long. Most of us must see that we made a mistake in the Bill authorising the construction of the Urangan railway. The time has almost expired

now, and not a single bit of work has been done towards making that line; and it is very likely that the company has been the means of stopping other companies from taking the matter up and running a private railway along that route. I do not think it right that we should give companies privileges of this kind, and let them trade on their privileges. This Bill would give the company an opportunity of doing so, and very likely stop other railways which would be proceeded with in the meantime if the privilege was not granted.

Mr. SHERIDAN said: Mr. Speaker,—I have before me the effect of the Urangan Railway Act and the disappointment which it has caused to the whole district through the contract not being fulfilled, and I feel inclined to support the idea of the hon. member for Enoggera. I think, in the first place, three years is much too long a time to allow for the construction of a railway $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles long. I remember that what happened in regard to the Urangan railway was this: that immediately the Bill passed, people took to speculating in land. Land syndicates were formed all along the proposed route, which enabled people to speculate in land. I have my serious doubts whether there ever was any intention of completing the line. The time has not elapsed yet, but it will on the 23rd December, and I believe the sum deposited to insure the completion of the railway—namely, £2,000—was altogether too small. To those syndicates, which were formed on each side of the proposed railway, £2,000 would be nothing. They would still be large gainers by inducing the unsuspecting public to buy their land. Therefore I do hope that the private railway now contemplated will be surrounded with as many safeguards as possible, and that the Bill will be so amended as to prevent a recurrence of what happened in regard to the Urangan railway.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put and passed.

On the motion of Mr. DONALDSON, the consideration of the Bill in committee was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

QUEENSLAND TRUSTEES AND EXECUTORS SOCIETY (LIMITED) BILL.

REPORT FROM SELECT COMMITTEE.

Mr. CHUBB brought up the report, together with the evidence, of the select committee appointed to inquire into the Queensland Trustees and Executors Society (Limited) Bill, and moved that it be printed.

Question put and passed.

On the motion of Mr. CHUBB, the second reading of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for Thursday next.

PHILLIPS'S PATENT SLEEPERS.

ESK AND MARYBOROUGH RAILWAY.

Mr. WHITE, in moving—

1. That, in the opinion of the House, the time has arrived for the adoption of Mr. Phillips's system of railway-making, wherever practicable, on all lines not contracted for.

2. That the first £160,000 saved from the original estimate by such construction on the new method be employed in extending the railway from Esk towards Maryborough, *vid* Kilkivan.

—said: Mr. Speaker,—I have to congratulate hon. members of this House on the very laudable energy and enterprise they have displayed in pushing the railways of Queensland so far ahead, considering the great mileage we have and our very small population. I believe that over 1,600 miles of railway have been constructed, while we

have a population of scarcely 350,000. I believe that such enterprise is unprecedented in any other country. But, sir, we find that in consequence of the way in which we have constructed railway lines, we have a burden upon us—a burden of something approaching half-a-million of money annually; and, therefore, we need to pause and see what we can do to prevent an increase of that burden. We find that not only have our railways cost a large sum of money, considering that they are light lines, but the maintenance of them is extremely costly. It appears that the maintenance of our railways takes a full half of all the earnings of the railways. That leads us to consider that there must be something wrong in the construction. We find this cost for maintenance can scarcely be dispensed with, on account of the shifting nature of the ballast used, the necessity for keeping the roadway clean and free from the growth of grass and weeds, and for keeping the ballast packed over and over again. A new system of railway-making has been adopted which we find has great advantages for the Queensland public in the making of our railways. That is Mr. Phillips's patent, and we find under that system that our railways can be made for about one-half the cost, and maintained for about one-half the present cost. We believe this new system is superior to the system we have hitherto followed, because the earth the line is packed with is more cohesive and more elastic, and becomes at the same time more compact, and the vibration of the trains has less tendency to shift the material upon which the line is laid. There is every reason to think that this "earth railway," as we may call it, will prove to be perfectly efficient. Persons practically acquainted with travelling with wheeled vehicles, and especially with heavy loads, can bear out the scientific facts adduced on this subject with regard to the pressure upon the square inch of surface. Therefore I consider the time has arrived when we should adopt that system of railway-making wherever practicable. With regard to the saving mentioned in this motion, this House voted £160,000 for the extension of the railway from Mount Esk towards Maryborough, *vid* Kilkivan. That money has been misappropriated, or has, at all events, been spent at the wrong end, as the line has been started from the Maryborough and instead of from Mount Esk.

Mr. ANNEAR: That is what you say.

Mr. WHITE: I say it has been wrongfully spent in being spent at the Maryborough end, when the money was voted for the extension from Mount Esk towards Maryborough. However, that money is irretrievably gone from the Mount Esk district. I contemplate that, if this system is adopted, there will be a considerable saving, amounting to, if not fully one-half the usual cost of construction, to something nearly approaching that. I consider if we continue making our railways on that system we shall soon run up a saving of £160,000, and then I think that money should be spent upon the extension from Mount Esk. It is very necessary, for in the West Moreton district there is now no outlet for those who wish to settle on the Brisbane River, except beyond Mount Esk. West Moreton has been completely picked over, and there is now no land left for selection except up in that direction, and I think we should therefore provide for the extension of the railway in that direction. I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said: Mr. Speaker,—I think it is rather soon for any hon. member to ask this House to express an opinion by a resolution of this kind. The hon. member

must surely be aware of that. It must be admitted that the Government have very boldly given effect to their opinion and their judgment as to the value of Phillips's sleepers in the construction of the railway it is now proposed to undertake as a test for them. With regard to the saving mentioned, of course where any saving can reasonably be effected in the construction of lines in this way it will be done, but it will be quite time enough to think about how we are going to spend those savings when we get them. It is asking too much to expect that the House should express an opinion in a general way upon a resolution of this kind, and the Government are not inclined to accept such a resolution as a recommendation or guidance for them in any way.

Mr. CHUBB said: Mr. Speaker,—I have a very strong objection to this motion as it is worded, because the hon. gentleman proposes to take the first £160,000 saved for the purpose of a railway towards Maryborough from Esk. If the test of this system of railway-making is to be applied first in the North it will be very unfair, if there is much saving in connection with it, to bring the savings down to the South. When the Government brought in their Loan Bill they appropriated the £10,000,000 loan to three divisions—the Southern and Western, the Central, and Northern divisions. The railway to which the hon. member refers is in the Southern division, and if any of the savings from this system of construction are to be applied to this railway, let them be taken from the savings on one of the Southern lines, which are a part of the railway scheme of the Government. My great objection to the motion is that the hon. member would like, if he could, to get £160,000 from the north or central portions of the colony in order to spend it upon a line in the southern portion for which £160,000 has already been voted. Then, again, with regard to the first portion of the motion, I quite agree with what has fallen from the Minister for Works. The question is quite in embryo at present, and we ought not to commit ourselves to a general application of the system to all the railways of the colony until we first see how the experiment turns out. If it is successful, every hon. member, I am sure, will agree to its adoption. The moment it is found to be a very much less expensive system, it will be adopted without the necessity of a motion being passed by this House. I hope the hon. gentleman will see his way to withdraw the resolution.

Mr. BLACK said: Mr. Speaker,—I am not quite clear as to what the hon. gentleman intended in moving this motion. I can hardly think he meant that in the event of this scheme being used in the northern portion of the colony, and a saving being effected thereby in the cost of construction, that that saving should be brought down here to make this railway from Esk towards Maryborough, *vid* Kilkivan. Did the hon. gentleman really mean that? That is what I deduce from it, and from the speech he has just made. There was a sum of £30,000 voted for the Laidley branch railway. Let us suppose that that line was constructed for £15,000 by using these steel sleepers; does the hon. gentleman mean that that saving of £15,000 is to be taken to make the line to Kilkivan?

Mr. WHITE: Yes.

Mr. BLACK: That is certainly not what the motion, as it is worded, would lead hon. members to believe. If the motion were carried, I take it, it would only be binding on this Parliament. It would certainly have no effect on the new Parliament. I agree with the Minister for Works that it will be quite time to think of how

to spend the savings when we have made them. We have never had any savings yet out of railway construction, and the majority of the votes in the £10,000,000 loan, for railway purposes, were only votes on account. I do not see how it is possible that any saving can be effected.

The PREMIER: There has been none up to the present time.

Mr. BLACK: Most of the railways recently completed have cost a great deal more than the money voted. I believe the duplication of the line between Brisbane and Ipswich has cost a great deal more than was estimated, and if there is any saving effected on other lines it is only right that it should go towards paying the deficit that has already accrued. Taking it altogether, I do not think the hon. member's motion is likely to be carried. It is too vaguely worded, and I do not think it would be practicable to carry it out. I have every confidence in Mr. Phillips's system of steel sleepers, under certain conditions which I have referred to before—in the more northern parts of the colony, where the question is, either metal sleepers or no railways, in consequence of the ravages caused in timber of any sort by white ants. But we cannot be certain yet that these sleepers will be the best sort of sleepers that can be adopted there. In the more southern portion of the colony, where we have a large quantity of ironbark and other timbers suitable for sleepers, I do not know that it would be judicious to insist on steel sleepers being used. Although we talk about the economy of railway construction under Mr. Phillips's system, it is not so very certain that there will be any very great economy. It is very probable that here the economy will be the other way. The land along the line will have to be drained. Perhaps not in the first instance, but certainly in going across swampy ground side-drains will have to be put in, and I should not be at all surprised if eventually it was found necessary to use ballast. But Mr. Phillips's system of sleepers, or some of similar construction, are the only sleepers which can be used for railway construction in the more northern portions of the colony. I am not at all sure, and I do not think the Minister for Works can give us any assurance, that an absolute saving in cost will be effected by using these steel sleepers.

Mr. MACFARLANE said: Mr. Speaker,—It is well known in our district that the hon. member who has introduced this resolution is a very hearty supporter of the steel sleeper system. He is very sanguine that by the adoption of it a large amount of money will be saved to the colony, and, holding those opinions, I think he is quite justified in bringing the resolution forward. I think, also, he is justified in looking after the interests of his own electorate. He wants to appropriate the savings he speaks of for his own electorate, believing that a certain amount of money, which was voted for making a line from Esk towards Kilkivan, was wrongly taken away from that electorate. On these grounds I think he is justified in bringing the matter before the House. He might have given another reason why the first savings, if there should ever be any, should be applied towards the making of that railway, and that is the vast amount of settlement that is taking place where this line would be made. But the hon. member does not want the whole of the savings; he only wants the first £160,000. If his ardent anticipations should ever be realised, I shall be glad to see the savings applied in that way, but really I have my doubts about it. The thing is only an experiment so far as it has gone, and the experiment may not yet turn out so well as the hon. member anticipates. However,

I hope his anticipations will be realised, and that some day we shall see this railway made out of the savings which we shall effect by adopting Mr. Phillips's system of steel sleepers.

Mr. BAILEY said: Mr. Speaker,—I have no doubt that this motion originated partly from a little jealousy on the part of the hon. member's constituency and the Ipswich people, and partly from a desire to divert what will become a very important traffic from the Kilkivan district towards his electorate. But I do not think the Maryborough people or the people of my district have the least jealousy in the matter; neither have they the least objection to a rival line—for it would be a rival line—from Mount Esk. It is said the route is a very difficult one, and that the further you go, and the nearer you approach Kilkivan, the more difficult it becomes. But most important discoveries are being made almost weekly in that district, and I have not the slightest objection that the Ipswich people should come in conflict, as it were, with the Maryborough people, for that traffic. As to what the hon. member said about Mr. Phillips's steel sleepers, I thoroughly coincide with him. I myself have seen parts of the country where lines of railway have been made, where nearly the whole of the young timber, for a mile or two on each side, has been utterly destroyed because the wood was wanted for sleepers. I should have been very glad indeed if that young timber could have been saved; it would have been a very important asset to the colony at the present time. If by the adoption of these steel sleepers we can prevent the destruction of our young timber—the very best and straightest of our timber—Mr. Phillips will have conferred a great boon upon the colony. I shall certainly support the hon. member's motion, because I know very well that everything must have a beginning, and the abstract resolutions at first seem to be of little value. I have found myself from experience that in the course of years they tell, and that what at first was a mere abstract resolution becomes by-and-by an actual fact and is carried into effect.

Mr. KELLETT said: Mr. Speaker,—With reference to the remarks of the last speaker about the people of the Ipswich district being jealous of the Maryborough people, I do not see where it comes in exactly. And as for talking about a rival route, I imagine it is well known to you, sir, and to some other hon. members, that this £160,000 that we have found out lately has been spent on some Maryborough railway, was spent on that work without ever having been voted.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Yes.

Mr. KELLETT: Well, I should like to know later on when it was voted. It was as great a misappropriation of public money as has ever taken place in the colony.

Mr. FOOTE: Hear, hear!

Mr. KELLETT: I shall give the words of the vote, and the Colonial Secretary will be able to follow me. If he does not know the facts of the case now, he will before I have done. I think he knows very little about it at present. If he knows as much about it as I do and applies a little common sense, he will be able to see that he is entirely wrong. The vote of £160,000 was for "a railway from Ipswich towards Maryborough, *via* Kilkivan." Now, I should like to ask the hon. members and the Colonial Secretary, who knows so much about it, how that money came to be spent upon some line from Maryborough, when the vote clearly says "from Ipswich towards Maryborough." It was well known that £160,000 would never enable the railway to reach Maryborough; it was simply to go in that direction.

There are the words of the vote, which anyone can see on looking at "Votes and Proceedings." And now, sir, we find, after some time, that this money has been expended in the Maryborough district, and I distinctly state again that a greater misappropriation of public money has never been made since I have had a seat in this House, and I do not think previously. I do not see how any honest Ministry, when they look into the matter and find that they have made a mistake and have appropriated this money, which was not voted by this Parliament but by the preceding one for a certain specific work—that they have utilised it for some different purpose to that for which it was voted, without the matter ever coming before this House in any shape or form—I should like to know how they can defend it. We were told the other night when it was thought advisable to make a line of railway from Normanton to Croydon, and it was proposed to take the money that had been voted for a line from Normanton to Cloncurry for that purpose, that it could not be done without a special Bill being brought in for the purpose. But, sir, it seems that these things can be done without a special Bill if Ministers think fit to do it. The only way I can account for it is that they did not exactly understand or forgot what the vote was, because I do not think, if they did remember at the time, that they would have allowed the money to be spent in this way without coming to this House and asking whether they might do so. It appears to me now that there is nothing for it but this: The money cannot be got back again at the present time. I suppose the Treasury is not very full, and there is no money to carry on railways, and if they cannot find some other line like the one from Normanton to Cloncurry, which it is not necessary to go on with at present, and are not able to transfer the money from it to this line, the only other thing to do is to place a sum on the next loan vote for £160,000, to replace the money that had been taken for the line from Maryborough. That is the only course, because it will be a standing disgrace to the Ministry who have expended money for a purpose for which it was not voted, if they do not refund it, and use it for the purpose it was voted for.

Mr. MELLOR said: Mr. Speaker,—I think what has been advanced by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down is not exactly correct—that the money voted for the Kilkivan line has been misappropriated. What is the difference of starting the line from the Maryborough and Gympie line towards Mount Esk? The same thing has been done on the coast line.

Mr. KELLETT: It was to start from Ipswich. That was what the money was voted for.

Mr. MELLOR: Of course the Government had to take into consideration the best way in which the money could be expended, so as to pay the interest on the loan. I believe it will pay very much better from the Kilkivan end than if it started from this end.

Mr. KELLETT: Question.

Mr. MELLOR: That is a matter that had to be taken into consideration, and it is spending the money on the same line for the same purpose.

Mr. KELLETT: No.

Mr. MELLOR: It is going from Maryborough, *via* Kilkivan, towards Mount Esk. That is just the same thing.

Mr. KELLETT: No; it was to start from Ipswich.

Mr. MELLOR: At any rate there was no misappropriation of the money. With regard to the line itself, I think it has a much better chance of paying on the Kilkivan side than on the other. In addition to a large extent of valuable

mineral country, the district is much better adapted for settlement in every respect from Kilkivan towards Mount Esk than from this end towards there. As far as I can see there is nothing likely to be saved from the original vote. If the hon. gentleman asked this House to expend the £15,000 or £20,000 proposed to be expended on the Laidley line on this line, there would be something in it. It would have commended itself at once to the House. But I do not think there is any likelihood of saving any money on the present contracts for railways. Just a word with reference to Phillips's steel sleepers. I believe they are adapted for the construction of railways in some parts of the colony, such as from Norman-ton towards Croydon. As far as I understand the country there is almost perfectly level. I believe there is no timber there suitable for sleepers, and from what I have seen of the trial line at Harrisville it appears to me that they will suit very well indeed for the construction of railways over level country. And if they are proved to be a success they will be a great saving in the cost of constructing railways in the colony. I should have liked to see the Government make a trial of them on a small portion of the extension of the line from Sand-gate, where there are six or seven trains running daily. It is very level country, and the public would then have been able to see whether they would be a success or not. If the Government made a trial of that kind as a still further test it would be a great advantage. I sincerely trust they will do so.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. B. B. Moreton) said: Mr. Speaker,—In reference to what has fallen from the hon. member for Stanley, Mr. Kellett, I think it will be seen on looking back that the two original votes for the Esk River and Maryborough line, *via* Kilkivan, were passed by the late Government, and that the late Government also originated the construction. I think the hon. member for Townsville was the then Minister for Works, and laid on the table the plans and specifications for that line. Not only that, but I think that in answer to a question by the hon. member for Wide Bay, Mr. Bailey, he told the House that he was going to commence the line at both ends. The present Government put £45,000 in their loan vote for the extension of the line towards Esk—the second section, I think—and the money has been used for that purpose. It was the evident intention of the late Government to commence the Ipswich and Maryborough *via* Kilkivan line at both ends at the same time.

Mr. FOOTE said: Mr. Speaker,—The remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down seem to throw a different light on this matter. I remember that a deputation waited on the late Minister for Works a short time before he left office, and it was pointed out to him that £160,000 had been voted for the line. The vote was also a specific one; the line was to go from a certain point towards a certain point. Now, it is generally charged to the present Government that they have misappropriated this money, by starting the line at the other end, which the hon. member (Mr. Mellor) says makes no difference. It would make no difference in his opinion whether a line was started from the Gulf of Carpentaria, and from the great bend of the Mary at the same time; he thinks the money would be equally well spent if it were started at both ends as at one end.

The PREMIER: The motion was passed on the 9th October, 1882—

"The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Mr. Macrossan) moved that the House approve of the plans, sections, and books of reference of the branch line of the Maryborough railway to Kilkivan, as laid upon the table of the House 26th September, 1882."

Mr. FOOTE: I wish to see the matter cleared up, because it was placed to the credit of the Ministry that it was the outcome of a little scheming that they had conducted on behalf of some of their friends. However, the Premier states that the action was taken up by the hon. member for Townsville, who, I have no doubt, remembers the whole circumstances very well, as he has a most vivid memory, and will thoroughly understand what caused him to take that departure from the system that is usually customary in matters of this sort. This motion looks very peculiar to me; I do not remember having seen one like it before. If the hon. member has to wait for the extension of the railway to Esk until there has been a saving of £160,000 on lines by construction on a new method, a line will not be made in this generation; so that the farmers need not be in a hurry to get in their crops to send the produce by this railway. I would advise the hon. member to withdraw the motion, which looks to me very much like a "bunkum" motion. He has been schemed, as I would call it, out of the £160,000 which ought to have been appropriated for that line, and he should press upon the Government the necessity of including that portion of the line in the next loan vote. I certainly would not allow a motion of this sort to go before the country if I were he; I would withdraw it. It simply means "bunkum"—that is all.

Mr. SHERIDAN said: Mr. Speaker,—I sincerely hope that this motion will not pass. I think that if the hon. member seriously meant it to pass he would not have worded it as he has done. He suggests that if £160,000 should be saved in the North through the adoption of Phillips's steel sleepers, that £160,000 should be stolen from the North and spent in the Southern districts. Now, I do not think that any member of the House who will give the matter serious consideration would support such a motion as that. If there is a saving in the North it has a right to be spent in the North, and if there is a saving in the South let the South bear its own burdens. Besides, sir, I very much doubt, looking at it from a political point of view, whether it would be expedient or right to pass any such motion. It looks like dictating to the Government that because it has been ascertained—or may be ascertained—that a saving will be effected by the adoption of Phillips's sleepers, the Government must carry out this railway; and it is dictating to the Government that it must be carried out by using Phillips's sleepers. I hope this motion will not pass.

Mr. ANNEAR said: Mr. Speaker,—Before this motion is withdrawn, I would like to make a few observations in answer to the remarks made by the hon. member who introduced it. He states that he is quite confident that this plan will prove far cheaper than any other plan we have yet adopted in this colony. Now, I am of the reverse opinion. I feel confident that it will prove doubly as expensive to maintain as our present lines. The other day in giving some figures I made a mistake. I should have stated that the £432 per mile were the figures as given by Mr. Cross, which appeared in *Hansard*, I think on the 14th of last month. I cannot see how Mr. Cross's figures compare with the number of men who, he states in the same return, were employed on that three-quarters of a mile. Mr. Cross states that there were 6'80 men employed on three-quarters of a mile of railway; that was on the deviation of the Fassifern line. The amount of money it cost for three months was £187 15s. 5d. There were nine men to the mile, and nine men, at 6s. 6d. per day for 313 days, is equal to £915 10s. 6d. Now, I stated the other day, Mr. Speaker, that two years'

running on a line of that description, and incurring this expenditure, would pay for the ballast of a mile of road. It would not take nine months of this expenditure to pay for the ballast of a mile of road, reckoning 1,300 cubic yards of ballast to the mile. Now, sir, these are not my figures; they are those of Mr. Cross. I know that Mr. Phillips has invited me to enter into a newspaper contention over the matter, but I intend to enter into no contention of the kind. In regard to figures, I daresay that Mr. Phillips is a more able man than I am; he is a man I could not say a word against, and I believe he has been a very able servant of the Government. But this is a new departure from anything we have ever seen in the colony. In fact, Mr. Phillips had never seen anything like it himself. It was his own idea, and it has not been tried except on three-quarters of a mile of line, which is a sufficient answer in my opinion. If that is to be taken as a basis of what it is going to cost it will be more expensive than the lines we have already constructed up to the present time. The lines we have constructed have been ballasted. I look upon this question in a very simple way. Will mud, even consolidated mud, carry as heavy a weight as a stone foundation? A ballasted road on a consolidated bank is a good foundation; but if we put sleepers on mud or sand, as soon as it rains it at once becomes soft, and when a train goes over the road it becomes disordered. That is the way I look at it, Mr. Speaker. Time will tell. It is no use saying any more. Mr. Phillips's principle is to have a trial, and I sincerely hope it will be a fair trial. Time will tell whether the hon. member for Stanley is right, or whether I am right when I contend that that gentleman is altogether wrong. I am very glad, Mr. Speaker, that for once we have caught the Ipswich bunch somewhat napping. If we have caught them, sir, I am sure that it is the first time. But I do not quite believe we have, because we heard just now from the Premier that the plans were laid on the table of the House by the Hon. Mr. Macrossan, who was then Minister for Works, on the 9th October, 1882.

Mr. KELLETT: Tenders were called for by Mr. W. Miles.

Mr. ANNEAR: Before any tenders can be called the plans and book of reference have to be laid on the table of the House and approved. When we approved of those plans every member of this Assembly was present, with the exception of the hon. member for Stanley. Now, what has been done has been done by hon. members with their eyes open. It is very seldom we catch them with their eyes shut when Ipswich or West Moreton interests are concerned. I am sure the people of Maryborough will do as they have always done. We have nothing whatever against the people of Ipswich; in fact, I respect them very much. They are working in companies, side by side, developing the great mineral resources which exist in that district. There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that the money has been spent properly, and on the end of the line where we should have begun. The hon. member for Port Curtis and the people of Bundaberg would not object if the North Coast railway commenced at Bundaberg and Gladstone at the same time, when they know the railway is to be carried out. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that no harm has been done.

The HON. G. THORN said: Mr. Speaker,—Just before the question is settled I would point out to the House that the money was granted by the last Government for a railway from Ipswich towards Maryborough, and if hon. members will look at the loan vote of the year

1883 they will find what I say is correct. In 1884 tenders were called for this line by the late Minister for Works. I was present at a deputation a short time ago on the subject, and the Minister for Works asked the Commissioner for Railways if such was not the case, and the Commissioner for Railways stated that the late Mr. Miles had called for tenders in the year 1884.

Mr. ALAND said: Mr. Speaker,—I think hon. members wish to place a rather ungenerous construction upon the action of the late Minister for Works, Mr. Miles. I am sure that the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Macrossan, will take all the blame, if there is any blame attached to the matter. Now, what was done? We have it from the hon. member for Fassifern that the plans and book of reference were placed upon the table by Mr. Macrossan, the then Minister for Works, and there was an end of it until tenders were called. For some reason or other, although the late Government remained in office for some twelve months or fifteen months after that—at all events, for some time—they did not call for tenders for this particular line. When the present Ministry came into office they found this line, which had been passed by Parliament, but for which tenders had not been called, and tenders were then called in the ordinary course of business. I do not suppose that it was particularly brought under the notice of the late Mr. Miles that the tenders for the railway were not called for exactly on the terms of the loan vote under which this money had been authorised to be appropriated. What the hon. member for Maryborough says is perfectly true. The hon. member for Stanley, and the members for Ipswich, and those who now appear to be so very much interested in this line starting from Ipswich instead of from Maryborough, were in the House when the plans and book of reference were laid on the table, and why did they then not keep their eyes open and object, and say that the loan vote was for a line from Ipswich to Maryborough, and not from Maryborough to Ipswich? I object to the ungenerous criticism which has been passed upon a gentleman who is not here to defend himself.

Mr. KELLETT: No ungenerous criticism was passed upon him; you know nothing about it.

Mr. FOOTE: An Act is an Act.

Mr. ALAND: I know all about it.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said: Mr. Speaker,—I trust that the Government will not accept this motion of the hon. member for Stanley, Mr. White. It seems to me to be a motion that the House should not pass, even if the Government are willing to accept it. It is actually committing the House to a thing which is still undecided. The Government have laid down about one-third of a mile—I do not know exactly how much—with steel sleepers to test whether they can bear the running of trains over them. I am not prepared to say what test was made, as I have never seen it, but have heard various opinions expressed. I have heard some gentlemen who went to see the test say it was most unsatisfactory, and I have heard others say that it was perfectly satisfactory. Now, to carry this motion would commit us to the adoption of Phillips's system of railway sleepers, not only in the portion of the country for which Mr. Phillips says they are best fitted, but also all over the rest of the colony—where we have plenty of good ironbark for sleepers and also where we have none. That is a position in which this House should not place itself; and it is a position in which we should not place any Government. I am not quite decided as to whether ironbark sleepers would not do as well

in the North as in the South, though I have heard a great deal of the probability of the white ant eating into them. At any rate, it has not been proved. We have ironbark sleepers on the line to Hughenden, where the country is similar to that over which the line from Normanton to Cloncurry will pass. We have no certain information on the subject, but I have never heard that white ants have attempted to destroy the sleepers there. I think it is very probable that from the small amount of ballast used, especially in the northern part of the colony, the sleeper being entirely exposed to the light and the air, the trains constantly running over them, and the constant pressure—the pressure of the train on the sleepers and the consequent pressure of the sleepers on the ground—the white ant would scarcely attempt to make its home in the ironbark sleepers, seeing how difficult it is to penetrate ironbark. On that ground alone we should not attempt to pass this resolution; it should be negatived. As for the saving of £160,000, that is very problematical. I have never known a Minister who has been able to save money on the making of railways. He may try and think he will be able to save money, but within twelve months he will find the engineer come down with an additional bill of costs which he never contemplated. That was my experience more than once—and I think I did my best to keep the engineers down to as low a sum for construction as could be put down; and I am sure it will be the experience of all other Ministers who will follow the present Minister for Works. Even if £160,000 were saved on the Cloncurry line and the line from Normanton to Croydon, I do not think this House would consent to the appropriation of that money to the construction of any portion of the Esk railway, and I am certain there would be some stonewalling if any such attempt were made. Though some of the Ipswich members are said to have been caught napping, I do not think they were; and I am certain that the Northern members will not be caught napping if ever such a proposition is made to this House. Something has been said about the culpability of myself, or the late lamented Mr. Miles, in reference to his motion. At the time the plans and sections were laid on the table there was no such vote in existence; the money was voted afterwards.

The PREMIER: When?

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: I will tell the hon. member when. The specifications were tabled by myself on the 9th of October, 1882, and the following month the Loan Act, containing the item of £160,000 towards a line from Ipswich to Maryborough, *via* Kilkivan, was passed by this House.

The PREMIER: They were both done in the same session.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: I say the vote was not in existence at the time plans and specifications were tabled by me; therefore the Ipswich members could find no fault then. It was after the vote was passed by this House in such a way that the line should be commenced at the Ipswich end that they could have found fault with any appropriation for the other end. So that they were not caught napping, as the hon. member for Maryborough, Mr. Annear, said. As far as the tenders are concerned, we know that they were called by the late Minister for Works, and I believe he made the alteration complained of by the West Moreton representatives; in fact, he admitted it when a deputation waited on him in reference to the matter. I say nothing at all about my culpability, or his either. I have simply stated the facts, and hon. members can

draw their own conclusions. The money was not voted when the specifications were tabled and passed; it was voted afterwards, and for a specific purpose. Whether it should have been spent upon the Kilkivan end because specifications of that section were approved, or whether it should have been appropriated at the other end, of course, the House can judge just as well as I can. I think myself it was a misappropriation, and I think also that had the late Government remained in office, and had they determined to make that section first, they would have got a separate vote for it. I know it was their intention to begin the work at both ends. Circumstances, of course, prevented me from doing that, and prevented me from starting the work at the Ipswich end, though I believe I did start the first section. That is how the case stands as far as that vote is concerned. I did not hear what the Minister for Works said, whether he approved or disapproved of the hon. member for Stanley's motion, but I trust that hon. members will not take it as a party vote, even if the Government do make up their minds to accept it. My hon. friend the member for Bowen tells me that the question of the railway was not brought up at the time the Loan Estimates were discussed, so that the member for Maryborough, Mr. Annear, who thinks the members for Ipswich were caught napping, has made a mistake.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I think the explanation the hon. member has given is about as singular a one as ever came from a gentleman who has been a member of a Government. The same Government, in the same session, brought forward the two matters that are necessary before the construction of a line can be commenced; first, the appropriation of the money, and secondly, the approval of the plans; or you may take the approval of the plans first, and the voting of the money afterwards. They are the two things that must concur; they must both be done by Parliament before any railway construction can be commenced. In the same session, the same Government brought forward the plans and proposed the appropriation of the money, and I presume they did them both for the same purpose. If they did not, somebody was playing a very unworthy trick on Parliament. What could anybody say was the intention when in the same session a sum of money was voted for the construction of a railway between two points, and in that same session the Government were authorised to proceed with the construction of a particular part of it—what could anybody say but that the intention was that the moneys should be devoted to the construction of that portion of the line submitted to Parliament and approved by it? So far from the matter escaping notice when the Loan Estimates were discussed in 1882, the matter was discussed fully by the Ipswich members; and this point that has been raised in the last few weeks was simply one of those little dodges the hon. member for Fassifern mistakes for statesmanship. He thought he had discovered something that would damage the Government. He is the gentleman who got up the deputation to the late Mr. Miles on the subject. We knew all the time that it was one of those little tricks he used to pride himself upon; he used to boast that he was more accomplished in that kind of thing than anybody else in the colony. It is one of those small, paltry, little things by which he thought he would be able to do an injury to the Government.

Mr. MOREHEAD: You were at one time a subordinate officer under the member for Fassifern.

The PREMIER: I was a member of a Government with the hon. member for Fassifern.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Perhaps you put him up to these tricks.

The PREMIER: I have no hesitation in saying that it is a little thing that has been found out to damage the reputation of the Government, but I do not think it will be at all successful. The money was as clearly appropriated for the construction of that line as ever money was for any line, and I have no doubt that my late colleague, Mr. Miles, found all the plans waiting in the office, and simply carried out the pledge given by this House.

Mr. KELLETT: Mr. Miles acknowledged that the money was misappropriated.

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Townsville said he did not hear whether the Minister for Works had stated that the Government would support this motion. I do not think my hon. colleague indicated that the Government were going to support it; he certainly did not. On the contrary he pointed out that it is entirely premature. Of course the Government could not adopt the second part of the motion under any circumstances. As to the first part, that is entirely premature. It may do some day to affirm what is there stated, but certainly not now.

The HON. G. THORN said: Mr. Speaker,—I hope I shall be allowed to explain—

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Spoken, spoken!

The HON. G. THORN: I only wish to make a personal explanation. I know nothing whatever about this. It was no trick. I was not in the House when the line was passed.

The PREMIER: You were in the House in 1882. You were present during the discussion, and were talking all the time.

The HON. G. THORN: When the deputation waited on the late Minister for Works, the Commissioner for Railways told Mr. Miles that he called for tenders. That was the time I heard of the circumstances.

The PREMIER: You talked more about the line than anybody else.

The HON. G. THORN: I may have talked about it, but there was no trick in the deputation waiting on Mr. Miles. Until then I thought the money was still in the Treasury and available.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said: Mr. Speaker,—As a personal explanation, I wish to say that I hope the House does not imagine I throw any blame on the late Mr. Miles. I inferred from the remarks of the Premier that he was under the impression that I did. I simply stated the facts. It was said that the hon. members for Ipswich were caught napping, and I mentioned the facts to show that they could not have been napping, and that the discussion on the loan vote took place after the plans, section, and book of reference were laid on the table and passed by the House.

Mr. NORTON said: Mr. Speaker,—I am somewhat surprised at the question that has been raised now, because it should have been raised long ago, if it were raised at all. I have some recollection with regard to this line, and I recollect what the intention of the Government was after the hon. member for Townsville went out of office. Their intention was to carry the line right through, and ask for another vote to complete the line from Kilkivan to Esk. I speak particularly in regard to this subject, because I do not care to see anything in the shape of a suspicion of injustice done to a gentleman who was for so long a member of this House, but is not now with us; I speak of the late

Minister for Works. Hon. members may think he was to blame in this matter. Whether he was or not I think it is my duty to say that to some extent I believe I was to blame. I cannot recollect all that was done in connection with these plans before the late Government left office, but I know that they were in course of preparation, though I forget how far they had gone.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: You mean the permanent plans.

Mr. NORTON: Yes; I mean the permanent plans. Whether tenders were called for or not, I do not recollect, but if blame is to be cast on the late Minister for Works, I am quite prepared to take some of the blame. The matter was initiated by me, though it did not go so far as it did under the late Minister for Works. The intention of the late Government, however, was to ask for a vote to complete the line, and to go on with it at both ends.

Mr. WHITE, in reply, said: Mr. Speaker,—The Northern members who have spoken on this subject are very much afraid of contributing anything towards the South, but I think the financial separation they are going to get will save them from anything in that way. The hon. member for Maryborough expressed himself very feelingly about the little railway under Mr. Phillips's system, and he is a great advocate of ballast. There is no doubt that he is a very practical man in many things, but we want to take into consideration scientific facts along with our practical knowledge. Three tons on a dray with two wheels will press fully 750 lbs. to the square inch; that is, in the case of drays going all over the country on roads that are not metalled. The heaviest locomotive engine only presses some 10 lbs. to the square inch. What do we want with stones under the engines? We do not want them at all. The thing is absurd. The idea of talking about stones under an engine or train!

Mr. ANNEAR: Engineers have been a long time finding it out.

Mr. WHITE: I have attained my object in having the matter ventilated. Perhaps I may be too eager for economy, too precipitate, but the question is one that is well worth ventilating. It behoves us not to allow any time to slip in the adoption of such a system as will save our money, and I am perfectly convinced that any railways we make under this system will pay at the beginning. I do not want to make a line of railway now that will not be a paying concern. There is no reason why we should do so. It must be very poor country that will not pay the cost of maintenance on a railway built on this system. I hope, therefore, that the House will consider the question, so as to have the system adopted very early. For my own part, I may as well say that I shall oppose any railway that is brought before the House where this system is not adopted. I cannot vote for any railway line where that system is not to be carried out wherever practicable. I beg to withdraw the motion.

Motion accordingly withdrawn.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I move that the House do now pass to the Orders of the Day.

Question put and passed.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS BILL.

COMMITTEE.

On the Order of the Day being read, the Speaker left the chair, and the House went into committee to further consider this Bill.

Question—That in clause 4, line 14, "Burke, one member" be omitted with a view of inserting "Burke, two members."

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the clause—put.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said when the House rose last night the Chairman had been moved out of the chair earlier than usual for the purpose of allowing the Northern members to consult amongst themselves as to the course they should pursue upon the declaration made by the hon. the leader of the Government, and the compromise proposed by the hon. the leader of the Opposition. Well, he might say that since the House rose they had had an opportunity of consulting together, and he would tell the Committee presently what their resolution was. But before doing so he wished to point out to hon. members of the Committee the unfair means which the Premier had taken to disparage the claim of the North to additional members beyond what the Government were willing to give; that was two. The Premier had said he was willing to give two additional members. He thought that was what the hon. gentleman proposed.

The PREMIER: Two in addition to the four. That is six altogether.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: Two in addition to the fourteen provided by the Bill.

The PREMIER: The four are additional; we propose to give two more.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he knew that. Their claim was, he contended, a moderate one—for four. That was what they claimed, and the leader of the Opposition had tried to bring about peace where there was war at present, by proposing a compromise, which was usual when parties which were at war desired peace. But that was beside the question at present. He wanted to point out to the Committee the unfair means which the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government had taken to disparage what the Northern members considered to be their just claims, by disparaging the prospects of permanence of the Croydon Gold Field.

The PREMIER: I never did anything of the kind.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said that was what the hon. gentleman based his opposition upon against Croydon getting two members to itself, because he said the population might not be as large as it was on Charters Towers two years hence, or as it was on Gympie two years hence; and the reason the hon. gentleman gave was that goldfields as a rule in the colony of Queensland had had large populations upon them at the beginning, and that they had then dwindled down to very small populations afterwards.

The PREMIER: To a smaller population afterwards.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said, well, he did not go in for "hair-splitting."

The PREMIER: No; but there is a great deal of difference. It might be a very large population, but still be smaller than it was at first.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the hon. gentleman would have an opportunity of making a speech when he had finished, and he hoped the hon. gentleman would keep his temper as well as he kept it last night. He certainly did not display very much temper, but he displayed far too much as far as he (Mr. Macrossan) was personally concerned and as far as other members representing Northern constituencies were personally concerned. When the hon. gentleman instanced, in support of his conten-

tion of the non-permanency of the Croydon, the Gilbert Gold Field, and other goldfields, he selected fields which could not fairly be compared with the Croydon. The only fields in Queensland which could at the present time be fairly compared with Croydon were Charters Towers and the Hodgkinson. Those were the only two, because they started as reefing fields.

The PREMIER: The Etheridge.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the Etheridge was in the same district as Croydon. The other fields started as alluvial fields, and necessarily as soon as the alluvial was worked out the great rush of population went away somewhere else. That was a natural consequence. It was a natural consequence all over Victoria. On fields where there would be 100,000 people at one time, there would be, perhaps, twelve months afterwards, only 5,000 or 6,000, and they would be permanently employed; and the fields which he had in his mind's eye had remained permanent ever since, and the population kept increasing. That had been the experience on all alluvial fields. The hon. gentleman, he knew, was not aware of it. He knew very little about mining; he knew a great deal about the law of mining, but that was all. About practical mining he was utterly ignorant. The Gilbert was a purely alluvial field. He himself happened to be one of the miners who were on the goldfield, so that he knew something about it personally. It never became a reefing field. There were certainly a few reefs found near Gilberton at a place called Commissioner's Hill, and they were afterwards attempted to be worked by a gentleman whom the hon. the leader of the Government knew very well—a gentleman who was his partner in some land speculations. He attempted to work those reefs, but that did not make the Gilbert a reefing field, because at the time the reefs were attempted to be worked, the population had all gone with the exception of a very few persons indeed. Now, he did not say that the reefs on the Gilbert would not pay. They had never been properly tried. They had yet to be tried, and so it was with all the other fields the hon. gentleman had mentioned or alluded to. Therefore he said the hon. gentleman was most unfair in his contention, and in trying to influence the minds of members of the Committee to carry his purpose through, of only giving two more members to the North. Now, another means which the hon. gentleman took, and which was also unfair, was the statement made by him that the increase of population about Croydon was not an increase brought about by additions from the southern portions of the colony and from the southern colonies; that a very large portion of it was from the neighbouring fields, and from other parts of the North, which had lost population corresponding to what Croydon had gained. He thought that could be disproved; and though he had, of course, no positive way of doing it, he thought he could disprove it by a process of circumstantial evidence. Before doing so he wished to refer to another statement made by the hon. gentleman immediately before the Chairman left the chair. That was that an increase of 50,000 had taken place in the population since the census was taken in May of last year. The North claimed an increased representation on behalf of 10,000, and the hon. gentleman asked peremptorily, "What about the other 40,000?" What he had to say to that was that they did not exist, and that the hon. gentleman's statement was entirely incorrect, and quite as misleading. He could hardly say "intentionally" misleading, because he could not know what the hon. gentleman's intentions were, but it seemed to him at the time that the proper words to apply to the statement were that it was intentionally misleading.

The PREMIER: I had not the slightest doubt that the statement was correct.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he would prove that it was absolutely incorrect and untrue. Before doing so, he would read what the hon. gentleman said last night, word for word, and prove the statement, word for word, to be untrue. In that morning's *Hansard* the hon. gentleman was thus reported:—

"The PREMIER said the increase of population of the colony since the census had been taken was about 50,000. They had heard that additional representation was required for not more than 10,000 in the North, but what about the additional representation required for the other 40,000?"

He (Mr. Macrossan) asked "Where did you get your figures from?" and the hon. gentleman replied to that as follows:—

"He thought the hon. member must have forgotten. The estimated population at the time of the census was, if he was not mistaken, 325,000."

The PREMIER: That is a mistake, because I said 300,000; 325,000 is the census number.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he would give the real figures presently. The hon. gentleman went on to say—

"There had been an increase of about 35,000 up to the end of the year, and from then up to the present time probably it had increased by another 35,000; but he had taken it at only 50,000."

That was to say, the hon. gentleman was moderate in his statement—he wished to be within the mark, to tell the truth, and not mislead hon. gentlemen on the Government side of the Committee, upon whose votes the proper representation of the North depended. The hon. gentleman did not want to mislead them, so he was very moderate and said only 50,000. The hon. gentleman then moved the Chairman out of the chair. Now, he would show how much truth there was in that statement, and he would see what hon. members, to whom the hon. gentleman appealed, would think of the statement the Premier made for the purpose of damaging the Northern members, in their attempt to get proper representation. He referred the hon. gentleman for his figures to the "Statistics of the Colony of Queensland," as laid upon the table of the House, for the year 1886—the latest they had got. The census taken on the 1st May, 1886, gave as the population of the colony, 322,333. The hon. gentleman made a mere mistake of memory in saying 325,000.

The PREMIER: What I said actually was 300,000.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: No; what the hon. gentleman said was 325,000. The increase in the population from that time—the 1st May—until the end of the year was 35,000, according to the Premier's assertion. He must say that if that was the case it would be a remarkable year in the history of Queensland. He could not understand how the hon. gentleman could even imagine it. The greatest increase that ever took place in one year in Queensland was in 1883—the last year of the McIlwraith Government, when there was plenty of capital in the colony and confidence to invest it, and it was invested; plenty of labour fully employed and at high wages; when there was a general boom of prosperity all over Queensland, and when the Government of the day introduced 24,000 immigrants from Europe—notwithstanding all that, the total increase in the population in that year was only 39,000. Yet the hon. gentleman made the assertion in that Committee that the increase from the 1st May to December of last year was 35,000. Did not the hon. gentleman's own common sense tell him that he was making a mistake? Any member of the Committee could have told

him so. He knew the hon. gentleman was making a mistake, but the hour was so late when the assertion was made that he did not care to commence a discussion upon it. He could inform the hon. gentleman what the increase was during that time, to a unit. The increase was 11,690, or less than one-third of what the Premier asserted it was on the previous night; and the assertion was made, of course, to damage the cause of the Northern members, and to help himself and his own side. The population at the end of December last, was 334,000, according to that estimate. He must tell hon. members that the estimate was always over the real increase. Every time the census was taken the Registrar-General was found to be wrong by many thousands—last year by 5,000, and when the census was taken before, by 12,000. He might tell the hon. gentleman, in passing, that it was time some correction was made in that department. He believed the hon. gentleman was making some alterations and improvements in the Treasury, and it was time some improvement was made in the census returns. The Registrar-General took no notice of the actual census, and continued his blunder right on just the same as if the census was never taken. It was a positive fact that he went on every year taking his own estimate of the population as the basis.

The PREMIER: Where do you get the 11,690 from?

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: From the statistics.

The PREMIER: Is that from the census?

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: From the estimated increase.

The PREMIER: I cannot follow you.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he would give the hon. gentleman the page. He would find the figures on page 113 of the statistics. The hon. gentleman would find at the bottom of the page that the estimated increase from the 1st May to the 31st December of last year was stated to be 11,690. So that the statement the hon. gentleman made was a most inaccurate and unfair one to make under the circumstances. Having dealt with that statement and shown it to be utterly incorrect, he would now deal with the other statement made. Of course he had no statistics to deal with that; but he would deal with it upon the probabilities of increase, comparing the present with other years. The hon. gentleman said that the increase of population for the present year and since the end of last year was 35,000; 35,000 for nine months of the year was equal to 48,000 for the whole year. He had just stated that the best year Queensland ever saw was the year 1883, and he had given the reasons why the increase in that year was so high, and yet it only reached 39,000, or 9,000 less than the hon. gentleman's estimate would be, supposing it to be correct. What was the increase last year? According to the Registrar-General it was, speaking from memory, 15,000 or 17,000. He would take the best year since the hon. gentleman had assumed office, and they were 22,000 in round numbers. Take nine months of that year and the figures would be 16,827. So that giving the hon. gentleman nine months of the best year he had had since he assumed office it would make the total increase since the census was taken in May of last year, 28,517. If they could prove, as they had proved, that there had been so great an increase in the North as 7,000 adult males, not counting women and children, was it not sufficient to show that he was perfectly justified in claiming at least four additional members for the North? Even allowing the hon. gentleman's figures to have

some kind of correctness about them, where had the increase of population which he claimed gone? It had gone to the North; it did not exist in the colony outside the North; that was a positive certainty. He had shown that the increase in the North had been greater upon circumstantial evidence; he had shown it by the only means he had found available, and that was by getting at the amount of production. They could not have production without men. They could not have increased production in their primitive way without an increased population, because they had no great textile manufactures going on in which they could have increased production by means of increased machinery or the improvement of machinery they already had. Their products were the natural products generally of the soil. Therefore increased production meant an increase of population. Let them compare the increase of production—through the exports, of course. That was the only means he had. Let them compare the exports of last year and the previous year, and compare the increase of exports in the southern part of the colony and in the northern part of the colony; and he thought that by that comparison he would be able to prove that the increase of population in the North had been far greater even than they had claimed it to be, and certainly considerably more than the hon. gentleman was willing to admit. The total value of the exports from the colony in the year 1885 was, leaving out the odd hundreds, £4,573,000. The total value of the exports last year was £4,261,000, or a decrease on the previous year of £312,000. The colony of Queensland exported £312,000 worth of produce less in the year 1886 than it did in the year 1885. Let them now see how those exports were distributed. In 1885 the South exported—and when he said the South he meant the whole of the colony south of Cape Palmerston—the South exported £3,143,000, and in 1886 £2,463,000, or a decrease in the South of £679,000. Let them see what took place in the North. In 1885 the North exported £1,440,000, and in 1886 £1,799,000, or an increase of £359,000, as against a decrease in the South for the same year of £679,000. That alteration in the exports could not take place without considerable displacement of population, and that displacement of population had naturally—he said naturally, because there were better times now in the North than in the South—had been naturally from the South towards the North. Could anything be plainer than that?

Mr. MOREHEAD: They all know it.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said they might all know it, but the hon. Premier would not admit it, and he was trying to compel him to admit it, if he possibly could. Those were facts which he had taken from statistics, compiled under the Premier's authority by his own subordinate officers—let him gainsay them if he could! He would now take another test—the railways—and show the comparative increase in the returns up to the present date. The South-western railway system had about 755 miles of line open for traffic, and the increase up to date for the present year in comparison with last year was £15,000. The Northern railway system had 231 miles of line open for traffic—not a third of the distance—and the corresponding increase was £17,000, or actually £2,000 more than the increase on the Southern system. That was another proof that the North had the population, because they were able to make their railways pay. Their rates were not higher, but they had the productive power, and they must have the men to produce. They had the population, in spite of what the hon. gentleman might say. He would take another test—the Customs returns—

and he had to thank the hon. gentleman for giving him a copy of the latest returns; they had not been published yet, although they ought to have been out that day, and he presumed they were correct. The total amount of the Customs returns for the last quarter was £302,000, which was a considerable increase on the Customs returns for the corresponding quarter of last year. Out of that, the North had an increase, on the total increase, amounting to 37½ per cent. But their actual Customs returns during the quarter just passed brought them up to 28 per cent. of the total returns, showing a regular and continued increase. Last year it was 25·14 per cent., and the year before 24 and a decimal fraction per cent.; while now, according to those returns, for the first quarter of the present financial year it had increased to 28 per cent., showing that they had the population to consume as well as to export. Having said so much—having, he believed, established a claim for the North to greater representation than the hon. gentleman was willing to give—he would point out this: The Northern members contended that they did not claim what they were entitled to. In claiming four members they contended that the North would still be under-represented, not only in fact, but also especially considering the more rapid increase of population in the North than in the South, and that the inequalities there would in the course of a few years be far greater than they would be here. He had clearly proved that the North was entitled to a far greater amount of representation than they claimed, and yet the hon. gentleman was only willing to give them half what they claimed. And he must say this: that he was not able, and the Northern members were not able and would not accept the proposition of the hon. gentleman. Of course they in that House were small in number. If the whole of the rest of the House went against them they would be outvoted five to one, and if the Government party voted, as he had no doubt they would as a party, against them, they would be considerably outnumbered, even if they got assistance from some gentlemen who were more amenable to the demands of justice. They could not accept the hon. gentleman's proposition; they should only yield to force. Of course the superior force was on the other side, and they must yield to it. They could not help themselves, but nevertheless they would have it placed on record that they were obliged to yield to force. They would not have it said that they consented in a craven cowardly way to accept the proposition of the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, because he had got a strong following at his back and could do what he liked. Like every other party in the same position in every other part of the world where they had the same system of government—in fact, like any army fighting in the field—they must yield to superior numbers. It was to superior numbers that they were compelled to yield. He should go to a division upon the proposition he had made for two members for Burke, of course always with the understanding that he demanded two additional members for Croydon, and additional members also for other portions of the Northern district.

The PREMIER said one thing was perfectly clear from the speech of the hon. gentleman who had just sat down, and that was that he was determined, as far as he possibly could, to increase and perpetuate the ill-feeling that he for many years had been trying to stir up in the northern part of the colony. The hon. gentleman's speech was entirely irrelevant to the question before the Committee. What had his arguments to do with proving the population of particular districts? It was a most disingenuous speech. A stranger listening to it would suppose

that the Government, instead of proposing to increase the representation of the North by six members, were proposing to give only two, leaving entirely out of consideration that only two years ago the Government increased it by two members; so that as a matter of fact within two years by the present Government the representation of the North was proposed to be doubled. And yet the hon. member came down and spoke as if the Government were deliberately endeavouring to perpetrate a monstrous injustice upon the North. He said the hon. member's speech was calculated and intended to stir up and perpetuate ill-will. It was irrelevant to the subject under discussion. He (the Premier) spoke strongly last night, and he should speak more strongly to-night, without losing temper, because he considered that such action as the hon. gentleman had been guilty of ought to be exposed as it deserved. He should never flinch from saying what he had to say under such circumstances.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: You have been exposed.

The PREMIER said the hon. member referred to some statements he (the Premier) made last night, most of which were irrelevant to the present discussion.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Why did you make them?

The PREMIER: Irrelevant to the subject they were now considering. He (the Premier) referred last night to the fact that the population that had gone to the Bloomfield and Annan to a great extent came from other parts of the North.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: And Croydon.

The PREMIER: He also referred to the fact that some people had gone to Croydon from Woolgar and the Etheridge, and the hon. member that evening had twisted what he said, and represented him as saying that all the people who had gone to Croydon had come from the Northern districts of the colony.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: No.

The PREMIER: Yes; that was what the hon. member had said just now. But he (the Premier) said nothing of the kind last night. What he said he had just repeated, and he would repeat it again, for it was perfectly correct: that nearly all the people had gone from Woolgar to Croydon; that a good many had gone from the Etheridge and had since gone back, or a corresponding number; and that a considerable number had gone from Cloncurry. Those statements were perfectly correct. The hon. member had also referred to the fact that he (the Premier) had made a mistake when speaking of the increase in the population of the colony since the census was taken. Probably, following the hon. member, what he (the Premier) had said last night on that point was not justified by the actual facts. Probably 50,000 was an excessive estimate of the increase; he was quite prepared to admit that it must have been. He had in his mind, or thought he had, when speaking on the matter last night, that the population at the end of last year was 335,000, which he believed was correct. He also had in his mind that the census population was 300,000. The difference was 35,000, and when he spoke he forgot that the 300,000 was exclusive of aliens. That was how he fell into the error. Consequently the increase since the census and the end of last year was not 35,000. And with regard to the present year he had inferred that the increase had been as great, which he believed it had been. At any rate, it was a great deal more than 11,000.

1887—3 M

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: I gave nearly 16,000.

The PREMIER said the hon. member said the increase in population from the time of the census to the end of last year was 11,000.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: 11,690.

The PREMIER said he believed the increase from the 1st January up to the present time had been a great deal more than that.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: I gave 16,000.

The PREMIER said he thought to state the increase at 30,000 since the census was a very moderate estimate, because although for a short time after the census many people did not come to the colony a great many had come since then. But the alleged increase in the northern part of the colony did not amount to more than about 10,000; and if instead of the increase in the southern part of the colony being 40,000 it was 20,000, did that make any difference in the merits of the question? But it appeared that hon. members opposite, in their blind—blindness, should he say—

Mr. MOREHEAD: You are the only man who can see, I suppose?

The PREMIER said he was going to say something different, but he would say, in their blindness—

Mr. MOREHEAD: You can be insulting if you like.

The PREMIER: In their blindness seemed to think that the only increase in population had been in the North. Did they know that since the census had been taken there had been an increase of 600 inhabited houses in South Brisbane?

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: A great many empty ones too.

The PREMIER said that was a fact at any rate, and the same had taken place all through the metropolitan districts. He stood there, as he said before, to represent the whole colony.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: Do you?

The PREMIER: Yes.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: You do not.

Mr. W. BROOKES: Yes, he does.

The PREMIER: And every hon. member should remember that in dealing with a question of that kind they were bound to deal with all parts of the colony fairly. He had endeavoured to do what was fair. Of course they did not all agree upon the same basis of representation. Hon. members opposite contended that adult males was the only proper basis of representation. The Government side repudiated that opinion. They said they would take that population into consideration, and if they were a settled population attach great weight to them, but if they were unsettled they would attach very little to them. The hon. member had said deliberately, and knew that he had no right to say it, that he (the Premier) had gone out of his way to disparage the Northern goldfields. He did nothing of the kind, and the hon. member knew it. In what way did he disparage them?

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: Don't twist.

The PREMIER said he was not twisting, but the hon. member had twisted every word he (the Premier) had said last night. He could see plainly the intention of the hon. member. When he saw that the Government were prepared to do a fair thing to the North—more than a fair thing—when they were actually prepared to act in a generous spirit, he was afraid that that generous action would meet with its due reward, and he was determined

that so far as he was concerned the Government should get no credit for doing anything generous. That was the position he had taken up. He charged him openly with it. And then he would go and preach a crusade in the North against the unfairness of the Government, when he knew in his heart that the Government had striven all they possibly could, and had even gone beyond what they were strictly justified in doing in justice to the rest of the colony, to meet the demands of the North. The hon. member knew that perfectly well, but nothing was further from his wish than that should become generally known. But—

"The truth is strong, and will prevail,"

and when the Government endeavoured honestly and earnestly to do justice to the Northern people he hoped that even the sophistries of the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Macrossan, would not persuade them that they were doing the contrary. The hon. member for Townsville had stated that he (the Premier) had unfairly disparaged the Northern goldfields. He did not know whether there was any disparagement in regard to a goldfield scarcely eighteen months old in saying that he was willing to act on the admission that in the next two years it would become as prosperous as Charters Towers. The hon. member asserted that the only two goldfields in the colony to be compared with the Croydon were the Hodgkinson and Charters Towers. He was willing to take Charters Towers as the basis of comparison, and compare Croydon after two years with Charters Towers after more than ten years. Was that unfair? If they took the Hodgkinson as the basis of comparison, what would they find? That the reefs there had attracted a very large population, and were extremely rich on the surface, but when they went deeper it was found they ran out. At Croydon they did not know what would be the result when they went deeper. They might be troubled with water, and they might not; they might be troubled with sulphur in the ores, and they might not. Taking everything in the most favourable light, and looking not to the present but to the future, the Government had assumed that Croydon and Etheridge together would be as prosperous as Charters Towers. He did not think that was unduly disparaging the goldfield. He had forgotten some of the other points of the hon. member's attack, but he did not think it would be worth while to treat them very seriously, even if he had not forgotten them. The hon. member had referred to a number of statistics, which he made use of apparently to prove that the population of the North was increasing more rapidly than that of the South, and he had referred to exports. They all knew what the exports were, and they knew that the exports—which were almost entirely pastoral produce—had diminished during the last two years from causes with which they were perfectly familiar. That did not prove that the population of the Southern districts was not increasing in proportion to that of the North. The hon. gentleman had quoted the Registrar-General's report of the census. Well, here was the ratio of the increase of population per square mile in the Northern and Southern divisions of the colony, which were not so very different in area. The ratio of increase during the five years from 1881 to 1886, in the Northern division was '11, and the proportion of increase per square mile in the Southern division was '37, showing an increase in the South per square mile three and a-half times that in the North. It was no use trying to depreciate one part of the colony for the aggrandisement or advantage of another. They could not do serious business in that way, and they were there to do serious work. He did not know that they

could have more serious work than they were doing now. The hon. member had referred to the Customs returns for the last quarter as showing the large increase in the North. He (the Premier) had a table there from which he would give some figures showing how fast, if that was to be taken as the basis, they could judge that the different portions of the north of the colony were increasing. The increase in Brisbane for the September quarter above the corresponding quarter of last year was from £129,600 to £155,700—more than 20 per cent. The increase for Maryborough was from £13,500 to £15,900—nearly 20 per cent. The increase for the Burnett was not quite so large; at Rockhampton it was from £22,900 to £28,400—about the same; at Mackay from £5,300 to £7,400—nobody had complained yet that Mackay was badly treated in those proposals; at Townsville from £33,000 to £39,000—rather less than 20 per cent. At Normanton the increase was very large—nearly 200 per cent.—from £6,000 to £16,000—that they knew of and were making allowance for. The increase at Cooktown was from £7,300 to £8,500—less than 20 per cent.; at Cairns from £3,000 to £6,200—for that they were making allowance; at Port Douglas there was a diminution from £2,100 to £1,900.

Mr. HAMILTON: There has been a big rush there during the last fortnight.

The PREMIER: There was a considerable diminution at Burketown—from £1,000 to £670; at Dungeness, from £1,000 to £870; and in the Border Customs there was an increase from £4,500 to £7,260. Now, he thought that showed that with the single exception of Normanton, for which they were making special allowance in the Bill, the increase of population, so far as it could be gauged from the Customs revenue, was about equal in different parts of the colony.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: What about the Customs duty paid in Brisbane on goods for the North?

The PREMIER said he did not think a great deal of duty was paid in Brisbane on goods exported to Normanton, or Port Douglas, or Townsville, at the present time. It was an unknown quantity, and an unknown quantity could always be magnified as much as it suited the person speaking, so far as his conscience would allow him to do it; and he was afraid that in some cases that was also an unknown quantity. To come back to the practical matter before them. The hon. gentleman had said that he would divide on the question, and he (the Premier) did not in the least object to his doing so. He did not want the hon. gentleman to concede anything; he did not want him to admit for one moment that the Government were willing to do what was fair. He was quite willing that the hon. gentleman should take up the position that whatever the Government did was wrong, wilfully wrong, with the deliberate intention to work injustice. The hon. gentleman could take up that position if he liked; he (the Premier) did not care in the least. He had his own opinion about it, and he did not believe that the hon. gentleman's real opinion was very different from his own. Other people would be the judges of that; what they were concerned with now was the practical business. What he had said last night that the Government were prepared to do was, to give two members to Croydon and Etheridge; to divide the remainder of the Burke district, and give each part of it one member, and to rearrange the electorates on the eastern side—the present electorate of Cook—so as to give them three members. The question arose what should be the names of the divisions? He thought, on further consideration, that the electorate consisting of all the heads of the Flinders, from

Hughenden west to Cloncurry, might very properly be called Flinders. It was a name that deserved commemoration in this colony; and the whole of that part was on the waters of the Flinders. He thought the name of Carpentaria was a name particularly suitable for the electorate which skirted the shores of the Gulf, and then they might call the mining district Burke. He had been a little puzzled to know what would be a good name by which to call the mining district—he had suggested Etheridge and Croydon last night, but now he thought Burke would perhaps be better.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: I think the name "Burke" should be perpetuated.

The PREMIER said he thought so too. He did not think there was any objection to calling that electorate Burke. That was the original Burke; the first member for Burke was practically the member for the Etheridge, and was elected by the Etheridge, and he was a very good member too. He thought it was not at all a bad idea to call those electorates Burke, Carpentaria, and Flinders. Then of course he would offer no objection to the hon. member's amendment, but the meaning would be somewhat altered. Indeed, it was not worth while fighting about the amendment, because if the hon. member meant by Burke the remainder of the district, he (the Premier) also proposed to give that two members by two other names—either Burke and Flinders or Carpentaria and Flinders. The contest, as it appeared to him, now was shifted somewhere else—to the eastern side—whether the districts there should have one member more. The hon. member had not said where he wanted to bring in the second member in addition to the three they fought about last evening. He would mention, however, how the population would come out according to the division he proposed last evening. Of course, the population of Croydon and Etheridge was conjectural. They had no statistics to help them in that. Of the population of Burke they had some statistics to go by. Speaking from memory, each electorate would have about 2,000 total population, and 1,000 adult male population—that was Flinders and Carpentaria, or Flinders and Burke, whichever they were called. Coming to the eastern seaboard, the statistics given in the tables showed what the population of Cook would be; and of the other two electorates of Cairns and Woothakata, the population of the former, according to the census, was 1,999 total population, with an adult male population of 858. That, as he had pointed out when moving for leave to introduce the Bill, had been considerably increased since; but a considerable part of that population was a temporary population on account of the construction of the railway. The population of Woothakata, including Port Douglas and the Hodgkinson and the Herberton Tin Mines, would be 3,404 total population, and 1,497 adult male population.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: More than that.

The PREMIER said that was the population according to the census. The population of Port Douglas, so far as could be judged, had not increased much, nor had that of the Hodgkinson; and that of the Herberton Tin Mines he did not think could be said to have increased much.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: What about the Mount Albion Silver Mines?

The PREMIER said the figures included Mount Albion. There was a large population there, but they were as prosperous when the census was taken as at present.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: There is California Gully.

The PREMIER said at the time of the last election there were 200 people there; at least there were 200 votes there.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: How many according to the census?

The PREMIER said at present they were dealing with facts, and not with the number of votes polled in a certain place. That was how the matter stood. Of course he expected to hear more before they got to business; but when they did he should like to have the serious consideration of hon. members to the suggestion he had made—that the mining electorate be called Burke, and the others Flinders and Carpentaria. When they came to the eastern seaboard the contest would evidently have to be renewed; and they could then take the division the hon. member intended to take, and very properly too, to make manifest that he was only compelled to yield by superior numbers.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the hon. gentleman seemed to accept the addition of two members to Burke.

The PREMIER: If "Burke" means the goldfields.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he was agreeable to accept that. He was willing to adopt the name of Burke for the Croydon and the Etheridge, and was willing to shift the battle-ground to the eastern coast. He did not wish to prolong the contest, and he did not think that hon. members on his side wished to prolong it either. He was not sorry that the hon. member had considerably improved in his temper since the adjournment for tea. He certainly should not have made such an attack upon him (Mr. Macrossan) as he did, without good grounds. The hon. Premier must not forget that he was not speaking for himself at all. The electorate which he represented was, he believed, fully represented under the Bill. He had no interest whatever in the Croydon Gold Field. A great number of members thought he had, and had asked him; but he might say that he had no interests beyond the interest that each and every member in the Committee should have, more especially the Northern members, in seeing fair play shown to the districts which they represented. Of course he supposed that the Northern members represented the whole of the North, every one of them without exception. He was simply speaking for them in speaking as he had done. The Premier had no right to make a personal attack upon him as he had. He had called him a great many hard names; among the rest the hon. gentleman had said he was "disingenuous." That was as much as to say that a man was telling a lie—was a liar. It was a polite way of saying so. If he liked he could retort very forcibly upon the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman and he had often had duels in the House, and probably would often have them again, and he thought he very seldom came off second best, with all the hon. gentleman's legal ability and histrionic talents, of which he had a considerable amount; and he must say they were needed when he appealed to his supporters on that side of the Committee. When they came to the Cook they should have the real battle to fight. He would sooner see Carpentaria, as the hon. gentleman called it, and Flinders joined into one; but he was not going to quarrel with him over that, and neither would members who represented Northern constituencies. They were quite satisfied to take the name "Burke" for the Croydon and Etheridge Gold Fields, and give it two members; but they were certainly determined to get Cook another member. That was, the electorate of Cook as it stood upon the

electoral map, not the old electorate. They believed that the new electorate of Cook should have two members instead of one, as was now proposed to be given to it. They demanded four new members, and the hon. Premier was prepared to admit two, and it had been proposed that they should split the difference and take three. He was quite willing to take three, and he believed the members representing the North were willing also, so far as he knew their minds. The battle would have to be fought again. He supposed the Burke would have two members according to what the hon. gentleman had just said.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he thought the Government and the Committee might well consent to what he would be inclined to call the concession proposed by the hon. member for Townsville. It was a matter of great regret that the Premier should—he said it in all deference—have so far forgotten himself as to have spoken in the way he had of the hon. member for Townsville, and also of all the members for the northern portion of the colony. He had over and over again applied to those gentlemen, and to the hon. member for Townsville in particular, the term “irreconcilable.” The word “irreconcilable” meant that there must be some great injury given to another party that would not be reconciled.

Mr. S. W. BROOKS: Not necessarily.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: How about the dynamiters?

Mr. MOREHEAD said he knew nothing about dynamiters. Probably the junior member for Cook knew something about them. He did not know to whom the term “dynamiters” could be applied in that Committee. As he said last night, he had always represented what was now a Southern constituency, and speaking as a representative of the South and for the Opposition, he could say that all they desired was to live in peace with the northern portion of the colony, and to attain that by giving what he believed was substantial justice to the inhabitants of that portion of the colony. Nothing more had been asked by hon. members representing the northern portion of the colony. They were perfectly entitled to four members, and to give them three would be to give them less than they were entitled to.

The PREMIER: You forget that they have four already.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he forgot nothing; his memory was just as good as the hon. member's. The hon. member was in the habit of imputing either ignorance or blindness to members on the Opposition side. He did not know whether he was ignorant or blind; he could possibly see quite as far as the hon. member who led the Government, and he thought he knew the wants of the colony quite as well. He was a native of Australia. The hon. member, when it suited him, panned out—to use an expression which he thought might very well be used now they were dealing with a mining constituency—as an Australian, and when it suited him he panned out as a Welshman. In that particular line he imitated the gentleman he professed to have such a contempt for, that was Mr. Gladstone.

The PREMIER: I never expressed contempt for Mr. Gladstone.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he was perhaps wrong in saying that the Premier professed to have a contempt for Mr. Gladstone; but he professed a contempt for that gentleman's views on the question of Home Rule. He had not the least doubt that the hon. member while at home fell in with the party opposed

to separation, men whose opinions squared with those held by the hon. member himself; and who were disinclined to grant separation to the northern portion of the colony because it might not have suited at that particular time, considering that the Home Rule question was then—and still was—of paramount importance in Great Britain. That might have led the hon. member to express the opinion he did during that interview with a newspaper correspondent with regard to Mr. Gladstone's conduct in reference to that particular phase of British politics. In that, however, he had not the sympathy of his colleague, the junior member for North Brisbane, whose opinions with regard to Home Rule were well known. That hon. member, they were told, stood on a public platform and embraced, or almost embraced, one of the strongest Home Rulers in the city of Brisbane; and if he was prepared at a distance of 12,000 or 14,000 miles to do justice to another portion of the British Empire, still more ought he to be prepared to give—he would not say home rule—sufficient representation to the North. He therefore thought he might fairly claim the vote of the junior member for North Brisbane, and he did not see how the hon. member could get out of it.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: Why did you not support additional members for the Burke last night?

Mr. MOREHEAD said he had all through supported additional members for the North; he had never swerved from that course.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: You have done it in a very half-hearted way. That is all I can say.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MOREHEAD said he did not do as the junior member for Cook, Mr. Hill, did—run like a bull at a gate; he did not attack both sides; he did not abuse both friends and foes—he avoided doing that.

The PREMIER: Only your foes.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he was simply using the word “foe” in a political sense. The junior member for Cook might be described by the algebraical letter x —he was an unknown quantity—one did not know what he was going to do. He certainly had shown that he did not care one straw what he did or said, and as long as he hurt the feelings of somebody he was perfectly happy. He was like one of those Malays, under the influence of “bang,” running amuck. He did not care what harm he might do to anyone, but was perfectly satisfied so long as the harm was done—his object was achieved, and he was perfectly happy till he wanted to injure someone else. He would ask the Premier whether, after all the arguments and facts adduced, he could not see his way clearly and logically to give three members to the northern portion of the colony. As he had said before, and repeated now, they should do all they could to cement the colony together. The Committee should take no action which would help to bring about separation, and as such an overwhelmingly good case had been made out by the members for the North why that additional representation should be given, he thought it was the duty of the Committee to grant it. That would satisfy the North, notwithstanding that the Premier had said that the North would never be satisfied. He himself wondered the North had remained quiet so long, seeing the greatest development of the colony, in spite of any figures which might have been brought forward by the Premier, had been in the North. As a business man he knew that to be so. He could see, day by day, the enormous increase of trade and population in the northern portion

of the colony, and those were things they must take into account when legislating—the Premier said for ten years, but he (Mr. Morehead) joined with the hon. member for Townsville in thinking it would only be five years—for the redistribution of seats. He held with the hon. member for Townsville that a complete case had been made out for the four additional members; and by the Premier's own showing, as was clearly pointed out last night, the addition of 5,000 or 6,000 to the population of the North at Croydon gave them a claim to the four members asked for. After the hon. member for Townsville had said they were prepared to accept three, he thought it was only a measure of justice which the Premier might very easily and gracefully grant, and that he should accede to the request. He did hope that in the continuance of the debate the Premier would refrain from using the language and applying the epithets he had to the hon. members representing the northern portion of the colony. Up to the present, at any rate, they were a portion of the body politic, and he would ask the Premier in all seriousness to consider whether the mode of argument he had adopted was likely to lead to that result which the hon. member asserted he wished to see—that was, that the colony should remain intact, and that no separation should take place.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he was as anxious as possible to see the balance of power more equally extended to the Northern division of the colony; and he did not fall in with a Bill which would provide seven additional members for the Southern districts while there were only six additional to be given to the Central and Northern divisions. He did not consider it exactly a fair thing that everything should be sacrificed to a population basis, and that the vast extent of territory and immense resources of the North should not be taken into consideration in the question of additional representation. He could not allow that matter to pass over without making reference to the leader of the Opposition, and the way in which the hon. gentleman got up at the eleventh hour and pretended that he was advocating the claims of the North, when on the previous evening he had hardly a word to say in favour of them, but rather threw cold water on their efforts.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No, no!

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said the Northern members were anxious to get four members for Burke, and he was very much disappointed, as he expected that they would have had more assistance from the leader of the Opposition. It was on account of seeing that very little help was to be expected from that quarter that they ultimately thought they had better take what they could get. They came to the conclusion that they would have to be content with four members for Burke, even at the probable sacrifice of only getting three members for the Cook electorate, because they saw very little support coming to them from the Opposition, and there was an overwhelming voting power against them in the Committee. He did his little best, and he certainly considered that the Cook was fully entitled to four members, and he hoped the leader of the Opposition and the members of the Opposition also would assist them in their endeavours to get that number. If they did not, and the Northern members had simply to fight the battle out on their own account, there was very little chance of their getting what he considered was really fair and just. As he had said before, the Cook district was one of the most progressive in the colony, and from its distance from the capital, from its revenue, and from the disabilities under which the people laboured, it was entitled

to what he might term extraordinary representation. At Cairns, for instance, 1,000 new names had been added to the electoral roll within the past few days.

The PREMIER: How do you know?

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: I have it on very good authority that 1,000 additional names were placed on the roll within the last few days.

The PREMIER: I do not believe it.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he quite believed it; he knew that numbers of people had gone there lately; he knew that there had been a rush to Mossman and the Daintree by Port Douglas. Very rich tin discoveries had been made there, though how long they would last he did not know. He had read telegrams to the Committee the previous evening which showed that, according to the steamer returns, the population of Cooktown had increased by 1,300 adult males since the census. The Northern districts were forging ahead fast, and his whole endeavour was to get fair representation for them, as compared with the southern divisions of the colony.

Mr. PALMER said he would like to disabuse the minds of members of the Committee with regard to any impression which the speech of the last member who spoke might have produced with respect to the action of the leader of the Opposition. He did not say that any great impression had been made, but possibly there might have been some impression made on the minds of one or two members with regard to the position held by the leader of the Opposition on the question now before the Committee. The whole of the members on his side quite understood that the leader of the Opposition was perfectly in sympathy, in full accord, with them in their attempts to get additional representation for the North. If the junior member for Cook was not in a similar position, he (Mr. Palmer) supposed that happened because he was not in accord with anybody in the Committee. With regard to the statement that the leader of the Opposition had not spoken on the previous evening—

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: I did not say he had not spoken.

Mr. PALMER said the real fact was that nobody had a chance to speak except the member for Cook. That hon. member occupied the whole evening. Two or three times he (Mr. Palmer) wished to say a few words with regard to some figures quoted by the Premier, but he had to give up, as the hon. member allowed him no chance to speak. The leader of the Opposition thoroughly sympathised with the Northern members, and made a very able speech last night in favour of their attempt to secure increased representation. So that the junior member for Cook should not say that the hon. gentleman had only pretended at the eleventh hour, and turned round to assist them. He had assisted them all the time. There was another member for the North whom they had not yet heard. He (Mr. Palmer) would like to hear the junior member for Charters Towers.

The PREMIER: I have not seen him lately.

Mr. PALMER: He is alongside of you.

The PREMIER: He is not the junior member for Charters Towers.

Mr. PALMER: Well, the senior member for Kennedy, the Attorney-General, if the Premier desired to be so precise. He (Mr. Palmer) could not put things as precisely as the hon. gentleman would like. They had not yet heard the Attorney-General, and he would very much like to hear how he sympathised with the North in that matter, because the hon. gentleman represented a mining constituency, and they were now endeavouring to get proper representation for

a mining community. Very likely the hon. gentleman would throw a little light on the subject. At any rate, he (Mr. Palmer) was quite certain that the member for Kennedy would vote with the North when the question came to that point. With regard to the suggestion made by the Premier that evening, with respect to the division of Burke, as far as his (Mr. Palmer's) knowledge of the locality went it seemed to him a very suitable division. If the hon. gentleman could define the boundaries between what he was going to call Flinders and Carpentaria, it would suit the position of affairs and the way in which trade was carried on in that district. The junction of Croydon and the Etheridge in one mining electorate would also be very acceptable and suitable to the miners in those places. So far, therefore, as that went, there was no further contention. He would, however, say that he did not think the Premier was justified in what he had said respecting the member for Townsville when he stated that the speech of the hon. member was evidently intended to stir up strife. The speech of the hon. member for Townsville was simply a refutation of the figures given by the Premier on the previous evening. He (Mr. Palmer) thought that the hon. member made rather a conciliatory speech in answer to that made by the Premier on the previous evening. He would ask hon. members to recollect the tone of voice in which the Premier spoke; it was certainly not one calculated to make peace. There was no need, as he had said, of any further contention with regard to the Burke electorates, as they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Premier.

Mr. HAMILTON said that the manner in which the Northern members had received the present concession of the Premier indicated that they were not what the hon. gentleman had styled them—"irreconcilables." He (Mr. Hamilton) would not take up the time of the Committee by referring any more to the present motion, seeing that they had agreed to accept the Premier's proposition with regard to that particular electorate. But he must say that the statements made by his colleague, Mr. Lumley Hill, with regard to the leader of the Opposition, were not endorsed by the other Northern members. They were very grateful to the leader of the Opposition for the support he gave them the previous evening. Had his colleague the capacity to support them as thoroughly and effectively as the leader of the Opposition, probably they might have been more successful than they had been. Certainly the leader of the Opposition did not take up such a length of time as his (Mr. Hamilton's) colleague, Mr. Hill, did, as that hon. member was jumping up like a jack-in-the-box the whole evening. As a matter of fact it was generally considered by members on both sides of the Committee that the hon. member, Mr. Hill's, advocacy of a case was sufficient in itself to damn it.

Mr. GOVETT said he had listened attentively on the previous night to the way in which the Northern members had placed before the Committee the requirements of the North. With regard to the statements made about Croydon, he could fully endorse them, and he thought they were placed before the Committee in a most moderate way, both as to the requirements of Croydon as a goldfield and as to its prospects and population. He thought the hon. member for Townsville especially had spoken very moderately. He (Mr. Govett) had been at Croydon for the last two months making it his business to ascertain as much information as possible of the field. A great deal had been said as to the prospect of the field being permanent, and his opinion was that

it would be a very great field for the next twenty years. At any rate, whether it was permanent or not, before it had been proved that it was not permanent, there would have been many millions of money taken out of it. He felt convinced of that. He went there for the purpose of putting up machinery, and of course it was his business to make himself acquainted with the reefs that were likely to turn out well. He had done so to his own satisfaction, but the field was so extensive that one might be there for twelve months, and then have a great deal to learn about it. He approved of the suggestion made by the hon. member for Cook, Mr. Hill, that the Etheridge and Croydon Gold Fields should be thrown together as one electorate. That would meet the views of the Croydon miners thoroughly, and he had heard it expressed by them on the field that such would be a good arrangement. The district of Burke was a most important one. It was a large pastoral district, which required opening up very much indeed by the railway, and he trusted that the representative of Burke would insist upon the railway being carried out so as to open up the country. Now, he considered that the representation of the North was a question that should be dealt with very liberally by the Southern members, because it was such a remote part of the colony. The requirements of the North were not known down here by the Southern members. Of that he was certain. He had never been in the Northern district until recently, and he did not know as much about it as perhaps he ought to know. He thought the Premier might well grant three members instead of the two now proposed. The Croydon Gold Field was a most wonderful place, and Southern members going to it would be surprised to find well laid-out streets, large shops with thousands of pounds' worth of stock in them, large plate-glass windows in the shops, and numbers of two-storied buildings of a most permanent character, built of wood and iron. He believed that Croydon would become one of the most important places in Queensland. Although Croydon itself was about fifteen by twenty miles in extent, yet only fifty miles further towards the Etheridge there was another place which he believed would shortly break out, and which would be equal to Croydon itself. It was the opinion of practical miners that an enormous field would break out only fifty miles further on towards the Etheridge; so that he thought that the suggestion to combine the Etheridge and Croydon, and to give them two members, was a very good one indeed.

Mr. SMYTH said before the debate closed he wished to say a few words about the Gympie Gold Field, and the statement made by the senior member for Cook, Mr. Hamilton. The hon. member made a slight mistake when he said that no greater depth than 600 feet had been reached on Gympie. He had in his hand a paper which showed that reefing had been carried down 820 feet below the surface, and gold had been found in the third bed of slate. Those who had read the hon. member's statement in *Hansard* might have been misled by it, so that he took that opportunity of correcting it.

Mr. HAMILTON said what he had said was that the greatest depth in which gold had been found on Gympie was 680 feet, and he thought that was the information which he had received from the hon. member (Mr. Smyth) yesterday afternoon. He might have misunderstood the hon. member, but if they had reached a greater depth he was very glad to hear it.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he should like to say a few words to put himself right with members of the Committee. It appeared that after all his suggestion had been accepted unanimously

that Croydon and the Etheridge should be made to return two members. With regard to what fell from the member for Burke, Mr. Palmer, about his taking up the whole of the time of the evening, and not giving anyone else a chance, he must say that he was surprised that the hon. member, who was the person most directly concerned, should have had what he might call a "shunt," and have left the manipulation of his district to the member for Townsville, Mr. Macrossan, who posed now as a very pure patriot, solely interested in the North, and who, it appeared to him (Mr. Hill), was going to arrange everything for his own edification. He did not himself believe in submitting to the lead or dictation of the member for Townsville. He did not believe the hon. member was animated by those purely patriotic motives which he aired with his Hibernian eloquence to the Committee. He did not believe it. He distrusted the hon. member, and, therefore, he was not going to submit—

Mr. MURPHY said he rose to a point of order. It was contrary to the rules of the House to attribute motives to any member.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not notice that the hon. member attributed motives.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he had only called the hon. member a patriot. He was very glad to see another Hibernian coming to the rescue of the much maligned member for Townsville. He was not aware that he imputed motives to the hon. member, and if he did they were good motives. They had done the best they could for the Burke district, and he hoped when they got to the Cook district it would receive the same consideration as Burke had received at the hands of the Committee.

Amendment—"Burke, two members"—agreed to.

The PREMIER said he believed some members wished to say something about the dividing line between the Burnett and Burrum; but before that was done he had something to say about Chinchilla.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he understood it was the hon. gentleman's intention to take the electorates in groups. It would be far more convenient to do so. It would be far more convenient to finish now with the Northern group than to go on to the Burnett and Burrum.

The PREMIER: I understand it will only take a few minutes.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said that once the debate was started it was impossible to say how long it would take. It might take hours. It would be better to finish with the Northern group by going to Cairns and amending the boundaries there, and then they could get to Cook.

The PREMIER said they could not amend the boundaries when they got to Cairns, but they could see what amendments it was proposed to make. The only difficulty about the suggestion was that it would be somewhat irregular to go back to an earlier part of the clause. If, however, the Committee would waive that rule it would be very convenient to go back for the purpose of discussion. He understood the question between Burnett and Burrum was merely one of boundaries, and would not take long to discuss. He was going now to interpose by proposing that the words "Chinchilla, one member" be struck out. He would give briefly the reasons why he proposed to do that. Since last Thursday he had devoted considerable time to trying to arrange that group, and various trials had resulted in failure, as the population could not be equally distri-

buted. He could now, however, see an improved mode of division of the electorates which would leave the population of Darling Downs, including Dalby, almost the same as it appeared in the tables circulated to hon. members. There would be a difference of not more than 500 general population, and not more than about 250 adult males. They would be taken out of the Darling Downs group and put into the Western group. The Darling Downs would have about the same population as was proposed for eight members. By the changes he proposed, made almost entirely within the South-western pastoral group, they would get the Dalby electorate, having a total population of 3,701 and an adult male population of 965. Those figures might be capable of revision, because they were only that moment handed to him, but they could not be far out, for he had made the calculations roughly himself, and he found they were about the same. Then west of that there would be an electorate which he proposed to call Murilla. Chinchilla would not be in it any longer, so that they could not any longer retain that name. There was a Murilla Divisional Board, and their division was almost in the centre of the new district, so that Murilla, a native word, would be a very good name for it. It would be a purely pastoral electorate with a population of 2,014 general and an adult male population of 1,048. That arrangement would, of course, necessitate changes in the Balonne, Warrego, and Bulloo. For Balonne the general population would then be 2,856, and the adult male population 1,261; Warrego, total population about 2,400, and a little under 1,300 adult males; and Bulloo would have a total population of about 1,500, and an adult male population of about 1,000. That, he believed, would be a very fair division of that part of the colony and would leave the Darling Downs group practically the same as proposed by the Bill. He proposed now, therefore, to leave out the words "Chinchilla, one member," with a view of proposing afterwards "Murilla, one member." Of course maps showing the corrected boundaries and corrected tables would be circulated when they could be got ready.

Question—That the words "Chinchilla, one member" stand part of the clause—put and negatived.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he wished to move an amendment on the line "Cook, one member." He would move that the words "one member" be omitted, with a view of inserting the words "two members," and he would give his reasons for doing so. As the Cook stood at present in the schedules it had a total population of 3,997, according to the census return, and an adult male population of 2,002. That included Thursday Island and the fishing stations. Since the census was taken there had been a large increase on the tinfields—in fact, Bloomfield and the tinfield on the Annan had almost sprang into existence since that time. If the hon. gentleman would refer to the census map of Cook subdivision 7 and 7A, which included both sides of the Bloomfield, he would find that the population of those places was at that time very small—180 in one and 90 in the other.

The PREMIER: Not so much.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: My information is taken from the census tables.

The PREMIER: That includes Chinese and aliens. The observation I made is in your favour.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said the figures he quoted included all. On the Bloomfield, near Weary Bay, there was a large sugar plantation, on which there were a good many kanakas and Malays, but very few Europeans. The chief

part of the population there was composed of non-Europeans. The adult males in that census subdivision numbered 175 and 141; total 280. Since that time he learned, from information he had received from that portion of the country, that there had been an increase of 600 European adult males, chiefly working miners.

Mr. HAMILTON : Eight hundred.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said the hon. member for Cook had obtained later information on the subject, but he had taken the lower number so as to avoid making any exaggerated statements. That brought up the population of Cook to 2,603 adult males. Again, upon the Annan, nearer to Cooktown, there was now a population of 300 or 400 tin-miners, and it was an increasing population too. Anyone who took the trouble to look at the exports from Cooktown would see from the amount of tin exported that there must be a very large population there.

The PREMIER : There were 400 there at the time of the census.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said that included the entire district—a very large one; the portion he was referring to now had scarcely any population at the time the census was taken. There had been an increase there of at least 300. That made an increase of 900 adult males to the population of Cook since the census was taken, bringing up the total number to 2,900, to say nothing of the increase of the gross population. He would say nothing of the undoubted increase that had taken place in other parts of the division. There had been an increase in other parts, he knew, and wherever they came from they were new arrivals. If they came from Herberton their places had been supplied, because Herberton showed no decrease of population. It was an actual increase to the population of that portion of the country. He would also suggest that in giving that additional member for Cook, the boundaries should be slightly altered so as to make it a better boundary, and one which would not divide identical interests. The present boundary, as shown on the map, was from Cape Tribulation by a straight line going from there to the range on the Bloomfield, throwing some of the miners there on to the Port Douglas side, and others on to the Cook side.

The PREMIER : That is not intended.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he knew it was not intended; it was a mistake. The boundary should be a creek about fifteen miles south of Cape Tribulation, following that creek up to the head of the range, then following that range and striking the present boundary at the head of the Bloomfield. That would leave the whole of the Bloomfield in Cook, and the whole of the mining interest there would be kept together. That was a reasonable proposition, and with the addition of one member he believed it would be acceptable to the Committee. Before sitting down he would refer briefly to one argument the Premier had made use of as to the increase of population in the Cook. The hon. gentleman took it on an average number per square mile. He would ask any man in the Committee who knew what the North was, if it was a reasonable thing to take the average per square mile, when the whole of that vast extent of country on the Cape York Peninsula, for tens of thousands of square miles, did not contain a single white man? And yet the hon. gentleman said "Your population is only so many per square mile," and then contrasted it with the population per square mile in the South which was thickly settled in many places, and spread over the whole of it. If the hon. gentleman took the settled portion of the North the discrepancy between the two would not be so very great. If

he took the country he was talking of last night, between Herberton and Georgetown, he might go over hundreds of miles of it and scarcely see a living thing.

The PREMIER : There are plenty of similar places in the South.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he hoped the Premier would see his way to accept his proposition. He had no desire to prolong the debate in any way. He wished to see the Bill carried through. In accepting the compromise suggested last night by the leader of the Opposition, the Northern members thought they were going a great length, and he was certain that whatever hon. members on the other side might think, they were entitled to a much larger representation than they were asking for by accepting the compromise. The hon. gentleman several times that day, and several times last evening, made the assertion that they were getting four additional members now by the Bill, and two more which he was willing to give—making, in all, six. And yet, he said, the Northern members were not satisfied, although they got two additional members last year, bringing their number up to double what it was before. All that was admitted. But surely a man who owed £1 could not expect his creditors to be satisfied with 15s. or 16s. in £1 because he paid it in instalments. The hon. gentleman might as well argue in that way—"I have paid you 12s. this year, and 4s. last year, and you are not satisfied; you still want 20s." The Northern members certainly did want their 20s., but although they wanted it they had made up their minds to accept 18s. If the hon. gentleman was willing to pay that amount of his debt they would accept it, and give him an acquittance for it. As he had stated, he had no desire to prolong the debate. Therefore he should leave it with the hon. gentleman to say what the Government meant to do in that matter. As for himself he hoped they would give the additional member he asked for. He knew that if they got that member they should, although not perfectly satisfied, do their best to be contented until the next redistribution took place.

The PREMIER said he wished, before dealing with the amendment of the hon. member, to refer to one or two other matters. The hon. member had said that he (the Premier) had no right to refer to the increase of population per square mile. Of course the increase per square mile was not a perfect basis of comparison, but it was a very good test of the proportionate rate of increase in two divisions of the colony, the areas of which were not very dissimilar. If they took one-third off the area of the North for Cape York Peninsula, still the result would be that the proportionate increase in the South doubled that of the North per square mile. That was one basis of comparison. With respect to the boundaries in the schedule, a good many mistakes had crept in which it was proposed to amend by substituting a corrected list of the boundaries. The boundary of the electorate as described in the schedule began "at a point due east from Cape Tribulation, and bounded thence by a line westerly to that cape; thence by the range forming the northern watershed of the Daintree River." The boundary the hon. gentleman suggested was north of that.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN : South of Cape Tribulation. The boundary from Cape Tribulation makes a straight line.

The PREMIER said, on the map it did, but perhaps the range did not come down to Cape Tribulation. Those were small details that could easily be adjusted, and he should be very

glad if hon. members would assist him with their local knowledge upon those matters. It was intended that all the tin-miners on the watershed of the Bloomfield should be in the Cook district. Now, with regard to the increase of population, where did all those miners come from?

Mr. HAMILTON: From the South; fifty and sixty every steamer.

The PREMIER said that the contention of the hon. member was too absurd. He said that there was no one on the Annan and that district at the time of the census. The population on the Annan and the heads of the Endeavour—what might be called the country round about Cooktown—at the time of the census was 395.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: I said on the tinfield.

Mr. HAMILTON: About twenty at that time.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: There are settlers—a great many—on the Endeavour.

The PREMIER said the number of white people—of course they were only dealing with white people—on the Bloomfield was 191, and adult males 136. That was the population on the Bloomfield tin-mines, except a few people on the sugar plantation. The hon. member asked seriously that an additional member should be given to that district, because there was a rush to the Bloomfield tin-mines. That was what his argument amounted to. The hon. member had previously distinguished between alluvial mining and reef mining, but now that distinction was cast to the wind. The hon. member considered the population on an alluvial goldfield so uncertain a test that they should not be justified in giving representation in respect of it; but because in this case it was an alluvial tinfield—because there was a temporary influx of people there—although their information did not correspond in regard to numbers—he contended that it should get another member. It was not very long since there was a rush to a tinfield near Ingham, over the range, and there were about 500 or 600 miners there. How many of them were there now? They had nearly all gone even before the census was taken. An alluvial tinfield was just as uncertain a thing with regard to population as an alluvial goldfield.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: Do you mean Kangaroo Hills?

The PREMIER: Yes.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: There were never many people there.

The PREMIER said according to the official information he received there were at least 400 or 500, and they had asked for a clerk of petty sessions and all sorts of things. What the hon. member wanted additional representation for was merely a rush to an alluvial tinfield. It was perfectly well known that a great many miners had gone there from the Herberton tinfields, and would very likely go back again. He was certain that in passing an Electoral Districts Bill they were not justified in taking into consideration the population of an alluvial tin or an alluvial gold field. There might yet be another alluvial goldfield in the Cook district, and he would very much like to see a large one there. When a member was first given to that electorate there were 11,000 people there, and yet it was not proposed to give them more than one member. Three years later, when the population had increased, when the Hodgkinson and the fields round about it had been discovered, and Cairns had become settled, it was thought time to give it two

members, but they were not justified in dealing with a fluctuating population, or a rush of tin-miners to any part of the colony, as a basis on which to readjust the representation. He could not, therefore, accept the amendment of the hon. member. There was another matter he should like to refer to, to which the hon. gentleman had not referred—that was the population of Thursday Island. The population of Thursday Island was 552, and the adult males 373; but the majority of them were generally at sea, and were not likely to vote. He supposed there were only about forty probable voters there.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: More than that.

The PREMIER said there were not more than forty, and he did not think Thursday Island should be taken seriously into consideration. In fact, he had had some doubt as to whether it ought to be included in the electorate at all, only it seemed wrong that any part of the colony should not be included in some electorate, and there was no other place it could be tacked on to. The people were chiefly pearl-fishers, who had some little connection with Cooktown—some of them a good deal, as they hailed from Cooktown—but, as he said, he did not think they should be seriously taken into consideration. He could not see his way to accede to the amendment. It would, of course, be necessary to revise the Cairns boundaries.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he did not clearly understand from the Premier whether he proposed to include Thursday Island in the Cook electorate or not—it was not in the schedule of the Bill.

The PREMIER: Yes, it is. It is within the boundaries of the colony, which go very nearly to New Guinea.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he certainly intended to suggest that if Thursday Island and the islands in the vicinity were included in the Cook district it would be entitled to two members. He had been under the impression that the 373 adult males, who appeared in the census, were people living on the island at the time the census was taken. He had been at Thursday Island two or three times—he was there about six months ago—and it certainly appeared to him to be a very prosperous, thriving place. From a report made by the Government Resident, which had just been laid on the table of the House, he saw that the revenue there for last year was about £10,000. The pearl-shell and bêche-de-mer were certainly industries well worth looking after and protecting, and the best way would have been to give a representative to the islands as a group and another to the Cook district, for certainly their interests as toilers of the deep were not in any way co-operative with the people who were resident on the mainland. The population of the Cook district, in part, were sinking in the earth, and those people were sinking in the water. It was an important industry, and it had the claim of being about the farthest away of any from the seat of government.

Mr. BULCOCK: Are they white people?

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said a great many of them were white people. Some of the ignorant representatives of the Metropolitan group wished to know whether they were white people. If they had been round last year in the "Lucinda" when she was at Thursday Island, and had seen the entertainment provided, and the number of really white gentlemen there were there, they would abstain from asking such foolish questions.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Was that at the expense of the State?

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said it was ; and he wished a few more members could be induced to take those trips.

Mr. MOREHEAD : On the same conditions ?

Mr. LUMLEY HILL : Yes, even on the same conditions. It would be very good for the colony if some of the Brisbane representatives could be deported at the expense of the State, and sent to travel round to learn what was wanted in the various localities. It would do the hon. member for Enoggera, Mr. Bulcock, a good deal of good, open his eyes, and perhaps enable him to drop his winkers, and allow him to see a little further ahead. There were a great many white men engaged in the pearl-shell and bêche-de-mer industry, and there was a good deal of money embarked in it. If it were fostered it would make considerable progress. If the people there were given representation, and a local man could be induced to come forward, it would add very much to the prosperity and progress of the colony as a whole. That was why he wanted to see the North thoroughly represented—in order that hon. members might know what they had to legislate about, as they did not in a great many cases.

Mr. HAMILTON said the Premier had stated yesterday that the Northern members would be dissatisfied, no matter what request was granted. Well, they would be satisfied now if they got another member; that was all they were asking for now. The other day the Premier had virtually admitted that Cook was entitled to another member; but now it seemed that Cook was to be punished because Croydon had an additional member. He (Mr. Hamilton) could not see how, if Croydon had half-a-dozen members, that could alter the representation Cook was entitled to. It appeared that the Premier was afraid to allow the North to have a greater proportion of representation than he had already decided. Of course, the Premier wished to make out that the Government had been very generous—had been angels, unawares, to the North—in giving them four additional members; but additional members had also been given to the South, so that the North had not actually a greater proportion. If four additional members had been given to the North and none to the South they would have been satisfied. The Premier had spoken of the Bloomfield mines. The hon. gentleman was always depreciating the mines—tin, gold, or whatever they were—and saying that the mining population was not entitled to the same representation as agricultural and other districts, saying he considered that they would not be permanent—that there were no lodes. He (Mr. Hamilton) had been informed by a gentleman lately arrived from there, that there were lodes. The principal work, he believed, was alluvial, but there was an immense amount of country being developed. Then, when there was a great increase of population in any part of the North the Premier always stated that it came from another portion of the North. Now, surely those who resided in the North knew where the increase came from. They had only to go to the wharves and see the steamers going away every day laden with miners, and see them coming down again half empty, to satisfy themselves that the increase was from the South. He had received a telegram from Mr. Fowler, the editor of the *Cooktown Independent*, a strong supporter of the present Government, and a gentleman on whose word he could rely, who told him that on comparing the exit from Cooktown with the incomers he found an increase of 2,031. He had received letters also from the mayor of the town, from the secretary of the Progress Association,

and from the editor of the other paper, and they all agreed as to the increase in the population, and as to where it came from. There was no foundation for the statement that the miners on the Bloomfield came from the Herberton. Those places were gradually and surely increasing, but not increasing in the same ratio as Bloomfield. In regard to that the Premier went against his own census returns. He understood the Premier to say that the population in Bloomfield at that particular portion where the miners were now consisted of 135 white males. The present workings of the Bloomfield were in census district subdivision No. 7, and the total number of adult males, including Chinese and Polynesians, when the census was taken, was 135. But now in that district there were between 800 and 900 white adult males, independent of Chinese and Polynesians. That increase had taken place since the last census. In fact, the field had been opened since the census, and he could hardly see how miners could be working on a field before it was discovered. At Cooktown the adult white population, according to the census, was 2,002, and since that, it had increased, according to the Working Men's Progress Association, by 1,500, which would give one member for every 1,751 adult white males. In the whole of the Darling Downs group he noticed the average was 1,063 adult males to one member; and if the Darling Downs group, which was within a few hours of Brisbane, should have one member for every 1,063 adult males, he certainly thought that Cook district, which was the most remote in the colony from the seat of government, was entitled to one member for 1,751 adult white males, especially when they recollected that according to the census returns the increase in the North, even before the very large increase which had taken place within the last few weeks, was far greater than on the Downs. The census returns proved that on the Downs the increase from the year 1881 to the year 1886 was 12 per cent., and that the increase in the Northern division during the same period was 40 per cent. Now, the general white population in the new Cook electorate at the time the census was taken was 3,997, and since that time, according to the authorities he had referred to, it had increased by 2,031, giving a total white population of 6,028, or 3,014, to each of two members. In many electorates in the southern part of the colonies there were only from 2,000 to 2,500 total population, men, women, and children, which had one member to represent them. If they were given that amount of representation in the South, the North were surely entitled to two members for a population of 6,028—namely, one member for each 3,014 white residents. Of course, he was not including Chinese or Polynesians. If they took them in, and added the population of Somerset and Thursday Island, there would be a total population of 9,134. In the Southern divisions it had been stated that the basis of representation should be general population. He could see why adults, men and women, should be considered; but he could not see why children of three and four months old should have a voice in the representation.

Mr. MOREHEAD : They have a considerable voice in it.

Mr. BULCOCK : You are a bachelor.

Mr. HAMILTON said he did not see why they should be included in the representation. It had been argued that they should be, because they consumed dutiable articles, and shared in the taxation, but if they were entitled to it on those grounds then Chinese and Polynesians ought also to be considered. If the possession of children entitled one to additional representation on those grounds, then those who had kanakas

or Chinese servants, all of whom were taxed, ought to have greater representation. But, independent of that, according to the last reliable returns the male adult population of the new Cook electorate was 3,502, and the general population was 6,028, and on either basis it was certainly entitled to two members.

Mr. MOREHEAD said as this was a question which was intimately connected with the Northern division of the colony, he assumed that every member who represented a Northern constituency would give his views in the matter. He thought every member had expressed his opinion with the exception of the hon. Attorney-General. They might get some information from him probably as to how his constituency or the Northern group of electorates would be affected by the proposition of the Government. Of course his remarks would be all the more important, as he was a member of the Government. He was sure the hon. gentleman would not shrink from the responsibility of undertaking such an explanation or justification.

Mr. BULCOCK said he had been somewhat amused while listening to the members for the North. The Northern people had twice the representation of the South. One hon. member said the Southern districts should have no representation at all, because they were near the metropolis. The population of the Northern group was 48,679, and sixteen members were proposed to be given to them, which was an average of 3,042 total population to each. The population of the Metropolitan and East Moreton groups was 96,373, and sixteen members were proposed to be given to them, which made an average of 6,023 to each. Yet the North was not satisfied. They had twice the representation of the South. Of course there was the argument that the North was increasing; but parts of the North were decreasing, and the South was in some parts also increasing. The Premier that afternoon had mentioned that in South Brisbane and Woollongabba there had been an increase of 613 houses, and reckoning five persons to each house, that was an increase of 3,065 persons. Three members were allowed for South Brisbane and Woollongabba, which would make an average of one member to 8,093 of the general population. Yet that was called too much representation for the South, when the North had one member for 3,042 of the general population.

Mr. BLACK said the hon. member had endeavoured to make the most of his case by taking the total population as a basis.

Mr. BULCOCK: That is the proper one.

Mr. BLACK said that was a matter of opinion. It was rather ingenious, and, unless dissented from, would be very misleading. The Premier himself had not taken the total population as the only basis, but admitted that the adult male population had considerable weight—which was only right. In addition to that the Northern members contended that revenue contributions should also be taken into consideration. He did not think it was quite fair of the hon. member to make the deduction he had just made on the sole basis of total population. As one of the Northern members, he did not wish to have any undue advantage over any other part of the colony; he only asked that when such a measure was being dealt with—a measure which he hoped would beneficially affect the relations between the different parts of the colony—any inequalities of representation should, if possible, be remedied. The Northern members did not wish to obtain any undue preponderance, and it was immaterial to him what Northern members had been given heretofore. No doubt the concessions were only made after considerable remonstrance

on the part of Northern members; and when two additional members were given to the North some time ago, the southern portion of the colony also received two additional members, so that the balance of power was left pretty much as it was before. Again, when four additional members were added to the other Chamber the whole of them were taken from the southern part of the colony; so that no attempt was made to remedy the inequality of representation on that occasion. And the same principle was being followed now—the preponderance had been increased in a greater proportion in the southern and central portions of the colony.

Mr. BULCOCK: What about the population?

Mr. BLACK said he would not say that the hon. member was not justified in taking the total population as a basis on which to ground his arguments, but Northern members looked at it from a different point of view, and he contended that they had a right to make the deduction they had made. They did not take the total population as the sole basis; they allowed a certain quota for that basis, and a certain quota for the adult male population, and they claimed another quota for the very large revenue being derived every year, for many years past, from that part of the colony. If the North only contributed 25 per cent. to the general revenue—which had not been disputed—they contended that should also be one reason why the North was entitled certainly to equal consideration with the other divisions of the colony.

The PREMIER: It has been disputed every time the statement has been made.

Mr. BLACK said the hon. member knew it was true, and it had been proved over and over again.

The PREMIER: The figures are the other way.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: They are not the other way.

Mr. BLACK said the hon. member had misquoted the figures in the report he handed to Sir Henry Holland at home, and if the hon. member denied that, he would be prepared to meet him on that ground if he liked. He only contended for representation equal to that which was given to other parts of the colony. In the analysis he had made he had left out entirely the question of Croydon with its undoubtedly large population, because it was very likely that a considerable proportion of that population had gone from other parts of the North; but if a considerable proportion consisted of new arrivals from other colonies, the position taken up by Northern members would be very materially strengthened. They were willing to accept seventeen members for the Northern division of the colony, but he contended they were entitled to eighteen if they got anything like that justice which should be accorded to the Northern division. The Central division had one member for every 1,165 adult males; the Southern pastoral and Darling Downs group together had one member for every 1,125 adult males; and in the event of the North getting seventeen members, it would have one member for every 1,152 adult males. Was there anything unreasonable in asking, not for an excess of representation over that of the Central division, but for representation on the same adult male basis as that of the Darling Downs and Southern pastoral group together? As he said before, he left out entirely the known large population on the Croydon. He would assume, for the sake of argument, that the population there would not be permanent, though the balance of evidence was decidedly in favour of there being not only a permanent population, but of an enormously increasing

population on that field. In addition to the population basis, which alone was a justification for asking for seventeen members for the North, there was the very heavy contribution to the revenue per head of population in the North; so that he hoped the Premier would see the justice of the request that the Northern division should have seventeen members, because under-representation had really been one of the most serious grievances under which the North had been labouring in the past. Hon. members knew the stand he had always taken upon the question of the grievances the North had suffered for a long time, and he said now that if the reasonable concession asked for were given to the North it would go a very long way to remove those grievances. And he appealed to hon. members on both sides, if they wished to see the affairs of that magnificent colony carried on successfully, if they wished to see the colony made one large powerful important colony, now that the opportunity was offered to them—not to do greater justice to the Northern division than was being conceded to the Southern divisions, but the same measure of justice, on the same basis and for the reasons he had pointed out, as they were prepared to concede to the Southern and Central divisions. They asked for no favour, but they did claim that the Committee should give the North that right which had undoubtedly been denied it for several years past.

Mr. BULCOCK said he supposed the hon. gentleman who had just sat down would admit that there were some Customs returns from the Southern division of the colony on account of goods consumed by women and children. All the goods that paid duty were not consumed in the North; so that the South was at least on an equality with the North in that respect. With regard to the adult male population of the North as a whole, and the Metropolitan and East Moreton groups of electorates, he would point out to the hon. members that the North would have one member for every 1,224 adult males, while the Metropolitan and East Moreton electorates would have one member for every 1,667, and South Brisbane, with the addition he had before mentioned, would have one for every 2,010. He, therefore, did not see that the North had any ground for complaint. It was very liberally and generously treated, and that everlasting nagging for an additional member was some proof to him of the truth of the Premier's statement that the Northern members would never be satisfied.

Mr. PHILP said he hoped the Committee would consent to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Townsville. It would really go a long way towards redressing the grievances of the Northern members.

The PREMIER: Oh!

Mr. PHILP: Let the hon. gentleman try it. The hon. member for Enoggera, Mr. Bulcock, was trying to draw a comparison between the metropolitan and Northern constituencies. That was a very unfair thing to do. They had heard the statement of the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, to which the junior member for Cook referred the other night, that in Great Britain and Ireland electorates at a distance from the capital returned more members than those which were nearer the seat of government. London, which had a population of over 4,000,000, which he believed was greater than Ireland, only returned one-half the number of members Ireland did. Ireland had 106 members, while London, according to the Premier, had forty-five, but according to the hon. member for Toowoomba, Mr. Groom, fifty-two. He (Mr. Philp) believed fifty-two was correct. If the Northern constituencies of the colony had double the number the metropolitan constituencies had, they would be quite satisfied.

The PREMIER: That is exactly what they do get.

Mr. MOREHEAD: No.

The PREMIER: It is, according to the population, as you can see from the tables.

Mr. PHILP said the metropolitan constituencies were getting sixteen members. The Committee knew that nearly every property owner in or near Brisbane had votes for all those constituencies. A man might live in Brisbane and have eight or nine votes. He remembered that last session a member of that Committee stated that a friend of his had seven votes for metropolitan constituencies. Brisbane was so situated that a man could live there and give his vote in nearly every electorate, even if the elections were all held on the same day. A person could not do that in the North. Even if he had eight votes he could not vote at Normanston, Croydon, and Burke; he could not afford to do it. In the electorate of Cook there were a number of persons who had never had representation—namely, the pearl-shellers of Thursday Island. He thought it would be an act of justice if the Committee gave them some representation, and paid a little of the interest they owed them at the present time. It would have been a good thing for the colony if Thursday Island had had some representation in times past. It would be in the minds of hon. members that last year they passed a Bill to amend the Pearl-shell Fisheries Act. No one in the House really knew anything about the subject, and he believed that if there had been members present who understood the matter—if Thursday Island had been represented in the House—there would have been effected a saving of hundreds of pounds annually to the colony. £80,000 worth of pearl-shell were exported annually from the colony; he had that on the authority of a gentleman representing the celebrated London jeweller, Mr. Streeter; he believed the quantity of pearls annually stolen amounted to the value of the pearl-shell exported. The pearls obtained in that way were easily sold by the divers to travellers going to and fro, and were sometimes disposed of at a hundredth part of their value. He believed that if Thursday Island had had representation in the House when the measure to which he referred was before them last session, they would have passed a law forbidding the selling of those pearls by divers at Thursday Island. The hon. member for Mackay had very ably shown that if the present tables were taken as the basis of representation, and the North only got seventeen members, they would simply be getting what they were entitled to, without taking into consideration any increase of population. According to the tables there were 19,589 adult males in the Northern division; that, divided by 17, would give 1,152 adult males for each member. They found that a member had been given to the Central district for 1,165 adult males, and that in the Darling Downs and Southern pastoral groups a member had been given for 1,150 males. Why not do that in the North, which was farther from the capital? In considering that question, it must be borne in mind that it was very difficult to get members to represent the North who could afford to spend the necessary time in Brisbane to attend to their parliamentary duties. He knew hon. members would say that a man had no right to be elected if he could not attend to his duties, but they wanted to have as representatives local men who knew something of their wants and requirements, and, as he had previously observed, it was very difficult to get men who could afford to come down to Brisbane and leave their business for four or six months in the year.

to attend the House. He thought the Committee might stretch a point in that case, give way gracefully, and accept the amendment of the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Macrossan. He knew that numbers of people were daily settling in the Cook electorate; at one part, about 300 miles north of Cooktown, there were men mining. He knew that no census collector went there last May twelve months, and he believed that the miners were not engaged there at that time. He knew another place, called Long Kelly Gold-mines, where there was a machine at work, employing twenty or thirty men; those men were not at work when the last census was taken. And there were 1,000 tin-miners at work in the electorate who were not there at the taking of the last census. When he was in Sydney two months ago, in one month nearly 200 tons of stream-tin was sent down from Cooktown, and that was valued at £10,000; and £10,000 divided amongst 1,000 men would give the excellent wages of £10 a month, and it must be remembered that those men paid heavy Customs taxes. The Premier had compared the increase in the Customs duties at all ports of the colony, and said that in some cases they were 17, 20, and 25 per cent. He would compare them for the quarter ended 30th September. At the port of Mackay for the last quarter the only increase of Customs revenue was £2,076. That showed that there had been greater consumption, for at the last census there was no crushing going on at Mackay, and consequently fewer hands employed. At Townsville there was an increase of £5,934; Normanton, £10,332; Cooktown, £1,275. That was the electorate for which they were now contending for another member. At Cairns the increase was £3,196; Thursday Island, £757. There was Bowen £410; making a total increase of £23,980. Against that there were the ports that had shown a decrease. Cardwell a decrease of £314, Port Douglas £176, Burketown £325, Dungeness £207; making a total decrease of £1,022, and a net increase of £22,962. The total increase for the quarter was £59,642, showing that the proportion of the increase of the North was 37½ per cent., or more than one-third of the total increase over the whole colony. £84,700 was collected in the Northern ports during the last quarter out of a total of £302,346, showing an increase of 28 per cent. of the gross collections, and that was not taking into consideration the amount of money collected in Brisbane. He was not prepared to say how much that was, but he knew that a considerable amount was collected there. Then let them look at the increase on railways. Of the Southern and Western Railways there were 755 miles open, and the increase from the 1st January to date was £15,939; of the Northern railways there were 231 miles open, with an increase of £17,592, showing that there must have been an increase in the population to produce such a result. Now, while they were talking the other night on the decentralisation scheme—the pet scheme of the Premier's—the hon. gentleman referred to the large number of consumers there were in the southern part of the colony of Northern products. Well, he could tell the hon. gentleman that there were no consumers in the southern part of the colony of Northern products. On the contrary, it was the North that consumed Southern products. What did the North produce? Wool, gold, tin, and sugar; but he could assure the Committee that there was more sugar produced south of Mackay than the whole colony used. Last year 25,000 tons of sugar were produced south of Rockhampton out of a total of 59,000 tons, and all the colony consumed in twelve months did not exceed

16,000 tons; so that really there was nothing produced by the North which the South consumed, or which the South did not produce in as great abundance. That, he thought, ought to be taken into consideration. They were consumers of Southern produce, and the South largely depended on the Northern prosperity for its market. Looking at the coal-mines of the South, the great bulk of the coal was used by steamers taking it in large quantities to the North, and it was used extensively on the Northern railways. During the last five years the total product of coal was more than doubled in the Ipswich district. The bulk, he repeated, was consumed by steamers going north. An hon. member had remarked that nearly all the steamers going north were all loaded, but they brought nothing back to Brisbane. They brought large quantities of sugar to Melbourne and Sydney, and large quantities of tin went south. The wool went home direct. So that the North did not supply anything to the South, and that point ought to be considered. The under-representation of the North had been a dispute of long standing between North and South, and an opportunity now occurred of remedying the grievance, for, as the hon. member for Mackay had stated, the real grievance was that the North was not fairly represented. They wanted at least seventeen members out of the total number.

The PREMIER: You want one more than the Government will give you, whatever that is.

Mr. PHILP said he could assure hon. members that when the Bill came before them, and before there were any new members provided for the South, the Northern members thought they were entitled to four more members. They had reduced their demand to three, notwithstanding that two additional members were given to the southern part of the colony, and he thought the Premier might now fairly give way on the question. They had only asked for a reasonable thing. They only asked for the same representation that the Central, Southern pastoral, and Darling Downs groups had got, and they asked for the same proportion as the Metropolitan group, compared with what those groups had in other colonies. In New South Wales one-third of the population was in Sydney, yet Sydney only had one-fifth of the representation. In Victoria more than one-third of the population was in Melbourne, yet it did not receive a third of the representation; and, as he stated before, in Great Britain, London had a larger population than the whole of Ireland, and they had only half the members. Look again at Scotland with a million less inhabitants than London, yet it returned 50 per cent. more representatives. He hoped members on the other side would really consider the question free from party feeling. For a long time the North had had a great grievance against the southern part of the colony, and the time had come when they might fairly be granted additional representation.

The PREMIER said he did not know that there was much more to add to what had been already said. What he had said just now he thought was right. The hon. member said the North wanted one more member, and he had replied that they wanted one more than the House would give, whatever that was.

Mr. MOREHEAD: You said one more than the Government would give.

The PREMIER said it amounted to about the same thing. A demand had been made to him for greater concessions to the North, and he said on behalf of the Government that they could not be granted. If the Government had conceded one more member, one more still would have been

wanted. When a man was determined to be dissatisfied nothing would satisfy him. He might illustrate the case in this way: A man came to him lately and asked him if he would sell a certain piece of land. He said, "Yes, if you will give me my price." He was asked for his price, and he said, "I want £1,000 more than you are prepared to give me." That was exactly the state of mind of the Northern members.

Mr. MOREHEAD said it was very gratifying to know that the Premier was in such a fine position personally as to be able to require £1,000 more than the capital value of his land; but that was not the question under consideration by the Committee. The hon. gentleman talked about a "concession" to the Northern members. He objected to that word "concession" being applied at all to the demands of the North. The North sought for no concession, but for what was right and just. He took it that the North did not go to the Government or to anyone else *in forma pauperis*, but asked for nothing but what they were entitled to; and consequently the word "concession" was inapplicable to their demand. They heard from the Premier that night that he would give the North as much as he liked, and they could either take it or leave it.

The PREMIER: I never made any such statement.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that was practically what the hon. gentleman had stated. They had got now a democrat tinged with imperialism, and the hon. gentleman had come out with the idea that he was going to rule the roast here and act the part of a shoddy autocrat. He did not think the members of that Committee would stand it. They might have an unjust measure rammed down their throats by a brute majority. With their present parliamentary representation they might not be able to prevent that. The Premier, in acting as he had done in not listening to the reasonable requests of the North, and in not giving due weight to the heavy arguments produced on that side by the hon. member for Townsville, the hon. member for Mackay, and the hon. member for Musgrave, Mr. Philp, who certainly made one of the most able speeches on the question which had been delivered in that Committee, had failed to give due consideration to them. He simply said he would do so and so, and that the Government would only give so much, irrespective of any arguments which might be brought forward on the Opposition side of the Committee.

The PREMIER: I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Then the hon. gentleman's words did not convey the meaning he intended them to convey. The hon. gentleman said "We will only give one member."

The PREMIER: I said nothing of the sort.

Mr. MOREHEAD said it was an unfortunate thing that the hon. gentleman revised his speeches so much, because he was satisfied that if the record was taken correctly then that would be found to be the hon. gentleman's statement.

The PREMIER: You will see it to-morrow.

Mr. MOREHEAD: We shall not see it to-morrow.

The PREMIER: You can see it to-morrow morning.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he could, and he would find it distinctly stated that the hon. gentleman said he would only give so much, and if the North would not take that they could go without any.

The PREMIER: When was that stated?

Mr. MOREHEAD: Now, within the last seven minutes.

The PREMIER: Shame!

Mr. MOREHEAD said the hon. gentleman cried "Shame!" and he could continue to cry "Shame!" It would not in any way affect him. The cries of "Shame!" and the interjections given utterance to by the Premier were more likely to cause the people of the colony to cry "Shame!" upon that hon. gentleman than upon him for anything he had said. He said distinctly that the Government held out the threat that that was all they would give. "Will give" were the words the hon. gentleman used.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: "They want one more than the Government will give."

Mr. MOREHEAD: Yes, that was what the hon. gentleman said. "One more than the Government will give," which meant that the Government had arrived at such a pitch of obstinacy that they would not listen to any argument or any contention set up by those who differed from themselves; that no matter what arguments were brought forward, no more members than the Government decided to give would be given. That was not the way in which to meet a question of that sort, and was certainly no answer to the arguments brought forward by the hon. member for Musgrave. To his mind, speaking as a Southern member, no more convincing speech had been made in the Committee than that made by the hon. member for Musgrave. It was not met by any argument, but simply by the assertion from the Premier that the Opposition side of the Committee "want one more member than the Government will give." He hoped he had now reported correctly the expression made use of by the Premier.

The PREMIER said he had never heard the hon. member for Balonne make a more unfair speech than he had just made, and he did not think anybody had ever heard a more unfair speech. He (the Premier) had said more than once that the North did not want any particular number of members—they did not want seventeen, eighteen, or sixteen members, or any particular number of members—but they wanted one more than they could get.

Mr. MOREHEAD: You said "One more than the Government will give."

The PREMIER said he had stated several times in the course of that debate—he would repeat what he said just now—that the Northern members did not want seventeen, or eighteen, or sixteen, or any particular number of members, but one more than they could get. He had said that a great many times.

Mr. MOREHEAD: No—"One more than the Government will give."

The PREMIER said he had made that statement a great many times—Would he be allowed to finish his sentence? When the hon. member for Musgrave, in speaking, said that the Northern members only wanted one more member, he interjected, "One more than the Government will give, whatever that is." Every hon. member of the Committee knew what he meant, and the attempt to turn it, as the hon. member for Balonne had done, was unworthy of that hon. gentleman's position. Hon. members on the other side had, one after another, been appealing to him to consent to the amendment, and were asking him continually for one more member. There was no use in pretending not to know the meaning of words; he could not consent to the amendment, and he had said that many times before—if he had agreed to consent to it, they would have wanted one more member still. The only argument that struck him as new in the speech made by the hon. member for Musgrave was that in

Ireland, which had about the same population as London, they had twice as many members as London. Here they proposed to give the North, with only half the population of the metropolitan constituencies, the same number of members. Hon. members opposite said they would be satisfied if they were treated in the same way. They were treated in exactly the same way, and they were not satisfied; and if his theory were correct—he would be glad if it were incorrect—they never would be satisfied.

Mr. HAMILTON said that no action of the Premier's would tend more to intensify the feeling for separation in the North than that hon. gentleman's attitude towards Northern members during that debate. The Government supporters could laugh; with them, whatever the Premier did was right—he had only to threaten a dissolution and they put their tails between their legs and came to heel. A more servile following he had never heard of. The Premier's manner to the Northern members was most insulting, and in so acting the hon. member insulted the men they represented. He firmly believed the Premier wanted separation, and he believed he knew the hon. gentleman's reason for wishing it. The hon. gentleman did not care to advocate it openly, but every action of which he was guilty in that Committee showed a covert desire for separation.

Mr. BULCOCK: What will he get by it?

Mr. HAMILTON said he would get increased political power in the severed portion of the colony, because nearly every Northern member was a political opponent of that hon. gentleman on account of his treatment of the North, and by getting them out of the House by means of separation the hon. gentleman would make a clean sweep of about fourteen political opponents, and would so increase his chance to have another tenure of office. The hon. member for Bulcock was always talking about the metropolitan constituencies.

Mr. S. W. BROOKS: I rise to a point of order. Is that a proper expression to apply to the hon. member?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Cook knows he has no right to address the hon. member for Enoggera by his name.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I would remind you, Mr. Fraser, that last night an hon. member was referred to as the hon. member for Macrossan, and you never raised any objection.

Mr. ALAND: That was a sheer mistake.

Mr. HAMILTON said he held that the correct way was to address a member according to the interests he represented, and as that hon. member represented himself more than any other interest, he contended that the title he gave him was not out of order.

Mr. BULCOCK: I do not represent California Gully.

Mr. HAMILTON: The hon. member is very good at California Gullies. He has got his name up for it at any rate.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: He has added a new word to the English language.

Mr. HAMILTON said it was an admitted fact that the metropolitan constituencies should have a larger amount of population per member than outside constituencies had, and that was the case, not only in Queensland, but throughout the world, and it was extremely unfair to compare them with distant constituencies like the Cook. He had pointed out, and it had not been denied, that Cook had a population of 3,502 adult white males, and for that population they were only asking for two members, or one for

every 1,751 adult white males. How many of the other groups showed so high a figure? The average of the Wide Bay group was only 1,281 per member, and of the Darling Downs group 1,063. Thus the Darling Downs group, within a few miles of Brisbane, had one member for every 1,063 adult males, and the Cook was rebuffed because they simply asked for one member for every 1,751 adult males in one of the most remote electorates in the colony. Last night the Premier virtually admitted that they were entitled to two members, but said that if Croydon, which had nothing to do with Cook, had a member given to it Cook would be penalised by having to remain as it stood.

Mr. PALMER said there was a great deal in the manner in which a gift was conceded; the manner of giving was of almost as much value as the gift itself; and it would be a great matter if the Committee would generously accede to what the North very fairly and legitimately asked for. It would rob the gift of a great deal of its value if it had to be contended for in a division, while all discordant feelings would be swept away if it was granted in a gracious spirit. Reference had been made to the extreme northern part of the electorate, Thursday Island, where there were nearly 400 adult males on the settlement. From want of representation, the whole of those people were politically dead. They took very little interest in the affairs of the colony, because they had been cut off for so many years from all political intercourse with the people on the mainland. They were a community whom it was very well worth their while to encourage, and it was a duty they owed them to bring them within the pale of Queensland political life. The case for the North stood on a very firm and sure foundation. Hon. members on the other side had admitted their ignorance of the conditions prevailing in the North, and one reason why the Northern members were so persistent and united in their demand for further representation was because Southern members had not taken advantage of the means given to them to make themselves acquainted with a very large part of the colony, which they were supposed to legislate for. He hoped hon. members would treat the matter fairly, and sink all party feeling that might arise. The demand of the North was a just one, and he hoped the Committee would graciously accede to it.

Mr. BROWN said he was sorry the Premier did not see his way to give an additional member for Cook. The point to be considered was simply this: Was that district entitled to more than one member? Taking the tables before them, even without considering the increase of population that had undoubtedly taken place, it must be admitted, merely as a matter of justice, that the district was entitled to two members. If they compared that constituency with the Darling Downs group, or the Central group, or with any other part of the colony which was getting additional representation, it must be admitted that Cook, with an adult male population of over 2,000 when the census was taken, was most undoubtedly entitled to a second member. It was beyond dispute that there had lately been a large increase in the population of Cook, and although it might be urged that it was not a settled population, yet, when they took into consideration the fact that every man who had been in the colony six months was entitled to a vote, the natural corollary was that they were entitled to representation in the House. It did not matter whether they had been in the colony one year or ten years, it was the duty of hon. members to find them representation. It was well known that since the census was taken there had been an

increase to the population of Cook of at least 1,000 additional adult males. At Bloomfield alone the increase had been about 800. They knew also that in other portions of the peninsula further north population was increasing, but without that additional population he contended that the district of Cook was entitled to two members. There was another thing worth considering, and in suggesting it he might not be acting quite in harmony with the views expressed by other Northern members, although he agreed with them that the district required two members. Thursday Island was 300 or 400 miles away from Cooktown, and between the two places there was a large tract of territory which was practically unpopulated at the present moment. No one could contend that the district immediately round Cooktown was not entitled to a member, and then that extreme outpost, that prosperous place, Thursday Island, ought to have some representation. His idea was that the Government should give Thursday Island and the northern part of the peninsula a member. Why should the people there not be represented?

The PREMIER: They will be represented.

Mr. BROWN said he did not think they would be represented by the member for Cook. He said, cut the district in two, and let Thursday Island have a member. It was all very well for the Government, who, he had no doubt, were quite sincere and believed all they said, to urge that the population of Thursday Island and the Bloomfield district was not settled; but a very good point had been made by the hon. junior member for Cook, although it was not taken much notice of. He pointed out that at the time the census was taken a large portion of the population of Thursday Island were away at sea. They were nearly all pearl fishers and shellers, and it was perfectly impossible that they could all be on shore at one time.

The PREMIER: They are all included.

Mr. BROWN said he did not see how they could be included in the census, which was taken on a certain day when some of them were away at New Guinea, or off the shores of Western Australia.

The PREMIER: The census includes all people within the boundaries of the colony.

Mr. BROWN said, then the census must have been collected in a different way from what it was elsewhere. A great many of the ordinary residents of Cooktown who were entitled to vote were constantly away at sea, and could not be included in the census, and a considerable proportion of the population in the peninsula could not be included. The census collectors could not have gone through that country at that time without a staff of police to protect them; they dared not, and he was certain that numbers of people there were not included in the census. But, putting that on one side, he contended that that district, with a population of over 2,000 adult males, was entitled to two members quite as much as the Darling Downs or any other part of the colony. He certainly thought Thursday Island was entitled to representation, and the only way in which that could be effected was to give it a member to itself. He hoped the Government would take that seriously into consideration. The hon. the Premier had interjected that the Northern members wanted one member more than the Government were prepared to give. He did not think the hon. gentleman meant that if the Government gave three members the Northern members would demand four.

The PREMIER: That is exactly what I did mean.

Mr. BROWN said he could assure the hon. gentleman that he was quite in error. The matter was discussed a fortnight ago by the Northern members, and it was pointed out that a fair proportion of representation would be four members more than the Bill provided for. It was quite evident that with three additional members the North would be under-represented, but in order to facilitate the passing of the Bill, to try to meet the Government, and not to show any factious opposition, the Northern members would take that number. They had offered to take three if the Government would give them, and were not going to ask for any more. He was sure that the Committee, with a spirit of fair play, would see that they were not asking for anything out of the way. Some allusion had been made by the hon. member for Musgrave about the interchange of commodities between North and South, and he (Mr. Brown) would point out to Southern members how very necessary North Queensland was to them as a constituency. They should do everything they could to create good feeling between North and South. The members for Maryborough and the Central districts should realise that fact. They knew very well that Maryborough was dependent to a very large extent on the people of North Queensland. They were the best consumers they had of their commodities, of their timber, and their coal. If ever they got a profitable market for their coal it would be in the North, and if they drove Northern Queensland to separation they would lose the best customers they had. They ought to take that seriously into consideration. The Northern members were not asking anything unreasonable, and those members had better give them their assistance. Hon. members might laugh, but he was talking seriously. They knew how far the mills and foundries of Maryborough were dependent on North Queensland. Their foundries got any amount of work from the North, and if the people of the South and Central districts knew what was to their own interests, they would recognise the just claims of the North, and give it every possible assistance. The Northern representatives were not offering any vexatious or factious opposition. They were simply arguing that from the tables supplied by the Government, setting aside the increase of population in the North, of which they had indisputable evidence, their demand for additional representation was a very reasonable one. He was sure that if the Committee wished to conciliate the people of the North and to treat them in a friendly, kindly way, they would give them the additional members asked for.

Question—That the words "one member," proposed to be omitted, stand part of the question—put, and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 28.

Sir S. W. Griffith, Messrs. Jordan, Rutledge, Dutton, Moreton, Dickson, Kellett, Groom, W. Brookes, Smyth, S. W. Brooks, Mellor, Isambert, White, Campbell, Buckland, Bulecock, Wakefield, Sheridan, McMaster, Salkeld, Foxton, Morgan, Bailey, Grimes, Higson, Kates, and Annear.

NOES, 23.

Messrs. Norton, Morehead, Chubb, Macrossan, Nelson, Hamilton, Black, Jessop, Lumley Hill, Stevenson, Lalor, Donaldson, McWhannell, Adams, Foote, Palmer, Philp, Govett, Pattison, Thorn, Brown, Allan, and Murphy.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

The PREMIER said he did not think it was worth while discussing any further question that evening. He moved that the Chairman leave the chair, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Question put and passed; the House resumed; and leave was given to the Committee to sit again to-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that this House do now adjourn. If there is any time for Government business to-morrow—if it is not too late when the private business has been disposed of—the Electoral Districts Bill will stand at the head of the paper.

Mr. MOREHEAD: What does the Premier consider too late? Till what time does he propose to sit to-morrow? Supposing private business is concluded, does he intend to sit after 9?

The PREMIER: I hope not. I should not be disposed to sit after 9, certainly.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at two minutes to 10 o'clock.