

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 2 OCTOBER 1888

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

daily papers, and that the sum of £25 had been paid for the expenses of printing the Bill, according to the Standing Order. He moved that the petition be received.

Question put and passed.

QUEENSLAND PERMANENT TRUSTEE, EXECUTOR, AND FINANCE AGENCY COMPANY (LIMITED).

MESSAGE TO THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Mr. POWERS said: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move, without notice, that the following message be sent to the Legislative Council:—

“Mr. PRESIDENT,

“The Legislative Assembly having appointed select committee to report upon the Queensland Permanent Trustee, Executor, and Finance Agency Company (Limited) Bill, and that committee being desirous to examine the Hon. J. S. Turner, Esq., the Hon. F. T. Brentnall, Esq., and the Hon. W. H. Wilson, Esq., members of the Legislative Council, in reference thereto, request that the Legislative Council will give leave to its said members to attend and be examined by the said committee on such day and days as shall be arranged between them and the said committee.”

Question put and passed.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE.

STEEL SLEEPERS FOR NORMANTON-CLONCURRY RAILWAY.

Mr. PALMER said: Mr. Speaker,—I wish to ask the Minister for Railways, without notice, a question in regard to the transit of steel sleepers from Brisbane to Normanton. I know the progress of the railway has been stopped on several occasions through the want of these sleepers to carry on the work, and I would like to know from the Minister for Railways if any steps have been taken towards expediting their transit.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. H. M. Nelson) said: Mr. Speaker,—The contractors for the carriage of the steel sleepers have not been able to carry out their contract as arranged, and a considerable delay has thereby been caused in the transport of the sleepers from Brisbane. I have made arrangements with other parties to carry a large quantity of the sleepers, and believe there will be no further delay. Of course, any extra expense will be borne by the contractors; but I do not think there will be any increase. The contract was for sailing vessels, and I am having them sent by steamer.

INJURIES TO PROPERTY ACT OF 1865 AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

On the motion of Mr. CORFIELD, this Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Council for their concurrence by message in the usual form.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT EXTENSION BILL (SEAMEN).

THIRD READING.

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

WAYS AND MEANS.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

On the motion of the COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. Sir T. McIlwraith), the Speaker left the chair, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to further consider the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, 2 October, 1888.

Petition—Ann Street Presbyterian Church Bill.—Queensland Permanent Trustee, Executor, and Finance Agency Company (Limited)—Message to the Legislative Council.—Question without Notice—Steel Sleepers for Normanton-Cloncurry Railway.—Injuries to Property Act of 1865 Amendment Bill—third reading.—Ways and Means—resumption of committee.—Messages from the Legislative Council—Queensland Permanent Trustee, Executor, and Finance Agency Company (Limited) Bill—Sale and Use of Poisons Bill—first reading.—Adjournment.

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

PETITION.

ANN STREET PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH BILL.

Mr. REES R. JONES presented a petition from Alexander Anderson, William Jones, John McLennan, Alexander Muir, and Thomas Cochran, of Brisbane, praying for leave to introduce a Bill to enable them to vest in new trustees the lands comprised in deeds of grant Nos. 2847, 2848, and 2849, and to enable the trustees for the time being thereof to sell, mortgage, or lease the same, and for other purposes. He said the necessary advertisements had been inserted in the *Government Gazette* and in one of the Brisbane

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved—

That there be raised, levied, collected, and paid on—Candles, per reputed lb., 2d.

He might state that the item of 3d. per lb for candles in the printed list was a misprint.

Mr. SMYTH said he was going to object to the tax of 2d. per lb. on candles, and for several reasons. In the first place, it was a class tax which would press upon the mining community in particular. A good deal of provision was made in the proposed tariff for the protection of various persons. For instance, the agricultural population were to be protected, and that also meant that the miners must suffer from the increased price of the articles that would be required on the gold-fields. If candles that the miners could use could be produced locally they would be satisfied. That was not so, however, and he could tell the Committee that the miners preferred to pay 2d. per lb. more for the imported candles than to use the locally-made article. The colonial-made candle—the Apollo Company's candle—was a good candle, no doubt, for domestic purposes, and so used would burn as long as the imported candles, but on account of the want of stearine or the soft nature of the candle, it was not suitable for mining purposes, and the miners preferred to pay an additional price for the imported candles. The proposed tax would be a great burden on the mining industry, and he could speak of mines which would be affected by it to the extent of £50 or £60. He had spoken to Mr. Dickson, when that gentleman was Treasurer, about the tax on candles, and he had mentioned that as the price of the English candles was only 4½d. per lb., free on board, the proposed tax of 2d. per lb. was equivalent to a tax of 50 per cent. Where was any other article in the tariff taxed to that extent?

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Plenty.

Mr. SMYTH said an hon. member interjected that there were plenty, but he would like to have them pointed out. The miners of the colony were already heavily taxed in comparison to those in other colonies. In Victoria a miner's right cost only 5s., while it was 10s. here. He would like to know if any member in the Committee would get up and argue that there was any other class in the community taxed in the same way as the miners. Candles, he considered, should be put on the free list instead of being taxed. It might be all very well in the case of dividend-paying mines to put on a tax, but what about the non-dividend-paying mines, many of which employed from sixty to seventy men? Yet it was proposed to put 45 or 50 per cent. additional duty on an article which could not be made here. The Apollo Company had been established long enough to show whether they could produce the article which was required; but they could not. He intended to propose that candles be put on the free list. He could see many articles on the free list that had no business there. The mining industry was one of the chief industries they had, and instead of being hampered by heavy taxation it should be assisted in every way. The miners were taxed up to the eyebrows already, and could stand no more. In New South Wales only 1d. per lb. was charged on candles, and here it was proposed to charge 2d. The tallow and everything necessary was here, and yet no one had made a candle suitable to the mining industry, and he did not think that that manufacturing industry deserved any protection whatever. He moved that candles be put on the free list.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the hon. member should move that the word "candles" be struck out, and he could then move that they be put on the free list if he was successful.

Mr. SMYTH said he would move that the word "candles" be omitted.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that the principal object of bringing in a new tariff was to raise additional revenue, as that was the want of the colony. Three or four amendments had been brought in since the original tariff was passed, and he knew it would be a very great convenience to pass an entirely new tariff. With that object they had not only to pass the articles upon which additional duty was asked, but also all those upon which there had been no increase. When he was placed in that position he did not expect to be taken advantage of in the way proposed. Hon. members, of course, could challenge every item, but he did not expect to be taken advantage of on an item of that sort. There had been no increase on candles, and 2d. per lb. had been collected since 1874. The hon. member said that the miners were at present taxed up to the eyebrows. If they were, he should like to know who was not taxed up to the eyebrows. He would like to know of anything on which miners paid duty, that other persons did not.

Mr. SMYTH: Tax property owners.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the hon. member went back to that same old song that had been debated for twelve days without arriving at any other conclusion than that money must be raised. The 2d. per lb. on candles was not additional taxation, and he thought it ought to pass.

Mr. MELLOR said he certainly would like to see a reduction on the tax on candles, and it would be only an act of justice to the miners. The tax had always been felt as being very heavy and unjust. It might be said that candles could be made in the colony; but those made here had been tried, and it was found that the miners could not possibly use the locally-made article. It was a tax purely upon the mining industry, because generally the candles used for domestic purposes were manufactured in the colony, whilst all the candles used by the miners were imported. As had been said by his hon. colleague, the miners were taxed far and above any other class of the community.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. B. D. Morehead): In what way?

Mr. MELLOR said in every sense. Miners were not allowed to get freeholds. They paid 10s. a year for a quarter-acre of land. They had to pay for miners' rights, and when the land was leased again to the leaseholder they paid £1 an acre for it. In every shape and form the miners were taxed above the rest of the community. The proposed tariff would press harder upon the mining community than upon any other class. The miners were dependent upon their industry, and had to consume all the articles brought into the colony; and he would like to have seen a form of taxation that would have been more equal. The present taxation was not equal, but if the leader of the Government would remit some of the taxation on the miners it would be very much to his credit and the credit of the Committee. He should support the amendment.

Mr. HAMILTON said he hoped the amendment would be carried, and he did not think it was asking too much that it should be. The amount of revenue collected on candles was not very large, and it seemed to him that it was a special tax upon one portion of the community. Hon. members had stated on many occasions that the miners were not more heavily taxed than others. That had been stated more than once, and he had hardly thought it necessary to reply to the statement, because he imagined

that the majority would not believe it; but since he had heard the statement reiterated, and particularly by representatives of squatting constituencies, he would show that the miners were taxed more than any other class. Now, the miner required first to pay 10s. per year for the right to occupy ground 50 feet square, but the squatter for the same amount of 10s. could take up a square mile of country.

Mr. MURPHY: No.

Mr. HAMILTON said he could prove to the hon. member that that was the case. In the Burke district there was the run called "Bruce"—100 square miles—for which £25 a year was paid. That was less than 10s. a square mile. Then there were Wallace and Bulloo North—each of those paid 5s. a square mile; and not only that, but the squatters could live where they liked. They could erect residences and dams, and at the end of their term were allowed compensation for the improvements. Look at the relative position of the miner. He had to pay 10s. first for the privilege of working a piece of ground 50 feet square in area, in alluvial workings, and if he wished to be exempt he had to pay another 10s. If he wished to leave it for a month he had to pay 10s. for the privilege of not working it. If he got up quartz and stacked it he had to pay 5s. for protection. If he wished to get his claim amalgamated he had to pay another 5s.; and if he took up a residence area and left his claim for three days it was jumped unless he paid 2s. 6d. for protection. In fact he had to pay for the privilege of doing everything.

Mr. SMYTH: There is the stamp duty.

Mr. HAMILTON said there was also the stamp duty. If mining shares which were utterly worthless were transferred the stamp duty had to be paid on those shares.

Mr. MURPHY: Squatters have to pay stamp duty.

Mr. HAMILTON said a squatter had not to pay for erecting a building on a square mile of country, for which he paid 10s. per annum, nor was his land liable to be jumped if he left it for three days; but the miner had to pay 2s. 6d. if he left his claim for that period, in order to protect it. Squatters, no doubt, consumed a large amount of dutiable goods, but there were also special duties imposed for their protection, and the miners were the best customers which the squatting and other industries which had protection could have.

Mr. MURPHY: No.

Mr. HAMILTON said it was so. There was at present a duty of 2d. per lb. on tinned beef, and now it was proposed to increase that duty to 4d. per lb., the price of beef now. Was that not protection? And that commodity was one largely consumed by miners. Tallow, which was also produced by the squatters, paid 2d. per lb., and it was also proposed to increase the duty to 3d. on candles. Was not that protection?

Mr. MURPHY: No.

Mr. HAMILTON said he did not think the hon. member for Barcoo was so devoid of intelligence as not to be aware of the fact that a duty of 3d. per lb. on candles would prevent their introduction from outside, and increase the demand for tallow in the local market. Then there was machinery. The amount of machinery used by miners was far larger than the amount used by squatters, who practically paid no duty on machinery as compared with miners. Rope was also taxed to the extent of 8s. per cwt., and a duty was imposed on fuse and dynamite. With regard to the tax imposed on candles, as the hon. member for Gympie had pointed out, the miners had to get the candles they used from home,

because the candles produced in this colony were unsuitable. They had not sufficient stearine in them, and the consequence was that they melted on to the quartz, and when it was crushed sickened the quicksilver, the result being that a large amount of gold was lost. The candles imported did not, however, mix with the quartz and sicken the quicksilver, so that by using them that loss was prevented. For the reason which had been adduced, therefore, he was of opinion that the impost on candles was practically a class tax, and that it would be a fair thing to leave the duty as it was at the present moment. He hoped the increased duty would not be carried.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: There is no increase.

Mr. HAMILTON said there was a proposed increase. It was proposed by the tariff to increase the duty from 2d. to 3d. per lb.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I have explained three times that 3d. is a misprint.

Mr. HAMILTON said he did not happen to hear the hon. gentleman make that explanation, and he was not therefore responsible for the mistake. The papers placed in their hand were supposed to be correct, and in them the duty was stated at 3d. At the same time, he considered it would be a fair thing to strike out the tax altogether.

Mr. LISSNER said that, as one of the mining members, he would say a few words about the proposed duty. The last speaker appeared to be under the impression that the duty had been increased. He (Mr. Lissner) was quite satisfied that it had not been increased, and, considering that the country was owing a considerable sum of money, and that they wanted to pay off that amount by extra taxation, he did not think there was any particular hardship on his friends, the miners, in proposing to continue that tax. The miners were not the poorest people in the colony.

Mr. SMYTH: They are the best taxed.

Mr. LISSNER said he admitted that they were very well taxed, but he also admitted that they could very well bear all the tax put on them. Mining in this colony was not the same now as it was thirty years ago. Those engaged in that industry were mostly interested in getting gold out of very deep ground, and it was companies generally that carried on that work. The miner who worked the ground was not the person who paid the duty on candles. He supposed that members of that Committee holding shares in mining companies paid more in proportion than many miners. He was very glad that the tax was not to be reduced. The country wanted revenue, and he would be quite satisfied to leave the tax as it was. If there was a chance of abolishing the tax altogether and the country still be solvent, he would vote for the amendment; but as it was not solvent he considered that they should continue the tax. For his part, he thought it rather offensive to have the miner trotted out as a poor man on every occasion. He noticed that in Victoria, which was regarded as a colony that supported miners, a charge of 2d. per lb. was made on the candles. The same impost was levied in other colonies, except in New South Wales, and unfortunately it was not solvent. He liked to vote for solvency, and therefore would support the tax.

Mr. ANNEAR said he did not think that 2d. per lb. duty on candles would do any harm to the miner; but, on the contrary, he believed it had done them a great deal of good. Before the Apollo Company came into Queensland English candles were selling at 9d. and 10d. per lb. At the present time the best English candles could

be bought at 7d. per lb., duty paid. The contractors making the tunnels on the Valley railway were using Apollo candles, for which they paid 6½d. per lb. Protection on that article, therefore, had done a great deal of good. It had made English candles 2d. per lb. cheaper to miners than they were before the Apollo Company started in Queensland. Such being the case, he thought they should be consistent, and that 2d. per lb. duty was a very fair thing. He would, therefore, support the duty.

Mr. LITTLE said he would point out that the miners had to pay several items of taxation that had not been referred to at all. He referred especially to the unjust taxes they were compelled to pay to officers who received high salaries—mining registrars, for instance. If a miner took up an ordinary claim he had to pay 10s. for the right to hold it; then if he wanted it registered he had to pay a further sum and advertise it. He did not object to the cost of advertising, but what he did object to was having to ride perhaps forty or fifty miles to the warden, who would probably be absent, and having to wait about for days to see him and get the business done. He thought they should take those matters into consideration, and if any reasonable concession could be made to the miners it should be granted, because they were fully entitled to it. They consumed more dutiable goods than any other portion of the community—they had to do so by reason of the position in which they were placed—and he hoped that, as far as possible, consideration would be extended to them.

Mr. HODGKINSON said he understood the hon. member's speech to be in reality a protest against the whole tenor of the tariff, which was framed solely as an oppressive tariff on the working classes. The hon. member for Kennedy had said that the miners were not in a position of poverty, that they were able to bear taxation, but because a portion of the community was able to bear taxation, was that any reason why unjust taxation should be inflicted upon them. He was proud to say that the miners were able to bear their share of taxation, and were willing to bear it in the peculiar circumstances in which the colony was situated; but the most profitable mines in the country were now in the hands of companies, and it was no excuse that the charge did not fall upon the working man, because in any case it had to be deducted from the proceeds of the mine; and if by additional taxation a mine which was just on the line between payment of expenses and loss fell from the former category into the latter, the result must be attributable to the extra expense of working. The hon. member for Maryborough had stated, as an illustration of the fact that the imposition of a protective duty had been of advantage to the miner, that the duty on candles had enabled the Apollo Company to start, and thus compete with and reduce the price of the imported article, but if he had extended the argument a little further he would have seen that if the protective duty were taken off the price of candles, instead of being 7d., would be 5d.; that was supposing the duty to be 2d. per lb. But those little paltry considerations were beside the question. He believed the miners would swallow the proposed tariff wholesale, if they saw the Treasurer coming down with a scheme to make the property classes contribute their fair share to the taxation of the colony. Unless they had a land-tax, or an income-tax, or some tax by which those who had accumulated wealth, mainly by the exertions of the working classes, were compelled to bear a fair proportion of taxation no tariff would satisfy the colony. He

was sure many hon. members had read with surprise, in a recent issue of a Victorian newspaper, the price at which land was sold in Melbourne when it was first started, and what the same land was worth now. He would quote only one instance, in which the original price of the allotment was £20, and it was now estimated to be worth something like £190,000. What had increased the price of that lot? Was it the superior ability, energy, or virtue of the man who was lucky enough to buy and to hold it, or the accumulation of population and wealth around him? It was undoubtedly the latter, and it was extremely unfair that those men should not be called upon to contribute something in proportion to increment of value. Whatever position hon. members might take, he should oppose, as far as he possibly could, the carrying out of what he looked upon as a most iniquitous distribution of the pecuniary burdens required to pay for the government of the colony.

Mr. DRAKE said in discussing the item under consideration, it must be remembered that they were not discussing a motion to increase the duty upon candles. What was proposed really was to sweep away a duty which, up to the present, had had a distinctively protective operation. He would like to correct one hon. member who had stated that the ruling price of candles was 4d.; he found, according to the declared value in the statistical return, that the value was 5½d. He noticed also that only about one-half the imported candles came from Great Britain. The others were received from the various Australian colonies and from China. He did not know whether the hon. member meant to convey the idea that all those candles were better than Queensland candles, or whether the Queensland manufactured article was the only one that could not be used in mining. The hon. member for Gympie had admitted that the Queensland candle was very good for domestic purposes; the hon. member for Maryborough said it had been found very good in excavating the railway tunnels on the Fortitude Valley railway; so that evidently a very good article was being turned out, and he did not see any reason for supposing it was inferior to the candle imported from the other colonies, Hongkong, China, or Germany. He saw no reason why the duty should be swept off in order to please the mining community. He did not think that, up to the present time, they had shown sufficiently good reason for it. At the same time, while he should certainly vote against the proposal to wipe the duty out, he wished it to be understood that in doing so he did not endorse the opinion of the Colonial Treasurer that taxation through the Customs was the only available means of raising revenue.

Mr. SAYERS said he did not doubt that the Apollo candles were good for railway purposes and for domestic use, but he maintained that they were not used in the mines. They were of a softer nature than the imported article, and when the ends were thrown away the grease dropped about and destroyed the action of the quicksilver. They could not compete with the English-made candle for mining purposes. The candles from New South Wales, Victoria, and China, referred to by the hon. member for Enoggera, were not used in mining; only those from Great Britain and the Continent were used. Apollo candles had been tried, but they would not answer the purpose so well as the imported article, and their use in the North was solely confined to domestic purposes. He should like to see the Treasurer, if possible, reduce the duty on candles to at least 1d. per lb., and that would be quite a sufficient amount of protection to the local manufacture. He, as well as the hon. member

or Enoggera, wished to see the candle-making industry fostered, but he did not wish to see any industry fostered to hamper another industry. Everything connected with the production of newspapers was to be introduced free under the new tariff, and it seemed to him that every industry was fighting for itself. The imported candles were almost entirely used by the miners. It had been said that the mining community were paying hardly anything towards the revenue in the way of taxation. Well, they had their miners' rights to pay for, rents of leases, exemption fees—

The COLONIAL TREASURER: We have had all that half-a-dozen times over since this debate commenced.

Mr. SAYERS said they would no doubt hear it over and over again. He intended to bring it up as often as he thought fit. He maintained that, as a class, there were no persons so heavily taxed, or who contributed more to the revenue than the miners. It had often been said by the present Minister for Mines that the Northern miners were taxed far heavier in proportion than any similar class in the Southern portion of the colony; and he had no doubt the hon. gentleman was still of that opinion. The question of the duty on candles had been brought under the notice of the late Premier, and now that a new tariff was being considered, he hoped the Colonial Treasurer would see his way, if not to wipe the duty off altogether, at least to reduce it. If the hon. gentleman would do so they would assist him to increase the duty on several other items which were mere luxuries.

Mr. PALMER said the import tables for last year showed that the total amount collected on candles was £6,000, and that sum must be divided over the whole colony.

Mr. SAYERS: No; kerosene is very extensively used for domestic and other purposes.

Mr. PALMER said that every household in Queensland paid its share of that £6,000. He had never been in a house where candles were not used, and those candles came principally from the United Kingdom and New South Wales. To say that the miners of the colony paid that tax exclusively, to their own detriment, was arguing quite outside the figures they had before them; and the share paid by the miners of that £6,000 could not be very large when it was distributed over a colony of nearly 350,000 inhabitants. But it was too small a matter to fight over, and he hoped hon. members would reserve themselves until they came to the proposed duty on machinery.

Mr. UNMACK said he should support the proposed duty, in order to encourage the local industry. Last year the imported candles amounted to 730,690 lbs., while during the same period the local manufacture produced no less than 1,159,872 lbs., or about 20 per cent. more. Presuming, for the sake of argument, although, of course, he could not agree with it, that all the imported candles were consumed by the mining industry, the tax would be in favour of the miners; and he should, therefore, support the original motion.

Mr. ISAMBERT said that, although he, and, no doubt, a majority of hon. members, were in favour of the tax on candles, yet it was only fair that the mining members should be allowed to speak to their constituents.

Mr. HODGKINSON asked what the hon. member for Rosewood meant by saying that the mining members should be allowed to speak to their constituents? He should like to know who were speaking to their constituents more than the members for the farming districts. It

was their right to speak to their constituents, and so long as he was a member of the House and able to speak to them, he intended to do so on every occasion on which he thought he could do them any good.

Mr. GLASSEY said he hoped the Colonial Treasurer would accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Charters Towers, and reduce the duty on candles to 1d. per lb. That amount would represent a duty of 25 per cent., and it was a reasonable amount of protection for the local industry already established in the colony. He should certainly vote for the reduction to 1d., although he could not see his way clear to vote for the entire abolition of the duty.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted be so omitted—put and negatived.

Mr. SMYTH said that, after the expression of opinion, he had thought it advisable not to waste the time of the Committee by calling for a division, but he would move another amendment before the question was disposed of.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had explained to the Committee that it was a misprint, and he had moved the motion as "2d."

Mr. SMYTH said, if he were in order, he would move that the word twopenny be struck out, and the word one penny be substituted.

Amendment put.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said he intended to vote for the amendment, and wished to state his reason for doing so. He agreed that the tariff was brought in for the purpose of raising money, but that was no reason why certain admitted anomalies in the existing tariff should not be corrected, and he regarded the present proposal as one of them. There was another reason—when a particular class of the community would be exceptionally burdened by proposed increases, it was only right that some reduction should be made on other goods through which that class contributed more than others.

Mr. TOZER said he had a few observations to make, and he hoped the Committee would bear with him in reference to that proposed reduction. He did not wish to unnecessarily take up the time of the Committee, but he had never spoken on the subject of the tariff. Many members on the Opposition side were not thoroughly acquainted with all the burdens that the mining community were bearing, and his object was to stimulate that industry. He did not wish to refer particularly to the subject of candles, but other items. The other items were fuses, oils, explosives, wear and tear, and, lately, acids, which were general mining material; the first question was, could the Treasurer spare the money? He might say that if the law, as it stood at present, were administered the Treasurer would be able to derive sufficient revenue from other sources, and articles which really were required to encourage the mining industry might be allowed to come in free. He did not think the Treasurer would consider it waste of time if he alluded to one matter. There was a wholesale defrauding of the revenue at present in the matter of stamp duties upon transfers of shares, and he could make that remark emphatically from a long experience of goldfields.

Mr. SMYTH: In Brisbane also.

Mr. TOZER said that out of 100 men who ought to pay, 99 did not. It was only within the last week that he first saw the proper stamps put upon a transaction in scrip that the law authorised, and that was by a member of that Committee. If the Treasurer were to see that secretaries and directors of public companies performed their duties in that respect, there would be no

necessity for him to impose these extra taxes. He (Mr. Tozer) had been on the goldfields for many years, and had seen numbers of rich spots not being worked, and he could assure the Treasurer that if the mining industry did not receive more encouragement it would go down. There were not many men engaged in alluvial mining at present. He could say that the gold miners had not the slightest desire to avoid taxation, and the Treasurer had given them credit for that. Miners were unselfish, and always went in for protection, and he had never heard the slightest complaint from one of them as to the enormous amount they were required to pay. At the present time they were assisting other industries, particularly the agricultural industry. Every man engaged in the agricultural industry was receiving from the mining industry the sum of £18 per head per annum. Miners were a class of persons who congregated together, and numbered a good many in family. Taking them all round, they might calculate every miner's family at three; and to support the agricultural industry in the colony every one of them had to pay the sum of 18s. Therefore, they could not be accused of selfishness. They were severely taxed in ways that many hon. members knew nothing of. He did not go in for all that "gush" over the miners, and call them the saviours of the colony, but only looked upon them as good stimulants when the colony was in a depressed state. He looked upon squatters as being coadjutors in assisting the colony forward, and what he wanted to do was to stimulate them all; and he hoped the Treasurer would take that view of the case and get money only from the persons who were able to pay it. In consequence of the high charges upon some articles it was impossible to work certain mines at the present moment. He knew of a property of 60 acres, and was sure anyone might doubt him when he stated what amount had been paid to the revenue in respect of that property alone. It was taken up some years ago, and last year he became possessed of a small share in it. He found, on looking through the books, that that property had paid in rents and duties £2,500. He would tell them what that small property had paid during the present year. It had to pay £30 a year in licenses; it had to pay £60 a year rent; it had to pay as duty on the necessary machinery to make the land reproductive £250, in fact, had paid that already; on stores another £250, and in labour it had to expend, as the law required it, £10,800 during this year, and now he found in addition to all that it would have to pay, in consequence of the increased duties on certain articles in the tariff, another £2,000. Those were direct taxes upon the industry. He did not know of any other industry in the colony that was directly taxed to the same extent. The squatters would bear with him if he said that the large amount of money spent upon the railways of the colony was of much more value to them as a class than to the miners, who only received as yet an indirect benefit from that expenditure. He would be glad if the Treasurer could see his way to agree to a reduction of the taxation, not upon the item of candles alone but upon all those articles to which he had referred, and which were really the miners' tools as much as the hammer, pick, or drill. He was, however, so strong a protectionist that, if pressed on those views, he would have to support the whole duty proposed on candles. He trusted members on the other side of the Committee would be found ready to give the mining industry support, as, unless they did something to relieve the mining community of the burdens they had been patiently bearing for a number of years, they would find, as the deep-sinking went on, claim after claim quietly

abandoned, the supply of gold would fall off, and they would then find it was too late to stimulate the industry in the manner they wished. He trusted the Treasurer would give the industry the assistance he asked for, if not in the tariff before them, then at some future time. Some hon. members who had spoken on the subject, like the hon. member for Kennedy, had spoken as lucky men; but he spoke as an unlucky man, and he said that if he wished to put his worst enemy into any industry he would put him into mining. There was one large prize and a number of blanks, and, though many went for the large prize, on the whole he could safely say that the mining industry was not paying at the present time, though it was a great advantage to the colony, as it indirectly paid other industries and encouraged people to come here. For those reasons he hoped the Premier would be able to see his way to give those engaged in the mining industry some alleviation of the burdens now proposed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he was sorry to hear the hon. member speaking as he did about mining, and he was quite sure the hon. gentleman was not correct. He had a far larger experience and knowledge of mining than the hon. member. He was a miner thirty years ago, and had been intimately connected with mining since then. He could look back now to his friends in Sandhurst, in Victoria, and those who were alive had become well off; and become well off through mining. His experience was, that a man who stuck persistently to mining was sure to come out well in the long run.

Mr. TOZER: My experience is the reverse.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that was his invariable experience. The hon. member had spoken of blanks, and he knew to his cost how many blanks there were, but he also knew that something good always turned up in mining some day. As one deeply interested in mining, he did not see his way to reduce the duty upon candles, nor did he as a mine-owner; and it was the mine-owner who would have to pay the tax. As a mine-owner he did not consider the item a heavy one. He had a few words to say in reply to the argument of the hon. member for North Brisbane, the leader of the Opposition, who had given them that day a reason why he would support the proposed reduction of the duty. He remembered well when that matter was previously before the House—when the candle works were established at Bulimba. There was then a duty of 2d. per lb. on candles, and they found that the men who established those works brought their stearine from Melbourne and did nothing but make the candles here. He saw that was too much protection for candle-making, and none for stearine making, and he immediately brought the matter before the House, and proposed to raise the duty on stearine—which before that was very small—to 1½d. per lb., to give protection to candle and stearine makers. At that time the 2d. per lb. on candles pressed as heavily on the miners as now, as they were no better off then; but they did not find the hon. gentleman opposite at that time propose to increase the duty on stearine, and take 1d. per lb. off candles. Yet, now, after leaving the country with a deficit of over £600,000, he coolly came down and said he would vote to relieve the miners of the proposed taxation.

Mr. COWLEY said he would vote for the reduction, as he thought the proposed duty of 2d. per lb. was too high a protective duty. On that one item the amount was, perhaps, not much, but in the aggregate the proposed increases would amount to a great deal. At Townsville

they found vast sums of money were being expended in constructing breakwaters to enable vessels to go alongside the wharves, by deepening the channel, and thus land goods at a reasonable price, while on the other hand they were asked to dam up the channel by putting prohibitive duties on the articles they had to import. They might as well leave off the work in the channels or take off the duties.

Mr. AGNEW said that if the question went to a division he would vote for the Colonial Treasurer's motion, that the duty be 2d. per lb.

Question—That the word proposed to be omitted stand part of the question—put, and the Committee divided :—

AYES, 43.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Nelson, Morehead, Macrossan, Black, Donaldson, Pattison, Luya, North, O'Connell, Paul, O'Sullivan, Palmer, Smith, Allan, Archer, Isambert, Dalrymple, Gannon, Drake, Lyons, E. J. Stevens, Groom, Murphy, Stevenson, Crombie, Dunsmore, Rees R. Jones, Watson, Adams, Plunkett, Agnew, Perkins, Lissner, Campbell, Murray, Corfield, G. H. Jones, Battersby, Little, Annear, Powers, and W. Stephens.

NOES, 24.

Sir S. W. Griffith, Messrs. Rutledge, Hodgkinson, Jordan, Glassey, Barlow, Hamilton, Philp, Salkeld, Tozer, Sayers, Macfarlane, Grimes, Wimble, Foxton, Unmack, Hyne, McMaster, Mellor, Smyth, Buckland, Cowley, Goldring, and Morgan.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

The COLONIAL TREASURER, in moving—

That there be raised, levied, collected, and paid on—Cheese, bacon, hams, mustard, pepper, spices, nuts (all sorts except coconuts), and butter—per lb., 3d.—

said he found they had made a mistake in one item, and that was putting 3d. per lb. on pork. He had taken a good many of the facts from the hon. member, Mr. Groom, and now found them not to be correct. He thought the hon. member had also found that out. Now, in this colony the matter stood in this way. When the duty on pork was only 1d. per lb. and the duty on bacon 2d., a bacon factory was established in Brisbane. The reason for its being established was that the half-manufactured article was accepted at half duty, and the owners were in that way enabled to work up a large amount of colonial pork also. As a matter of fact, the owners had told him that during last year they had worked up 1,500 sides. If the duty on pork and bacon was equalised, then this result would follow, that the colony would be handicapped in favour of Victoria, because cured bacon was much lighter than imported pork, and therefore 3d. on the pork was a very different thing from 3d. on bacon, the former being much the heavier. The consequence would be that the establishment he referred to would be bound to close, as they would be competing against themselves in Melbourne, and it would pay them better to make the bacon in Melbourne and send it up here, because they would save all the difference in weight between pork and bacon. The company at present was limited to the present consumption of colonial pork, not to the amount they could put through the works, but to the amount that was being offered. More was being offered every year, and they would, in course of time, be able to cure colonial pork entirely; but, in the meantime, it was quite impossible to be dependent entirely on colonial pork. The factory referred to was the only place where bacon was manufactured in the colony, and if it was closed, the market for farmers would be limited. They had, therefore, done wrong in raising the duty on pork. There were two ways of dealing with the matter. They might raise the duty on bacon to 4d., and then, so far as the manufacturers were concerned, that was

just the same. At the same time he did not think it would be advisable to do that. He would prefer to adopt the other course, unless the Committee were against it, and leave the duty on pork as he had originally proposed it—that was 2d. per lb. He would therefore move, after that explanation, that it stand as proposed in the tariff.

Mr. GROOM said that since the question had come before them he had been waited on by two representatives of the firm engaged in the manufacture of bacon. The facts stated by them were much the same as those supplied to the Colonial Treasurer. They were somewhat wrong in their estimate, and he thought it was only fair to put the other side of the question before the Committee. He had made a mistake the other night in putting the number of pigs in the colony at 13,000 or 14,000. In hastily going over the returns of live stock he had looked at certain figures, and he had misled the Committee by saying those figures represented the total number of pigs in the colony, whereas they were simply the increase in 1887 over 1886. The actual number of pigs in the colony for the year 1887, according to the returns of the Registrar-General, was 73,663. Now, according to what one of those gentlemen had mentioned to him that morning, the manufactory in Brisbane consumed 30,000 carcasses. The figures he had quoted did not represent the half of that, and that number did not include what was used for hams, but only for sides of bacon. The annual imports from New South Wales and Victoria amounted, in round numbers, to 700,000 lbs. of pork. Estimating that each carcass averaged from 80 lbs. to 120 lbs., that would only represent about 6,000 carcasses. He might mention that a side of pork seldom weighed more than 35 lbs., so that the Queensland pigs used were practically more than he had stated there were in the colony. In the statements made to him it was shown that if his figures were correct, and there were only 13,000 or 14,000 pigs in the colony, and the manufactories consumed 30,000 a year, they would require an additional supply from somewhere else, as the pigs in the colony available would not represent a third of what was required. But, as he had said, the statistics he had quoted showed that was not the case, and that supposing they manufactured the carcasses of 30,000 pigs into bacon in the course of a year, the present supply would do for over two years; but there was likely to be a large increase during the next three or four years, because the returns showed an annual increase of 12,000 to 14,000; so that, notwithstanding what the Colonial Treasurer had said, those men would be able in the course of time to obtain as much fresh pork from the local farmers as would supply them with all the material they required. Looking over the returns, he found there were 73,000 pigs in the colony; but although they were scattered over the country from the Gulf of Carpentaria to Point Danger, he found the largest numbers round the centres of population. In Brisbane there were 7,821; Bundaberg came next with 3,696; then came the Logan with 3,588; and Toowoomba with 3,115. Various other farming districts gave from 1,500 to 2,500, so that it was quite clear that the attention of farmers had been directed to that important industry; and under those circumstances he was prepared to withdraw his amendment. It would be an injustice to those men to suddenly increase the duty if they were unable to get the pork in the colony. He had been informed that there had been an attempt to evade the duty by bringing in the bacon in a half-manufactured state as pork. He had said on a previous occasion that he spoke subject to correction, and the Colonial Treasurer had corrected that statement by saying that that was

done by an arrangement come to with the Treasurer of the day, and therefore there had been no attempt at an evasion of the duty. That statement would appear in *Hansard* as a correction of what appeared the other day. Bacon was an article largely consumed in the summer time, and at that season they could not get a sufficient supply from the farmers of the colony. It was then the whole of the imported pork came in from Victoria. He would be no party to inflicting a hardship upon the consumers. What he would propose to do would be to give effect to the wishes of his constituents by omitting the words "bacon and hams," with the view of increasing the duty to 4d. per lb. He might say that many of his constituents desired to impose even a higher duty than that, but he was not prepared to ask the Committee to go as far as they wished. He might also say, with regard to the duty of 4d. per lb. on bacon and hams, that he had received letters and telegrams from almost every agricultural district in the colony supporting the view he had taken in regard to that industry, and informing him that a good many of the constituencies had communicated with their representatives, asking them to accede to the increase. If the item were carried—to impose a duty of 4d. per lb. on bacon and hams—then, of course, the duty of 3d. per lb. on pork would remain as on last Thursday evening; and in view of the efforts being made by the farmers to go into that industry, he thought the duty he suggested would undoubtedly stimulate them to a very considerable extent. At the present time they were sending out of the colony annually about a million of money for food which could be very well produced in the colony, and there was a considerable amount paid for those articles to which he was referring. He found that the total amount of pork imported into the colony in 1887 was 783,475 lbs.; bacon, 497,677 lbs.; and hams, 392,763 lbs. All those together represented an industry of considerable magnitude, more particularly when they took into consideration what the gentlemen he had referred to had stated the industry was capable of if it received reasonable encouragement. He therefore thought that the request he made of the Committee was a reasonable one. As he had before stated, his constituents had requested him to propose a duty of 6d. per lb. on bacon, 6d. per lb. on hams, and 6d. per lb. on butter; but he was not prepared to ask the Committee to go to that extent. Members were allowed a certain amount of latitude in the exercise of their judgment, and had to consider not only what was best for their own constituents, but also what was best for the whole colony, and he held that he was doing a proper thing in meeting his constituents halfway by proposing to increase the duty on bacon and hams by 1d. per pound. With that view he moved that the words "bacon, hams," be omitted.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that what the hon. member had stated was quite correct—namely, that almost all the agricultural districts of the colony had petitioned for quite as great an increase of duty on hams and bacon as was now asked, and in many cases a great deal more. He (the Colonial Treasurer) had had petitions from nearly every agricultural district in the colony, asking that the duty on those items should be increased from 3d. to something under 6d. per lb., but he had not had a single petition from anybody else. But the farmers must not ask too much. Let hon. members consider how much those duties were. They were the most protective duties in the tariff. He supposed bacon was worth about 60s. per cwt., which was about 7d. per lb., and they proposed to put 3d. per lb. on it; that was 40 per cent. That

was a pretty fair protective duty. With regard to butter, the price of that varied considerably, but he believed the duty on that was very much the same. He thought 3d. per lb. on bacon was a very fair thing, and he should stand by it.

Mr. STEVENS said that, in considering the various items in the tariff, the surrounding circumstances in each case should also be taken into consideration. What he meant was, that they should consider other industries that would be encouraged besides the one they proposed to deal with. It could not, he thought, be claimed that the bacon-curing industry was much protected when there were so many thousands of pounds of bacon annually imported as was shown by the statistics. He felt confident, however, that if the duty was increased as proposed it would lead to refrigerating chambers being established in various centres of population along the coast, and that large quantities of hams and bacon would be cured in the country. It would, further, have the effect of increasing the production of pigs, which would give immense assistance to farmers, because they would then be able to use large quantities of corn, which they could not now sell at a fair price. They should consider, therefore, not only the benefit which those establishments would receive from the proposed protection, but also the large amount of money that in the long run would be derived by the country if the proposal was adopted.

Mr. MORGAN said the Treasurer had stated that he would stand by the tariff on that point, and the question must, therefore, be decided by a division. As a representative of a farming district, he regretted very sincerely that the Treasurer when referring to the measure of protection on those two items of bacon and hams, did not go a little further. It was all very well to say that they were at present protected to the extent of 40 per cent. But they had already increased duties in some cases 100 per cent., and would do it in more cases before the tariff got through Committee; and, if it was right to increase the tariff in some instances as much as 100 per cent. for revenue purposes, it was equally right to increase it to the same extent for protective purposes. The adoption of the amendment now proposed would not only encourage the production of hams and bacon, but it would also encourage agriculture, because it would lead to a large area of land being put under cultivation to provide food for the pigs. And what difference would it make to any man in the year—even a man with a large family—if another 1d. per pound was put on bacon? It would only be a very small item indeed, because bacon, whatever might be said to the contrary, was to a great extent a luxury. As he had said, the effect of putting on that extra duty would be to encourage agriculture, and give employment to a large number of people settling on the land. But he supposed it was very little use arguing the matter at any great length. He hoped the question would go to a division, and if it did he would certainly support the increased duties.

Mr. ADAMS said he might state that he had had a communication from his constituents asking him to vote for an increase of 1d. per lb. on bacon, but he could not see his way to support the proposal, because the increase, though in the interest of farmers, would not serve the whole community. One hon. member had said that the adoption of the proposed increase would lead to the establishment of refrigerating chambers along the coast, but what would be the use of such establishments if there were no means of communication with the interior of the colony? He contended that it would be impossible to have those establishments unless

they imported pork from the other colonies. It had also been said that people would feed their pigs on corn for which they could not now get a fair price. He saw the other day that maize, at Too-woomba, fetched something like 4s. 6d. a bushel, and wheat 3s. 6d. In that case the food for pigs would cost more than the food for human beings. He was perfectly convinced that pigs could be raised in many parts, in fact, in all parts of the colony. It was a well-known fact that wherever wild pigs were found in the colony they were generally in very good condition; therefore it was evident that, if people would only go to the trouble of breeding pigs, an ample supply of pork could be grown for the consumption of the whole community. He maintained that by putting an extra 1d. a lb. on pork they would not be protecting the farmers as a class. They would only be protecting those who had direct railway communication, so that in fact they would be protecting the few to the detriment of the many.

Question—That the words “bacon, hams,” proposed to be omitted, stand part of the question—put.

The Committee divided:—

AYES, 37.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Morehead, Donaldson, Pattison, Black, Unmack, Luya, Glassey, Hodgkinson, Rutledge, O'Sullivan, Palmer, Hunter, Philp, Smith, Archer, Smyth, McMaster, Gannon, Dalrymple, Goldring, Macrossan, Hamilton, Cowley, Grimes, Little, G. H. Jones, Lissner, Corfield, Sayers, Wimbie, Agnew, Adams, Lyons, Watson, Dunsmore, and Paul.

NOES, 27.

Sir S. W. Griffith, Messrs. Jordan, Plunkett, Barlow, Drake, O'Connell, Perkins, Salkeid, Crombie, Stevens, North, Allan, Macfarlane, Buckland, Murray, Annear, Campbell, Powers, Mellor, Tozer, Foxtor, Isambert, Hyne, Groom, Morgan, Stephens, and Battersby.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. UNMACK moved that the word “mustard” be omitted, with the view of reducing the duty on the article to 2d. It was not a large item, but mustard was an article of daily consumption, and it could not be produced in the colony. He did not believe in increasing the cost of all those articles in that way.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. DRAKE said there was a good deal of ambiguity in regard to “nuts.” He had been told that the Collector of Customs had insisted upon collecting the duty on iron nuts. Then with regard to “cocoanuts,” there were two articles known to commerce as the coconut—namely, the fruit of the palm and the article from which cocoa was made. In commercial circles in England, in order to distinguish the one from the other, the fruit of the palm was called the “cokernut.” He presumed that was the article that was meant to be exempted.

Mr. SMYTH said that the manufacture of iron nuts was a specialty. They were only made by certain firms in Great Britain, and the industry was not carried on in Australia. It was only where the demand was great that they could get special machinery to manufacture them.

Mr. ANNEAR said it was something new to him to hear that they could not make iron nuts in Australia. The majority of the iron nuts used in Queensland were made in the colony.

Mr. GROOM moved that the word “butter” be omitted. In asking the Committee to consent to an increased duty on butter he was simply giving effect to the wishes of his constituents who were engaged in the butter industry; and he believed the effect of the imposition of such increased duty would not only be to improve the condition of those men, but to improve the condi-

1888—2 c

tion of the butter industry generally. Without repeating his speech of last week he might simply remark that there could be no doubt that dairy produce represented a very large and important industry. In Victoria, as he had previously stated, it amounted to £2,000,000 a year, of which a very large proportion was contributed by Queensland. They were sending every year to Victoria an amount of money which would be almost incredible if they were to analyse it carefully. There were peculiar circumstances in connection with the Queensland butter industry which must be taken into consideration. There were no facilities whatever in Brisbane for storing butter. It was estimated that the present population of Brisbane and its suburbs was nearly 100,000, and the consumption of butter by such a large population must necessarily be enormous. They ought to give every possible encouragement to their own people to manufacture the butter for that population, instead of sending money out of the colony every year, as they did, to import butter, and another commodity called butterine, which was not butter at all. If proper facilities were afforded in the city for refrigerating chambers, as much butter could be obtained from the Darling Downs, the Logan, and the West Moreton districts as would supply the whole of Brisbane. At present it was impossible to send butter down in summer, because there was no proper storage accommodation whatever. The discussion that had taken place might possibly lead to something being done in that direction. He did not believe the farmers should have everything done for them, and they did not want it; and he was happy to say that a company had been formed whose intention it was to carry out the same business as was carried out by the Food and Ice Company in Sydney, and by the South Coast and West Camden Company in the same colony. If the assistance of a protective tariff enabled them to do that, they would no longer hear it said that farming did not pay, and that by asking men to go farming on their public lands they were inveigling them to their ruin. Farming was subject to trials and vicissitudes, but there were times when it could be made to pay. He knew hundreds of farmers on the Darling Downs who were in as sound and good a condition financially as any other body of men in the colony, but they had gone through the privations and hardships incidental to all colonies in their earlier stages. By a little judicious encouragement, not only would refrigerating chambers be formed, but butter factories would be started, and various other good results would ensue. He was bound to carry out the views of his constituents. They had asked him to do what was an impossible thing, but he was going to meet them half way; and, whatever was the result, they would have the satisfaction of knowing that they had been fairly represented in the Committee in reference to that very important matter.

Mr. DRAKE said that, before the debate proceeded further, he should like to hear some definition of the item “nuts (all sorts except cocoanuts).”

The COLONIAL TREASURER said there were no cocoanuts came into the colony out of which cocoa was made.

Mr. DRAKE said there might be.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said cocoa was made out of beans, not out of nuts. The tariff, as printed, had worked very well for a great number of years, and the matter might safely be left to the department.

Mr. DRAKE said it would be much clearer if the fruit of the palm were spelled “cokernut” instead of “cocoanut.” There could be no possibility of mistake then.

Mr. ARCHER said that when the nut from which they made their chocolate came from the bean it was called the cocoanut. When it was made into nibs it was called "coca"; so that even in that respect it was different from the cocoanut. Of course, he was going to vote against the duty of 4d. proposed by the hon. member for Toowoomba on butter. He was not going to give the Treasurer more money than he wanted. He wished to remark the extraordinary inconsistency of some hon. members who talked so much about the working man, and about other members who wished to tax the luxuries he enjoyed. They were going to tax bacon, which was absolutely necessary for the poor miner going out prospecting. He could not take half a bullock, but he could take a piece of bacon in his pack-saddle, and, with a piece of damper, he could make a decent meal. But that was to be taxed, and butter was to be taxed, and everything else was to be taxed that was necessary for his breakfast or dinner or anything else. And that was to be done, not only to the extent to which the Treasurer had committed himself, but up to 40 per cent. in some cases. He hoped the Committee would be upon its guard against increasing the cost of the working man's living.

Mr. STEVENS said the hon. member who had just sat down had called attention to other members speaking up for the working man, and patting him on the back, when he had just attempted to do the same thing himself. The working man was a very good judge of what suited him best. No working man objected to protection. In the greatest protectionist colony, the working men were almost all protectionists, not only farmers, but the miners themselves. They all returned protectionist members. In the present case there were two sides—each side accusing the other of talking up the working man, and then doing it themselves all the time. There were various kinds of protection. A miner did not wish his children to be brought up as miners. That had been referred to by the Treasurer. The miners looked forward to the manufactures which were being instituted as places to which their children could go to find employment. That feeling influenced men employed in all industries. They did not want to be confined to one class of labour, such as carriers, or bricklayers, or stonemasons, or whatever it might be. They wished to see some fresh fields where there was more room, and that was the chief reason for their being protectionists. Protection was more advantageous to them generally.

Mr. SMYTH said in regard to the miners in Victoria being all protectionists, he might say that they had very good reasons for being so. All the articles that they ate or drank, and everything they wore, were protected against all the world. But they received a sop on condition that they became protectionists. They received £80,000 a year to develop claims. How much did they receive in Queensland? Last year they did not receive £5,000. The farmers wanted protection for themselves, and wanted the miners to pay for it. But when it came to a question of protecting the miners, and giving them some consideration, so that they could work their mines cheaply and develop the industry, members voted against it. Queensland was the greatest colony in the group for minerals, and the mineral industry was the greatest industry in it. When the Treasurer came down and said to the miners, "I will give you £80,000 a year to develop the industry and settle a large mining population," then the miners would submit to those taxation proposals. He had noticed in all the divisions that had

taken place while the debate had been going on that the protection was only for certain classes. The timber industry was to be protected, and the Northern miners had to suffer; the farming industry was to be protected up to the eyes, and Northern miners had to suffer. They could not make butter enough in Toowoomba to supply themselves, let alone supply other parts of the colony; and they could not make enough butter in the Logan district to supply themselves. They had to import it. As to Victorian miners being protectionists, of course in Ballarat there was a large foundry, which received orders for making locomotives, but they were made at great expense to the colony, and it was a mistake to make them in Queensland. At Sharp Stuart's foundry, in Manchester, they could not compete with the colony. They could not make locomotives for Queensland, because they were so bound down, although they could make a better article. They said they were not sure whether the colony would always be a protectionist colony. If they were sure, they might settle here and make locomotives. Locomotives were only put together in Queensland; the different parts were obtained from England or Belgium. The miners in Victoria only submitted to taxation because they received a sop in the shape of £80,000.

Mr. STEVENS said the hon. member had accused protectionists of voting in one direction; but he had overlooked the fact that the tax on candles had not been reduced, for the reason that they were produced in the colony, and it would have been absurd for protectionists to vote for the reduction of the freetrade duty upon candles. If it had been some explosive that could not be made in the colony the case would have been different. The protectionists asked that duties should be imposed upon things that were being manufactured in the colony. As to the hon. member's remarks about the people of the Logan not producing sufficient butter for themselves, of course he knew nothing about it. He might be an authority in regard to Gympie, but he knew nothing about the Logan. That district exported a large quantity of butter.

Mr. GROOM said he did not wish to labour under the imputation of supporting agriculture and not mining. When he voted for the duty of 2d. per lb. upon candles he did so under the influence of the speech delivered by the hon. member for Toowoong, who gave figures showing what the Apollo Company was manufacturing, and that that company supplied them a great deal cheaper than the imported article. He would not reduce that duty because it would ruin that industry. So far from his having voted against measures for the benefit of the mining industry, he could appeal to the present Minister for Mines, who was as good an authority as any member of the Committee on the subject, to say whether he had not consistently supported him in motions which that hon. gentleman had brought forward frequently for prospecting grants. He had consistently supported that hon. gentleman in every measure he had brought forward for the benefit of the mining industry, whether for grants for prospecting for deep-sinking, or for the establishment of schools of mines.

Mr. SMYTH: There has not been a large one yet.

Mr. GROOM: Whose fault is that?

Mr. SMYTH: All the Governments'.

Mr. GROOM said the hon. member surely could not blame the farmers for that. He was sure the farmers would as cheerfully allow him or any other farming representative to vote for a large sum of money for

the development of gold-mining as for any other industry. If the Government put £20,000 or £25,000 on the Estimates for prospecting or for deep-sinking on goldfields, he would vote for it readily, and he was sure other farming representatives would do the same thing. It was not right to say that, because in a by-vote just now they had voted in favour of a duty which he regarded as essentially protective they were therefore in favour of discouraging the mining industry in which that article was to some extent used. He had no such desire or intention.

Mr. ANNEAR said he knew what the hon. member for Gympie was leading up to. The hon. member wished to pose as a great free-trader, but he had made a mistake in saying that the Queensland Parliament had never done anything for the mining industry, as they had done in Victoria. They had done just as much for that industry in Queensland as in Victoria, when the population of the two colonies was taken into account.

Mr. SMYTH: No, no.

Mr. ANNEAR said that as much as £5,000 was passed in that House in one vote for deep-sinking. The hon. member trotted out "the poor miner."

Mr. SMYTH: No. The miners do not claim to be poor.

Mr. ANNEAR said he knew the miners of Queensland were not poor. The hon. member seemed annoyed because the Committee had passed the duty proposed on candles, but why should he be annoyed? He supposed the claim in which the hon. member was a large holder might pay £100 a year for candles, but they paid £30,000 a year in dividends. The hon. member was only leading up to an opposition to the tax on machinery. He had never heard of a miner who was against the building up of the industries of the colony.

Mr. SMYTH: In your electorate.

Mr. ANNEAR said there were only two foundries in Maryborough, while there were a dozen in Brisbane, two in Toowoomba, two or three in Rockhampton, and they were spreading all over the colony. The miner did not object to those duties, but it was the wealthy proprietors who objected to them. The hon. member said Queensland produced no butter, but if he went up to the Roma-street market on three days in the week he would see that large quantities came down from the farming districts of the Darling Downs, and he would be convinced that in making the statement he did he was labouring under a delusion. The hon. member abused Victoria, but he (Mr. Annear) had the pleasure of being in Ballarat two years ago, and no one could see a better class of men—better clad or better conducted than were to be found throughout Victoria. The hon. member also said that he had been in some English foundries and that they did better work than was done in this colony. He (Mr. Annear) said that the machinery turned out in Queensland was preferable in many cases to 90 per cent. of the machinery which came to the colony from Europe.

Mr. MORGAN said the hon. member for Gympie was objecting because the duty proposed upon candles was allowed to remain as it was, but that ought not to be a reason why the mining representatives should take umbrage. The corn and chaff party had been consistent in protection. He wished to point out that already in Queensland they produced almost sufficient butter for their own requirements, and they wanted the extra 1d. for protection for this reason: When there was a surplus of the article in the other colonies shipments of it were brought

to Brisbane, not by Brisbane merchants, but for speculative purposes, and the result was a reduction in price, and the local producers suffered. If the extra 1d. was put on they would be able to meet those shipments to some extent, and would be more sure of a regular market.

Mr. LYONS said that, as the representative of a mining constituency, he thought the miners would be far better pleased if hon. members did not waste the time they did in repeating speeches upon subjects which had been discussed before. The miners would rather pay the increased duty proposed than have them sitting there for ever making speeches. It cost about £7,000 a year to conduct the proceedings of that House, and it would be better for the miners and for the whole colony if they could reduce that amount by something.

Mr. DRAKE said he would vote for the amendment, and would have given a silent vote had it not been for the remarks of the hon. member for Rockhampton. The hon. member twitted protectionists, in voting for the increases in those duties, with a disregard for the interests of the working man, and it was necessary to explain over and over again, apparently, the principle upon which they went. He would vote for the amendment because he believed that butter was an article they could produce in sufficient quantities to supply their own requirements. It would not increase the price of the article, and would not add any additional burden at all to those borne by the working man. He trusted that when they came to discuss the duties upon articles which could not be produced in the colony, and which bore heavily upon the working man, the hon. member for Rockhampton would show his love for the working man by voting against them.

Mr. MELLOR said he did not wish to give a silent vote upon the question, and he wished also to say a word or two in reply to the remarks made upon the action of his hon. colleague in the representation of Gympie in connection with the duty on candles. It had been said that that hon. member would be a heavy taxpayer under that duty, but that the mine with which he was connected was paying large dividends. That might be so, but for every mine that paid dividends there were twenty that did not pay dividends. He was himself paying about £100 a year in calls into a mine where some £50 would have to be paid in the tax on candles, and it was in those cases the miners would feel the tax. With reference to the question before the Committee, he certainly had sympathy with the farmers, and believed they should be protected. He certainly thought the article they were discussing was already sufficiently taxed. Formerly 2d. per lb. was collected on butter, and now it was proposed to charge 3d. per lb., or an increase of 50 per cent. It was an article that could not always be manufactured in the colony, especially in the summer, and they must depend upon getting their supplies from the other colonies. In reference to the previous vote, he must say that bacon and hams were commodities that could be manufactured here in abundance, and their manufacture might be made one of the chief industries of the farmers. He should have liked to have seen the last vote carried, but as it was not, he thought it scarcely fair to expect the proposal before the Committee to pass. He did not know whether the hon. member for Toowoomba, Mr. Groom, intended to press his other amendments, and particularly that relating to flour, but if so, he must say that he would do all he possibly could to prevent a duty being put upon flour. Flour was the staff of life, and he trusted that the hon. member would not press his amendment.

Question—That the word proposed to be omitted stand part of the question—put, and the Committee divided :—

AYES, 35.

Sir T. Mellwraith, Messrs. Nelson, Macrossan, Adams, Morehead, Donaldson, Pattison, Corfield, Unmack, Watson, Rees R. Jones, Agnew, Black, Dunsmore, Crombie, Hunter, G. H. Jones, Grimes, McMaster, Cowley, Dalrymple, Gannon, Mellor, Palmer, Archer, Smith, Philp, Sayers, O'Sullivan, Hodgkinson, Glassey, Hamilton, Laya, Little, and Battersby.

NOES, 21.

Sir S. W. Griffith, Messrs. Plunkett, Isambert, Groom, Wimble, Hyne, Campbell, Murray, Auncar, Barlow, Drake, O'Connell, Stevens, North, Salkeld, Allan, Tozer, Powers, Stephens, Foxton, and Morgan.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved—

That there be raised, levied, collected, and paid on—Confectionery and succades, ginger (preserved and dried), and leather (except otherwise enumerated), a tariff of 4d. per lb.

Mr. ALLAN said that, before the next paragraph came on, he wished to bring before the Committee another product which was coming into the colony in large quantities. During the last week 2,000 lbs. had come in. The product he referred to was made from fresh fat and other things, and came greatly into competition with butter, upon which they had just had so much discussion. He referred to "butterine," or "oleomargarine" as it was sometimes called. It was an article which did not come under the tariff at all; but he was sure that it was consumed as butter, although there was nothing in the tariff to show that it came into the colony at all. It was composed of the fat of fresh-killed animals. The fat was put in jacketed boilers and reduced at a temperature of about 122 degrees to oil. The oil was then taken off, the middle part reduced by cold to a pulpy sort of fat. After that it was put between galvanised iron plates, after having been folded in cloths; it was placed under a weight of about 2,000 lbs. to the square inch, by which the oil was pressed out, and it then formed oleomargarine. All that was used in this colony was imported from Victoria and New South Wales; it was also manufactured in England, America, and France. In its state as oleomargarine it was used for melted butter and such like purposes. It was also churned up with milk, and then exposed to a very cold temperature, after which it was exported to this country as butter, and, as he had said, as much as 2,000 lbs. had during the last week been imported into Brisbane. The hon. member for Fortitude Valley told the Committee the other day that butter of good quality was worth 3s. 3d. per lb. This butterine was imported into the colony at 8½d. per lb., and that when the duty was 2d. per lb. It would therefore be seen that it could be largely introduced into the colony when butter was at a high price, and thereby compete with the farmers. He wished to see a higher duty imposed on oleomargarine than that levied on butter, and would like to see it 1s. per lb. Chemists showed them that oleomargarine contained about 10 per cent. more of non-volatile fatty acids than butter, and was, in consequence, very indigestible, so that it was not advisable to bring it into the country. It was most unfair that it could be brought in at all times at the same rate as butter. He might mention that as far back as 1874 there were about 400 people employed in Paris in the manufacture of butterine. All the butterine, however, that came into the colony during the last ten days was imported from New South Wales and Victoria. He therefore supposed

that it was manufactured in those colonies, as he did not think it likely they would import it and then re-export it to Queensland. For the reasons he had given he would propose that there be a duty of 4d. per lb. levied on butterine.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Make it 6d.

Mr. ALLAN said he was very glad he had the Committee with him, and would willingly make it 6d. Butterine was injurious to health, and very indigestible. He might say, for the benefit of those persons outside who were not aware of the fact, that they could tell the one from the other by a very simple method. If a housewife drew the blade of a knife across butterine it would leave a white mark across it, but if that was done with ordinary butter there would be no such mark, as the butter would keep its colour. Another way of distinguishing them was by putting it in a hot pan, when it would be found that the butterine would splutter, but ordinary butter would not. He gave this information that people might know what they were using. He had no objection to raise the amount of duty from 4d. to 6d. and would now move—

That there be raised, levied, collected, and paid on—Butterine, per lb., 6d.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he would suggest to the hon. member that he should make the amount 4d. and add the item at the end of the paragraph just proposed. The amount of butterine imported since the 1st July was 3,000 lbs. weight. He had no objection to putting 4d. per lb. on butterine, but he would not raise it to 6d. per lb., because he knew they would have to impose a corresponding excise duty, as butterine was an adulteration, and they wanted to prevent it going into consumption altogether. Although he was a protectionist he did not want to encourage adulteration. He thought the hon. member had better propose that butterine be included in the list of articles on which the duty was to be 4d. per lb.

Mr. ALLAN said he was very glad to adopt the suggestion of the hon. gentleman, as he could quite see the common sense of it. He therefore moved that the words "and butterine" be inserted after the words "ginger (preserved and dried)."

Mr. UNMACK said he had a previous amendment to move. He proposed that the duty upon "confectionery and succades" be reduced to 2d. per lb. He did so knowing that the articles were in very large consumption, and although they might to a certain extent be called a luxury he believed that by many people they were looked upon as a necessity. He was not referring to the item of confectionery which appeared lower down in the tariff—chocolate confectionery—and which could well stand 3d. or 4d. per lb., but to dry or pan goods. These were in daily consumption, and were very largely used. The English price varied from 3½d. to 4d. The price of sugar required for production was very low, the cost of manufacture was also very trifling, comparatively speaking, and the article had been produced in the colony under the old tariff for a considerable number of years in a most successful manner. Several large factories had been started and were doing well, and the proprietors of those works had assured him that they would much rather the duty should remain as it was at present than be increased to 4d., because it would enable them to produce the same class of article they were now producing at a profit to themselves. The wholesale price in Brisbane had been all along from 5d. to 6d. per lb., and the duty of 4d. was neither desired nor necessary.

Mr. DRAKE asked the hon. member to explain why the confectionery manufacturers here objected to the proposed increase in the import duty. He could not possibly see how it would injuriously affect them.

Mr. UNMACK said the reason given by the manufacturers was, that the increased duty would considerably narrow down consumption; and they would much rather have larger consumption, seeing that they had the raw material at hand to work upon.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the reason was not a very logical or sound one. He thought the tax a very fair one. It could hardly be contended that lolly-pops were one of the necessities of the working man.

Mr. GLASSEY said he should vote for retaining the duty at 4d. He knew a manufactory in the North of England where the articles in question was manufactured, and where they would find young women working for the magnificent wage of 4s. a week. He did not think it desirable to encourage that sort of thing. They had abundant material in the colony to produce the article themselves, and certainly they should not encourage the importation of the article at the wages he had mentioned.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the paragraph—put and passed.

Mr. ALLAN moved that the word "butterine" be inserted after "dried." He wished to know whether it was the desire of the Committee to add "oleomargarine."

The COLONIAL TREASURER said it would be better to alter the amendment to read, "butterine and other similar products."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. SMYTH said leather and confectionery appeared to be banded together, and he was not going to let leather pass. They could produce any amount of leather in the colony, but for certain purposes connected with mining operations English leather was preferred. The difference appeared to be in the mode of manufacture, and it was a fact that colonial leather could not be used in mining. He did not see any reason for the increased duty. Seeing that they had the hides, the tanning bark, and all the appliances necessary for the manufacture of leather in the colony, if they could not make it with a fair protective duty, or without going to the extreme rate of 4d., it was a disgrace to Queensland. By putting on a duty of 4d. they would be taxing only one class of people who used English leather—namely, those who used it for mining purposes. Leather could not be manufactured in the colony for certain purposes, and, as they must have the article, to put a duty of 4d. per lb. on it was too great. He moved, as an amendment, that the words "Leather (except otherwise enumerated)" be omitted from the paragraph.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said hon. members would see that, while the duty on leather had been increased, there had been large exemptions made for the purpose of encouraging the leather industry in the colony. Patent leather, enamelled leather, kids, hogskins, levant, and morocco, and imitations thereof, were all put on the free list.

Amendment put and negatived; and paragraph, as amended, put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he was under the impression when he spoke before that pork had been put down at 3d. per lb. The word was moved to be omitted with the object of

inserting it again, but it was not inserted. He moved that the following new paragraph be inserted—

Pork (not including mess-pork) 2d. per lb.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved—

That there be raised, levied, collected, and paid on—

Hops, per lb., 6d.

Mr. PHILP moved, as an amendment, that the duty on hops be increased from 6d. to 9d. The Colonial Treasurer, in his speech, proposed to take the excise duty off beer, and increase the duty on hops to 6d. per lb. and on malt to 3s. per bushel. He (Mr. Philp) had found that unless the duty on hops was increased to 9d., and on malt to 4s., the duty on the two articles would not be equivalent to the 12s. 6d. taken off beer. He did not approve of the present mode of collecting the duty on beer, believing it to be far preferable to collect it through the Customs, and if the duty on those two articles were increased to 6d. per lb. and 9d. per bushel respectively, the amount realised would just about make it equivalent to the excise duty taken off beer.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that when he spoke on the matter he let the Committee understand very plainly, and gave them the figures for it, that with regard to beer they would lose more than they were putting on. He had no objection to the duty being made up to something near what was being taken off, but it must be distinctly on the understanding that the repeal of the Act imposing an excise duty on beer be carried by the House. They must not put the duty on the material out of which beer was made, and then repudiate their own action by retaining the excise duty on beer. It was on that understanding he spoke.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said the hon. gentleman was putting the cart before the horse. It was very doubtful indeed whether the excise duty on beer would be taken off; and as it was very uncertain how it would go, it would be as well to take the excise duty on beer first.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he did not think there was any uncertainty about it. The position he would be placed in would be this: When the resolution from Ways and Means was reported to the House, he should bring in a Bill containing the whole of the tariff that was now being carried. In that Bill would be included certain duties on the materials out of which beer was made, and in the Bill the House would also be asked to repeal the Act imposing an excise duty on beer. If the Beer Duty Act was not repealed, it would put him in the position that he, as Treasurer, had been fooled by the Committee—having been made to put a tax of £30,000 on the beer drinkers, or beer makers, whichever way hon. members liked to put it—and as he did not intend to be made a fool of he should simply throw up the Bill if that was done. He proposed certain duties, and if they were accepted on the faith, as he put it, that the beer duty was to be repealed, it was a perfectly fair exchange. If they did not they must take the consequences of throwing out the tariff.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said the hon. gentleman took a very erroneous view of the question. It was proposed to raise £30,000 on beer. The hon. gentleman wished to raise it in one way. Possibly the Committee might differ from him, and say that the best way of collecting that amount was the present way. If the Committee decided that the tariff was better as at present, that was no reason why the hon. gentleman should throw it all up. There would be only a difference of £2,000 or £3,000. It was

simply a question of which was the better way of getting the money from the beer drinkers, or beer makers. It would be no material alteration in the tariff. It was impossible to arrive at any understanding then as to what should be done in regard to beer. He knew of no way at all of deciding that, except by a division when the time came. The hon. gentleman said if the excise duty on beer were retained, he would not ask for the 6d. per lb. upon hops. He had no right to endeavour to force the Committee into the position he was attempting to force it into. He ought not to say the whole tariff would be withdrawn if, ultimately, the Committee should think it desirable to retain the excise duty on beer, instead of the higher duty upon hops and malt.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the hon. gentleman misunderstood him altogether. The proposal of the Government was that, instead of taxing the beer, they should tax the material of which it was made. Then if the Committee turned round and said they would keep the duty on beer as well as on the material, they would stultify the Treasurer, and he should consider the Government defeated. It was not a matter of £2,000 or £3,000; it was one of £35,000.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said if the Committee retained the duty on beer, the Treasurer could amend the schedule of the Bill he would have to bring in, and take the duty off hops and malt and leave things as they were. There would be no stultification about that.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had stated the position clearly on a previous occasion. He told the Committee that if he supported the increased duties upon malt and hops, the excise duty upon beer ought to be removed. If, after raising the duty upon hops and malt, the Committee insisted upon retaining the excise duty upon beer, he would throw it up. He had explained that already.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said he was only anxious that there should be no misunderstanding. He was sure the Treasurer had conveyed a different impression to the Committee.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was simply a difference in form.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said the proper way would be to amend the schedule by taking the extra duty off hops and malt.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he thought it right to let the Committee know what his action would be. It was on the understanding that the excise duty upon beer was removed that he had proposed those various increases, and it was not unreasonable, if the Committee insisted upon that, knowing at the same time that they were not going to repeal the excise duty on beer, for him to state the alternative. He would not confine himself to throwing up the Bill, if the Committee decided to retain the clause repealing the excise duty on beer.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said that, of course, that was another thing. He wished to see that the Committee would not, by any vote it might give now, tie its hands in dealing with the beer duty when that came before them. It was not before them at present, and they could not deal with it. The Treasurer could not compel members to pledge themselves, after giving a particular vote upon that question, to give a corresponding vote upon another. In the vote he should give on the present question, he should not consider himself in any way bound to support the removal of the excise duty upon beer. He intended to support its retention, because, as he had said before, it was a proper thing, and he should not consider that, by accepting the Treas-

urer's proposed increase of 6d. per lb. upon hops, he should be precluded from voting against the removal of the excise duty upon beer. He should probably feel that it was not fair to double the burden upon the beer makers. He was anxious that the Committee should not be led away, as some members might be, without knowing it, and be told afterwards they had pledged themselves to support the repeal of the excise duty upon beer. He believed most of the Committee were opposed to that.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he did not think the Committee would be acting very injudiciously if they voted for the increase proposed, knowing what would be the result. But, having told hon. members what the Government intended to do, he was done with it. He knew he could not bind any individual member, and, therefore, could not bind the whole Committee; but he was just stating the grounds upon which he proposed the present increase, and the action which would be taken if they raised the duties upon the materials from which beer was manufactured. If the Committee raised the duty upon hops, and then insisted upon retaining the excise duty upon beer, he considered that the Government would have been defeated.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said the Treasurer was putting the Committee in the position of trying to defeat the Government without intending it. That gentleman had tried to raise a false issue, and he was trying to get the ground clear. The hon. gentleman, by a side wind, wished to get hon. members to pledge themselves to abolish the duty on beer. He had better wait until beer came before the Committee and then get a direct vote upon the subject. They would face the subject when they came to it, and in the meantime any duty put upon hops would be provisional.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the Treasurer was in no way trying to bind the Committee. How could he bind the Committee? The hon. gentleman had simply placed before hon. members the issue which was at stake, and he stated it clearly and fairly. He was perfectly certain that hon. members understood it, notwithstanding the specious argument brought forward by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. DRAKE said he hoped the Committee would consider the question of the duty upon hops very carefully indeed, especially if it was to be understood that any vote given upon that item would have any influence whatever upon the repeal of the excise duty upon beer. He did not agree with the proposed increase in the duty on hops, and he was a long way from agreeing with the increased duty proposed by the hon. member for Townsville. Though, no doubt, hops was an ingredient of beer, and was largely used by brewers, it must not be forgotten that it was also used in almost every household in the colony. Hon. members would know that in the interior and outlying districts where there were long dusty roads it was often impossible for a thirsty traveller to get anything but hop beer or "hard stuff." Hops, he believed, could not be produced in the colony, or, at all events, he had never heard of any attempt being made to grow hops on anything like an extensive scale, and, therefore, a duty imposed on the article would not have a protectionist effect. He hoped that any proposal to reduce the proposed duty on hops, which, he thought, should be placed on the free list, or, at all events, have a light duty, would have the powerful aid of the hon. member for Rockhampton, as a friend of the working man. He would vote for a reduction of the duty, whether the excise duty on beer was removed afterwards or not.

Mr. SALKELD said that, as he understood the position, the Colonial Treasurer wished to have a second say in the matter. He did not want the duty on hops and malt increased and the excise duty on beer retained. There were many members of the Committee who did not want the excise duty taken off beer, and did not want the duty on hops increased; but if the excise duty was to be removed from beer, they would be prepared to support an increased duty on hops. Some way might be found for overcoming the difficulty, in case the duty was increased on hops and the excise duty retained on beer, by which the items could be re-submitted for the consideration of the Committee.

Mr. ISAMBERT said the proposed duty of 9d. per lb. on hops was dangerous and insanitary. Hon. members who thought it would be a tax on beer were much mistaken. A few years ago when there was some failure in the hop crop, and the price of hops rose to a very high figure, substitutes were found for hops in the breweries, and some of them were poisonous. Hops was about the only sanitary ingredient in beer, and he would be in favour of putting it on the free list, as it was a tonic, and was largely used for hop beer and for yeast.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had no idea of increasing the duty on hops beyond what he proposed in the tariff, though, as he had already stated, he had no objection to an increase upon malting barley beyond his proposal.

Mr. HYNÉ said he understood that the proposed increased duties upon hops and malt submitted by the hon. member for Townsville would not return an amount equal to that received from the present excise on beer by some £10,000. If that were so all he could say was that there were many items in the tariff increased, and he did not know why beer, which he looked upon as a luxury, should be exempt.

Mr. ADAMS said the Committee should be very careful in dealing with the proposed increased duty on hops. Some members had spoken about the thirsty people in the West wanting to get hop beer. He had been in that district, and he could say there was scarcely a household in which hops were not used for making yeast. It was also largely used by bakers for that purpose, as all bakers were not near enough to a brewery to get yeast. If there was to be a duty on beer he would rather that it was placed upon some other ingredient than hops.

Mr. POWERS said that the Colonial Treasurer had told them clearly that if they raised the duties on hops and malting barley they must either vote for the repeal of the excise duty on beer or stultify themselves by reducing the duties on hops and malt again. He would like the hon. gentleman to give an equally plain answer to another proposition. If the Committee reduced the duties on hops and malt to the old standard—from 6d. to 2d. per lb.—would the Colonial Treasurer be willing to support the retention of the excise duty on beer?

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had already explained why he proposed to increase the duty on hops and malt, because he thought it much better to do so than to have an excise duty on beer; and he had tried as far as he could to make the two things balance. The hon. member asked another problem altogether. The hon. member asked whether, if the Committee knocked off the whole of the increased duties he proposed, he would be in favour of retaining the tax on beer in that case? Very probably he would, but he did not concede that he was called upon to give any such undertaking. If the hon. gentleman could knock

off the duty on malt and barley and hops, let him do so, but he (the Colonial Treasurer) would consider what he would do after that. He would not give an answer to a problematical question, nor did he think it necessary. He stood by the tariff, with the exception that he would propose an increase on malting barley.

Mr. FOXTON said it seemed to him that the proposition put by the hon. member for Burrum was very pertinent. It was the converse of the one put by the Premier himself. The hon. gentleman desired to get an assurance from the Committee, or desired to arrive at an understanding that if his proposal with regard to the duty on hops were carried, it must be distinctly understood, as far as any understanding could be arrived at without coming to a division, that his proposal with regard to the omission of the excise duty on beer should be carried. Now, he (Mr. Foxton) thought that if the Colonial Treasurer desired to have such an understanding the understanding desired to be arrived at by the member for Burrum was perfectly fair, and followed as a matter of course.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he thought the hon. member might accept the answer he gave to another hon. member who seemed to be satisfied with it.

Mr. FOXTON: I do not think he is.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said, if not, he might object. What he said was that if the duties named were struck off, then he would say what he would do. He stood by the tariff.

Mr. FOXTON said he did not know whether the hon. member for Burrum was satisfied, but the hon. member was not the only one whom it was necessary to satisfy. If the hon. member for Burrum had not asked the question, it had appeared to him (Mr. Foxton) as one that might very properly be put. If an understanding was desired to be arrived at in one case it should be in the other, and the Treasurer should be equally prepared to give that undertaking, which he desired the Committee to give.

Mr. HUNTER said he did not believe in understandings. There was an understanding between the parties on the Elections Tribunal Bill, which was very much upset. He was pretty well sure that the majority were in favour of keeping on the excise duty on beer. What they should do would be to reduce the duty on hops to 2d., and risk carrying the duty on beer, and he was sure the Treasurer would not oppose the carrying of that tax. He did not believe in understandings being arrived at, as they had been broken before and would be again.

Mr. SALKELD said, in order to get on with business, he would propose that 6d. be omitted and 2d. inserted.

Mr. GROOM said he looked at the question from a different standpoint to others. Colonial beer was protected by an import duty amounting to £1 17s. per hogshead, and in return it paid an excise duty of 3d. per gallon. The Treasurer proposed an extra duty on hops, but hops could not be grown in the colony. There were a few grown in Victoria and Tasmania, but none in Queensland; and as far as malting barley was concerned there was no doubt whatever that that could be grown in Queensland. He did not know whether hon. gentlemen were aware of the magnitude that the colonial beer industry was assuming. Four years ago there were only thirteen breweries in Queensland; now there were twenty-five; and last year they produced, according to accurate returns, 2,496,736 gallons of beer. The profits on that were something enormous. When colonial beer

was being sold at £6 per hogshead, he was informed by a brewer that the net cost was £2, including the cask. Now, he thought that that would stand a very good tax, at all events. He was inclined to think, with others, that they ought to see if they could not utilise the productions of their own soil. The amount of malt imported amounted to 95,000 bushels per annum. Now, that amount could be grown in Queensland with the greatest possible ease; and as hops could not be grown here, he would suggest that the Treasurer leave hops at 2d. per lb., and increase malt to 4s. per bushel. Then the impost of 2s. 6d. on malting barley would give a stimulus to the barley industry, which would give employment to a large number of persons. He would like to see an effort made to encourage the agricultural industry of the colony, and if they could do so through the breweries let them do so. So that he thought it was as well to come to an understanding, and, although understandings were occasionally broken, it seemed to him there was no danger of such a thing happening in the present instance. The resolutions they were passing were not like the laws of the Medes and Persians, but could, if it suited them, be altered afterwards. He was in favour of encouraging native industries, and with that view he was inclined to assist the Treasurer in increasing the duty on malt to 4s. If the suggestion of the hon. member for Townsville were accepted, a tax would immediately be put on the hop beer industry. He should support the reduction of hops to 2d., and the increase on malt to 4s., because by so doing they would give a stimulus to the agricultural industry.

Mr. GANNON said that so that there might be no mistake, he wished to say that he was going to vote for the increase of the duty on hops to 6d., but when the beer question came on he should vote for the retention of the excise duty. He did not want it to be understood that he was going to vote one way to-day, and another to-morrow.

Mr. HODGKINSON said the increased duty on hops would affect almost every family in the pastoral and mining districts of the country. He might say it affected the sanitary condition of people in the bush, because hops were a household ingredient of bread and other necessities. If they were to increase the duty on hops still more, as the hon. member for Townsville had proposed, to 9d., the great consumption of hops would stimulate the brewers to find a substitute, and their only object in finding a substitute would be cheapness. So far as regarded the consumption of beer in the bush, it was almost unknown, owing to the cost of carriage of such a bulky article as beer in wood. It could only be carried for comparatively short distances from the place of manufacture. He appealed to those hon. members who were familiar with the outside districts if that were not so. Therefore, for the purpose of removing a duty which no one except the brewers complained of—that was, the excise duty on beer—they proposed penalising a very large section of the community by putting a duty on hops, which were used in many ways for domestic purposes. He thought it was inadvisable to increase the duty to 9d., as suggested by the hon. member for Townsville, and he even thought it inadvisable to increase it, as proposed by the Colonial Treasurer, to 6d.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he would vote for the amendment to reduce the duty to 2d. per lb., for the reason that it was used by so many persons besides brewers. Even if they took the brewing industry by itself, the very fact that that industry was a growing one, and that so many people drank beer, he supposed it was better that they

should drink pure beer than adulterated beer. He thought it better to increase the duty on malt and barley, and also the excise duty on beer. The hon. member for Toowoomba had referred to the profits of brewers. It was well known that large profits were made by them. In the papers only a few days ago they had seen that Guinness's brewery—a great limited liability company—had paid a dividend of 15 per cent. last year, another limited liability company had paid 20 per cent., and another 10 per cent. They knew that if those companies were able to pay 10 per cent. in England they ought to pay 20 per cent. quite easily out here, because they got far better prices for the beer. Besides that there was an import duty of 9d. a gallon on beer in bulk, and a duty of 1s. per gallon on bottled beer. It would be far better to reduce the duty on hops, even for beer drinkers, so as to give them the pure article, as if the duty were increased the brewer would be tempted to put in deleterious substances as substitutes.

Mr. GRIMES said the excise duty upon beer had produced £30,000. That sum was paid by the brewers, the retailers, and those who indulged in the luxury. By increasing the duty on hops to 6d. they were placing the burden on every man, woman, and child in the colony, and, under those circumstances, he could not support it. He should support the amendment proposed to reduce the duty to 2d. If they removed the excise duty on beer they should increase the duty upon malt.

Mr. POWERS said the hon. member for Carnarvon said that he (Mr. Powers) was not satisfied with the answer of the Colonial Treasurer. Personally he was satisfied with the answer. The Colonial Treasurer left it an open question whether they voted for the duty on beer or not. He had already expressed his intention on that question, and said exactly what he intended doing, and he was going to vote as he had said. If those duties were reduced, he understood the excise duty on beer would have to be retained.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said of course he might go further in some respects, and say that they must do something to counter-balance the proposal to take the duty off beer. He did not think hon. members need be very frightened. Hon. members surely understood him?

The Hon. Sir S. W. GRIFFITH: I do not understand you.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said if no additional duties were put on the materials of which beer was manufactured, it took away the reason for proposing the repeal of the excise duty on beer.

Mr. FOXTON said if the hon. gentleman had given that answer before he should have been perfectly satisfied; but that was very different from the answer he had given.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the Premier had made that statement half-a-dozen times during the debate.

Mr. DRAKE said he would point out that it appeared to him that the hon. member for Toombul had declared now that he was going to do the very thing that the Colonial Treasurer said he would not allow him to do.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he rose to a point of order. When had he ever uttered any expression that he wished to curtail the right to do and say what he pleased of any hon. member on that side of the Committee? Any hon. member was perfectly free to do what he liked.

Mr. DRAKE said he understood the hon. gentleman to say that, if an increased duty were not imposed on malt and hops, he would not propose the revision of the excise duty on beer.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Sit down, and try to understand it.

Mr. DRAKE said the hon. member for Toombul said he was going to vote with the Government for the duty of 6d. per lb. on hops, and that he was also going to vote for the retention of the excise duty on beer. Surely that was in exact contradiction to the lines the head of the Government had laid down. He knew the hon. member, and all hon. members, were free to say what they pleased. The increase of duty from 6d. to 9d. on hops would be giving an additional inducement to the Colonial Treasurer to refuse to retain the excise duty on beer.

Mr. GANNON said he was quite able to look after himself in regard to that matter. What he had said he wanted to be distinctly understood. He had said that he would vote with the Government on the question of the proposed tariff on hops and malt, and that he would also vote for the retention of the excise duty on beer. His reason for saying that the excise duty on beer should be retained, even although hops and malt were taxed, was that there would be a revision of the tariff, and they would possibly be taken off in the event of the excise duty on beer being retained. That was the way he put it, and there was no going behind it. He wanted it to be distinctly understood that the reason he was voting that way on hops and malt was that he intended afterwards to vote for the retention of the excise duty on beer.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the way he expressed himself was that if they now put additional duties on hops and malt, and the Committee afterwards refused to repeal the duty on beer, he would then propose that the increases made in the tariff be reduced. If he failed to carry that, then the tariff would go.

The Hon. Sir S. W. GRIFFITH said that was the position he tried to get the hon. gentleman to take up half an hour ago, but he took up quite a different one then. He (Hon. Sir S. W. Griffith) wished to say a word now, to point out to the Committee that they were likely to get into a little confusion. The hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Philp, had proposed to increase the duty on hops from 6d. to 9d. per lb. The member for Fassifern proposed to reduce it to 2d. per lb. Both those who believed in the increase in the duty, and those who believed in the decrease of it, should therefore vote in favour of the amendment of the hon. member for Townsville to omit the word "sixpence." He intended to vote for that, not because he believed in increasing the duty from 6d. to 9d., but because he thought they ought to reduce the duty, and for two reasons: one was that hops could not be produced in the colony, so that to increase the duty would be to raise the price of hops to the injury of a very large portion of the community who used them. There was no reason for increasing the duty except that they were going to substitute that increase for the excise on beer. As he did not believe in the remission of the excise on beer, he would vote for the amendment to omit the word "sixpence," with the view of afterwards inserting "twopence." Those who voted for the omission of "sixpence" would not, of course, commit themselves to "ninepence." When the question of the duty on hops was disposed of, they would know on what basis they were dealing with the duty on malt. Some members might be inclined to largely increase the duty on malt for protective reasons, and others might object to that because it would press too heavily on

brewers, or increase the price of beer to the consumer. The present question was unfortunately a double one—whether the duty on hops should be increased from 6d. to 9d., or whether it should be retained at its present rate. All members who believe in the retention of the 2d. per lb. rate would, as he had said, vote against the retention of the word "sixpence," in that paragraph.

Question—That the word proposed to be omitted stand part of the paragraph—put, and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 35.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Nelson, Morehead, Black, Donaldson, Pattison, Macrossan, Hamilton, O'Connell, Paul, Archer, Allan, Smith, Philp, Stevens, Gannon, Dalrymple, Little, Goldring, Cowley, North, Corfield, G. H. Jones, Lissner, Murray, Palmer, Campbell, Adams, Plunkett, Watson, Rees R. Jones, Dunsmure, Crombie, Lyons, and Agnew.

NOES, 30.

Sir S. W. Griffith, Messrs. Rutledge, Hodgkinson, Jordan, O'Sullivan, Drake, Barlow, Glassey, Grimes, Salkeld, Sayers, Stephens, Morgan, Macfarlane, Battersby, Powers, Mellor, Buckland, Smyth, Tozer, McMaster, Hunter, Hyne, Unmack, Foxton, Wimble, Isambert, Groom, Annear, and Luya.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

The Hon. Sir S. W. GRIFFITH said before the question was disposed of he wished to point out that, although the division had decided that the duty on hops should be 6d., it had not been settled whether the excise duty on beer should be retained. He believed it would be far better to abolish the duty on hops, for various reasons that had been given, than to abolish the excise duty on beer. He was not going to enter into a discussion as to the retention of the duty on beer, which he supposed would be a matter for serious consideration afterwards. Many reasons had been given why the duty on hops should not be increased from 2d. to 6d., and he believed that a majority of the Committee would rather see no duty upon hops at all. If it were possible to test the question definitely, and also to decide whether the excise duty on beer should be retained, it would be desirable to do so now; but that course was not possible, so that it must remain in suspense. If hops could not be grown in the colony, it would be a fair thing to take the duty off them and increase the taxation on malt.

Question—That the paragraph as read stand part of the tariff—put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved—

That there be raised, levied, and collected on—

Fruits, bottled or in tins or jars—per dozen reputed pints, and in the same proportion for larger contents, 1s. 6d.

Pickles and sauces—per dozen reputed pints, and in the same proportion for larger or smaller contents, 1s. 6d.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that would be a convenient place to introduce the duty on pulp fruit, which he promised the other day. He, therefore, moved that the words "pulp fruit, or fruit preserved by acid, 2s. 6d. per cwt.," be inserted. The great bulk of the fruit preserved by acid came in as fresh fruit. One of the characteristics of pulp fruit was that it came in in casks.

Mr. SMYTH said he would like to know if the hon. the Colonial Treasurer had ever visited any of the jam manufactories in Brisbane where pulp fruit was received, made up into the marketable article, and distributed to the people of the colony. Several members of the Committee, including himself, had done so; and he thought it would be a great pity to put a tax upon pulp fruit. The largest factory in the colony was Peacock and Sons, at Petrie's Bight, where a considerable number of persons were employed

in manufacturing the imported pulp into jam. Why should that pulp be prohibited from coming into the colony by being taxed?

The COLONIAL TREASURER said it was not prohibited from coming in. It was taxed already.

Mr. UNMACK said he looked upon the proposed tax as wholly inadequate for the purpose intended. They had been told by some hon. members that the pulp fruit which was being imported could not be grown here, and the other night they were told that all the fruit necessary for jam making could be grown here. He did not understand such lop-sided arguments at all. With reference to the duty now proposed, it was the Colonial Treasurer's original proposition that pulp fruit should come in under a duty of 15 per cent., or a $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per lb. He would direct the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that in introducing the Budget he mentioned that he had made a test of the *ad valorem* duties as against New South Wales. He (Mr. Unmack) had looked over the statistics and found that the declared average value of pulp fruit was $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per lb. But the value of pulp fruit imported from Tasmania ranged from $\frac{1}{4}$ d. to 3d. per lb., the average being at least 2d. or 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.; therefore the revenue had been defrauded on the *ad valorem* system to that extent. He was pleased to find that a fixed duty was to be proposed, but seeing that they had passed a protective duty of 2d. per lb. on a manufacture which would barely cost $\frac{1}{4}$ d., he thought the duty of less than $\frac{1}{4}$ d. per lb. now proposed was not sufficient. A duty of 1d. per lb. ought to be imposed.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said that as they had passed a duty of 2d. per lb. on jam, which might be said to be composed of an equal weight of sugar and fruit, or 1d. per lb. on the fruit, why should not the raw material pay half the duty of the fruit in the jam? He would suggest that the duty on pulp fruit be $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per lb., or 5s. per cwt.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he did not object to the 5s. The duty was 1d. per lb. in New South Wales, 2d. in Victoria, 4d. in South Australia, and 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in Western Australia. With the permission of the Committee he would substitute 5s. for 2s. 6d. in the new paragraph.

Amendment agreed to; and new paragraph, as amended, put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved—

That there be raised, levied and collected upon—

Castor oil (in bottle), cod-liver oil (in bottle), and salad oil (in bottle)—per dozen reputed pints, and in the same proportion for larger contents, 2s.

Preserved meat (not salted), and extract of meat—per dozen reputed pounds, and in the same proportion for larger or smaller contents, 4s.

Fish—preserved (not salted), and jams and jellies—per dozen reputed pounds, and in the same proportion for larger or smaller contents, 2s.

Mr. HAMILTON said he thought the duty of 4s. per dozen lbs. on preserved meat was rather too high. It would not benefit the colony from a revenue point of view. The amount received from the article last year at 2s. per dozen lbs. was £1,301, and if the duty was raised to 4s. it was not likely to lead to an increased importation of it. In fact it would practically prevent the introduction of preserved meat at all. From a protection point of view, it was the last thing that needed protection. The colony could compete with any other nation in the production of meat; and to increase the duty to 4d. per lb. would simply be putting an extra sum of money into the pockets of certain individuals who were engaged in preserving meat. That kind of meat was now sold wholesale

in the colony at 5d. per lb., and the consequence of the increased duty would be that those persons who prepared the meat in the colony would increase the price from 5d. to 7d. or 8d. per lb., and still be able to undersell those who were sending meat to the colony. But the increase was not necessary, seeing that they could do so well without it. The increase would not be beneficial from a revenue point of view, and it was not necessary from a protection point of view, seeing that at the present moment they could compete on favourable terms with any other part of the world.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the imported preserved meat was one of the most expensive luxuries they used. He had seen far better preserved meat made at Rockhampton, but it was the fashion to buy the imported article, and the increased duty would have the effect of encouraging a very valuable colonial industry.

Mr. ISAMBERT said that extract of meat ought to pay not less than 15 per cent., and it could very well afford to pay a higher duty than it did now. He would move as an amendment—

The COLONIAL TREASURER: It is scarcely worth while. Only a small amount came in last year.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved—

That there be raised, levied, and collected upon—

Soda crystals, galvanised corrugated iron, and iron wire, per cwt., 2s.

Acid, sulphuric, per cwt., 2s. 6d.

Iron castings for building purposes, and malleable iron castings, nails, paints (wet and dry), lead (white and red), per cwt., 3s.

Mr. TOZER said the Colonial Treasurer might try and assist an industry which was struggling into existence by putting sulphuric acid upon the *ad valorem* list. He knew certain persons in the colony who were making great strides to foster an industry, and the consumers of acid would be thrown into the hands of one firm. Sulphuric acid was of two kinds. There was what was called the "chamber" acid and the "tower" acid, and his opinion was that the best could only be obtained from Melbourne. The English price was £5 per ton. The consumption in an ordinary well-managed concern, apart from the larger concerns, would amount in duty to about £25 per week at the proposed rate, and that would be a heavy tax upon an industry which he was sure no one more than the Colonial Treasurer wished to see flourish—namely, the industry of extracting gold from the ores which quicksilver would not effect. The same mill which crushed stone used sulphuric acid for the product which quicksilver would not touch, and sulphuric acid was proposed to be charged 50 per cent., while the other ingredient, which made chlorine bleaching powder, was charged 15 per cent. There were four different industrial companies which had secured the right to use a new patent, and he understood from recent reports from England that the German and American authorities had examined that patent most carefully, and had decided that it was a good one, and one which it was very advisable for all persons interested in gold to acquire. If that was so, by all means let them acquire it if they could for dealing with the refractory ores which were found in the deeper levels all over the country. He hoped sulphuric acid would be placed in the *ad valorem* list.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said his reason for placing 2s. 6d. per cwt. duty upon sulphuric acid was to encourage the making of that article in the colony.

The Hon. W. PATTISON said he professed to know something about sulphuric acid, and the hon. member for Wide Bay had certainly endeavoured to mislead the Committee. The best sulphuric acid was not made in Melbourne, but by Messrs. Elliott Bros., in Sydney, who had started a factory in Brisbane, and there were other factories started in the Central districts—the Mount Morgan Company making their own. The price of sulphuric acid was £8 per ton, and if the duty of 2s. 6d. per cwt. resulted in its being made in the colony, there would be a great saving to the consumer, considering the cost of freight, the breakage of jars, and the loss of acid. The consumers would certainly not grumble at the impost of 2s. 6d. per cwt. upon it. The company to which he belonged would cheerfully pay it, and all other companies would do so as well. The bulk of the acid at present came from Sydney.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the figures in page 59 of the statistics of the colony of Queensland would show the accuracy of the statements made by the Hon. W. Pattison. The imports into this colony in the year 1887, from the United Kingdom were 3 tons 1 qr., from Victoria 67 tons 18 cwt., and from New South Wales 480 tons 12 cwt., which showed that the bulk of the acid came from New South Wales.

Mr. HAMILTON said if he thought that protection to sulphuric acid would very much increase the price he would vote against it; but it was his opinion that it would not. Elliott Bros. had started the manufacture of sulphuric acid in Brisbane, and it was evident that that protection would be an increased stimulant. Last week they obtained a retort at the cost of £400 or £500, and at present were making concentrated sulphuric acid, and believed that they would be able to supply it cheaper than previously. There was a very large amount of insurance and freight to be paid on the imported article and in sending the jars back again; and in a little while it would be much cheaper to use the Queensland-made acid. He hoped that the articles required in making the acid would be put upon the free list. He believed, even in Victoria, which went in for protection, they allowed all raw products to be admitted free. Sulphuric acid was made out of nitrate of soda and sulphur.

Mr. TOZER said he would be the last to say anything disparaging of Elliott Bros. He knew that they had supplied sulphuric acid for some time, but did not know that they made the concentrated article. The cost of carriage by railway and by sea was very great, and he was glad to hear from the hon. member for Cook that Elliott Bros. were able to supply concentrated sulphuric acid.

Mr. SMYTH said he understood that Elliott Bros. were putting up certain works to supply sulphuric acid, but in the meantime those using it would have to pay the increased tax upon it. He understood, also, that works were being started in the neighbourhood of Rockhampton, and that experts had been introduced from Germany to establish them. He could understand the proposal if the Colonial Treasurer was to say that the tax should come into force after two or three months from the date of the issue of the tariff, say from the first November or December, so as not to unnecessarily tax those who were getting the article while provision was being made for the establishment of works for its production locally. However, he could see from the proceedings of the Committee that it was no use either proposing amendments or making any objection on the Opposition side, as everything was being carried on party lines. The hon. members for Woothakata and Toombul had each spoken one way and voted the other, and hon.

members opposite were voting as the Colonial Treasurer wished. They could not hope to carry anything on the Opposition side while the tariff was being dealt with on party lines and by party votes.

Mr. ISAMBERT said he wished to move an amendment to put a tax of 10s. per cwt. on silicate of soda.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that amendments that were not amendments upon the wording of the tariff as proposed had better be left until they came to the *ad valorem* duties. The hon. member would have an opportunity of moving his amendment before they discussed the articles placed in the *ad valorem* list.

The Hon. Sir S. W. GRIFFITH said he had a question to ask which might be answered now, and save a discussion at a subsequent time, when there was no particular question before the Committee. He saw that sulphuric acid was the only acid mentioned in the proposed tariff, and he would like to know why other acids were to pay a duty under the *ad valorem* duties. In Victoria muriatic, nitric, tartaric, and "other acids" were free. He understood they were used largely in manufactures.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that he had inquired into the matter to see whether he could put them on the free list, but he did not get sufficient information to justify him in putting them on the free list as being the basis of any manufactures here. No doubt that was the reason they were placed on the free list in Victoria, and that reason might arise here in time.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved—

That there be raised, levied, collected, and paid on—Saltpetre and oatmeal, per cwt., 4s.; fish (pickled or salted, in casks) and dried fish, per cwt., 5s.; cordage and rope, per cwt., 8s.

Mr. ARCHER said he was going to move an amendment as he wanted his porridge free, and he hoped every member of the Committee would support him. He thought the Colonial Treasurer, on considering the matter, would see it was rather a shabby thing to put a tax on their morning porridge. Let them have a free breakfast table if they could. He would move that the words "and oatmeal" be struck out.

Mr. ISAMBERT said he had an amendment to move before that. He would move that the word "saltpetre" be omitted. It was absolutely necessary for the manufacture of sulphuric acid, and was used in curing meat and for other purposes, and should be placed on the free list.

The Hon. Sir S. W. GRIFFITH said it was on the free list in Victoria.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had not altered it. It would pay the same duty as at the present time, and he saw no reason for altering it.

Mr. TOZER said that it and sulphur were the two ingredients of sulphuric acid which they wished to see locally made.

The Hon. W. PATTISON said that was another mistake. Nitrate of soda was the other ingredient, and there was a great deal of difference, though he could not explain it.

The Hon. Sir S. W. GRIFFITH said he was under the impression that nitrate of soda was but another name for saltpetre.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. ARCHER moved that the words "and oatmeal" be omitted.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that in going over the tariff he wanted to get revenue, and he had it in his mind that oatmeal was a

luxury, and the proposed tax might be an encouragement to farmers. It came from New South Wales and Victoria, and he thought what they could do could be done here. The hon. member had better let the duty stand.

Mr. ARCHER: Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he will let the amendment pass?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: No.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he was going to vote with the hon. member for Rockhampton more because of the children than himself. No doubt oatmeal was the ingredient upon which many children were fed, and for their sakes he hoped the Colonial Treasurer would allow the amendment to be carried.

Mr. SALKELD said the Treasurer told them that what could be done in Victoria could be done here. He felt sure that oats for oatmeal could not be grown here.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Yes, they can.

Mr. SALKELD said the climate was against it. They could grow oats for green food and hay, but not for making into meal. He could assure the Treasurer that a large number of people were now using oatmeal for their children. They could not be induced to use maize meal. He knew many persons who formerly thought oatmeal not suitable for the climate, but they had changed their minds. It was one of the best articles of food, and they should encourage people to use it. He should be glad to see it on the free list.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it was not, of course, quite in his line to correct a gentleman representing a farming district, but when the hon. gentleman said the colony could not grow oats he must contradict him. He found that the production of the green crop had increased from 1,274 bushels in 1878 to 13,343 bushels in 1887, whereas the hay crop had increased at a far less rate—from 7 tons to 15 tons.

The Hon. Sir S. W. GRIFFITH said the hon. member referred to oats grown for horses. He did not think oats were grown in Queensland as food for men.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Why not?

The Hon. Sir S. W. GRIFFITH said that they did not suit the climate. He did not believe there was any more reason for taxing oatmeal than for taxing flour. There was no reason why the duty should be doubled; 4s. per cwt. was 3d. per lb. which was a high tax.

Mr. DRAKE said if the hon. member intended to divide the Committee he should like to hear an expression of opinion from farming representatives as to the capabilities of the colony for producing oats suitable for making oatmeal; because if oats could be grown here, it was better that they should be ground here than that the meal should be imported from outside.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said some hon. members were always saying that a cabbage could not be grown in the colony. He believed oats could be grown here very well. He would point out that the total amount of oatmeal imported was 683 tons. Of that quantity 351 tons, or about 60 per cent., came from Victoria, where the import duty was 6s. per cent. That was almost double what was now proposed.

The Hon. Sir S. W. GRIFFITH: That is a protective duty.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the fact was that Victoria was able to supply herself cheaply to sell to us.

Mr. SALKELD said he would like to hear of a case where oats had been grown for making

oatmeal. The oats spoken of by the Colonial Secretary were grown for horse feed and seed, but there had been none grown for human food, because the climate was against it. It was difficult enough to grow wheat here, and still more difficult to grow oats. Oats were not suitable for hot climates, and if the duty was made 8s. per cwt., instead of 4s., not a single bushel would be made into oatmeal.

Mr. GRIMES said he could speak as a farmer, and could say that oats suitable for horse feed could be grown very well, but there was not sufficient body in the oats to grind it up for oatmeal. It would not pay to grind up Queensland oats for oatmeal.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said if hon. gentlemen would look at the statistics they would find that for ten years the average production of wheat was 10 bushels per acre, whilst oats averaged 14 bushels per acre.

Mr. McMASTER said there were various kinds of oats. It was only once in ten or twelve years that they had a good season on the Downs for feed oats. He believed last season the oats grew to more perfection than they had done for the last twelve years, but he was quite sure that not once in twelve years would they get oats fit to grind into oatmeal. If a duty of £20 a ton was put on oatmeal they would still have to import it.

Mr. GROOM said there was no doubt they would never get rid of the prejudice that nothing could be grown in Queensland. That absurd notion had gone abroad, and no one would credit the amount of damage it had done, and the capital that it had driven from the colony. He had no doubt whatever that as good oats could be grown on the tablelands of the Downs as could be grown anywhere.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. GROOM: Hon. members said "no," but he had seen acres of oats grown on the Downs, and yet they were importing oats from the other colonies. Out of the whole amount of oatmeal imported last year, only 31 tons came from the mother country, 107 tons from New South Wales, 381 tons from Victoria, 51 tons from Tasmania, and 104 tons from New Zealand, and those colonies were manufacturing the meal. He supposed they would be told next that they could not grow maize for maize meal.

Mr. McMASTER: Yes.

Mr. GROOM: What maize meal did the hon. member sell? Was it Queensland?

Mr. McMASTER: Yes.

Mr. GROOM: Where was it manufactured?

Mr. McMASTER: At Mr. Pettigrew's mill.

Mr. GROOM said he was glad the hon. member was selling something grown in the colony. He was very glad there was one thing they could make in the colony, and that was maize meal. That appeared to be the only thing they could make out of their natural products. He saw that it was proposed to send home some 500 copies of the "Queensland Guide" to tell the people in the old country what could be grown here, and then, when they came out, they would be told by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley that nothing could be made in the colony from what they grew.

Mr. McMASTER: I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. GROOM said they had to contend against that absurd belief, and he was perfectly sure that if that tariff were framed on anything like liberal protective lines, they would have industries of that kind. They would require machinery, no doubt, to manufacture oatmeal, just as they did

to make flour. The hon. member for Normanby said that the flour from the Darling Downs was not good, and would not make good bread. He would advise the hon. gentleman to go to one of the best hotels in Warwick, on his next visit to that place, and ask the landlady to submit a loaf manufactured out of Warwick flour, and he would find the quality of the bread quite as good as if it had been made from Adelaide flour. The assumption had grown that nothing could be grown in the colony, and that was what the farmers had to contend against. He should vote for the proposal of the hon. gentleman on oatmeal, so as, if possible, to establish the manufacture in the colony. At all events they should give the industry a trial, and if it were found they could not manufacture oatmeal, by-and-by they would have got so disgustingly rich by this tariff that they could remit the duty. They should try and get rid of that prejudice. That was the greatest bugbear which members of that Committee had to contend with. It was perfectly absurd to ask people to come here and settle on the public lands, and then when they had grown anything to cry out that it was colonial, and that they must have the imported article.

THE HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said he had no sympathy with those who decried the colony—quite the contrary; but it was no use shutting their eyes to facts. Everyone knew that certain products could only grow in certain climates, and if those climates were not to be found in Queensland those products could not grow here, and it was no disparagement to the colony to say so. If oats would grow in Queensland fit to make oatmeal, he should be disposed even then to hesitate to impose that duty, because he regarded oatmeal very much the same as flour. As a matter of fact, however, it was notorious that not a pound of oatmeal had ever been made in the colony, nor had its manufacture ever been tried. There was no reason why it should not be, if the oats could be grown here, but they could not make the oatmeal without the oats. No hon. gentleman had ever seen a bushel of oats grown in Queensland that could have been made into oatmeal.

MR. ALLAN said he would just remark that in the year 1878 the oats grown in the colony amounted to 1,200 bushels, and that had gradually increased to 13,000 bushels last year; and out of those 13,000 bushels they grew 10,000 bushels on the Darling Downs about Warwick and Toowoomba.

THE HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: What do you do with them?

MR. ALLAN said they fed horses with them, and in Scotland they had the saying, "What makes good horses makes good men." He believed the oats grown on the Darling Downs were quite as good as what they imported, although they had not yet manufactured them into oatmeal. They had been told that of all the oatmeal they used only 31 tons came from England; and they grew enough oats on the Darling Downs to make 200 tons of meal a year. That was taking the quantity grown at present, and if there was a large market it would be no trouble to grow much more. They could grow as good oats round Toowoomba, Warwick, and Stanthorpe as could be grown in any of the other colonies, or in any part of the world.

MR. HAMILTON said it had been argued that, because oats could be grown in Victoria, they could be grown in Queensland; but they must remember that the climates were entirely different. No one disputed that a great many bushels had been grown on the Darling Downs, and that the amount was yearly increasing, but they had the evidence of practical farmers to prove that although the oats were very good

for horses, they were not good for human food. The duty, however, at 2s. per cwt. only amounted to £1,391, and that would be doubled if they made the duty 4s. per cwt. He thought they should not increase the duty above that they had hitherto been paying, and when in two or three years they paid off the £600,000 Treasury bills which had been left the Government as a legacy by their predecessors, they then perhaps could put oatmeal on the free list.

MR. McMASTER said he wished to reply to the statement of the hon. member for Toowoomba. That hon. gentleman made sweeping charges against hon. members, and particularly against him. For instance, he had charged him with having stated that nothing good for food could be grown in Queensland. He had never said anything of the kind. The words the hon. member had used were: "The hon. member for Fortitude Valley has stated over and over again that nothing good for food can be grown in the colony." He knew what farming produce was quite as well as the hon. member for Toowoomba, and what he had said was: "Providence grew the goods, but the farmers spoiled them." He said that they could not grow oats, or manufacture oatmeal. Although they grew oats they were no good, and it would not pay to erect machinery for the production of oatmeal. He knew that there were magnificent articles grown on the Darling Downs, but the Darling Downs were not the whole of the colony. He admitted that some good produce was grown there, but they were not going to consume all they grew. He was willing and ready to assist to protect those farmers, but he was not going to do that at the expense of everyone else.

MR. SMYTH said it was proposed to increase the duty on oatmeal from 2s. to 4s. a cwt. That was an act of great ingratitude on the part of the present Government. It should have been called, not the "National party," but the "oatmeal party." They all knew very well that the "Glasgow reunions," the "Paisley bodies," and the "Two Hoors at Hame," and all those bodies had put the present Government in power—not the "National party"; certainly they had been assisted by a branch of the "National party" from another part of the world. That was the assistance which the Government received in getting into power; and now they proposed to increase the tax on the oatmeal which those people consumed from 2s. to 4s. That was the gratitude they showed to those who returned them to power. They could not grow oats in this colony. But they had the hon. member for Toowoomba trying to shove that business on because they thought they could grow oats at Toowoomba. Toowoomba was not the colony; there were other places in Queensland besides those little districts within a hundred miles of Brisbane. He did not want oatmeal himself; it made him feel rather itchy; but it was, he knew, useful for some purposes. As for oats, it had been argued that there had been a large increase in the quantity produced in the colony. That was quite correct. But there had also been a large increase in the number of racehorses, and they consumed the oats—not human beings. If the hon. member for Toowoomba insisted upon any increase in the duty on articles eaten by human beings, the mining party in that Committee would go against him. They would do all they could to make the life of the working man in this colony as easy as possible, and to make the cost of living as cheap as possible.

MR. UNMACK said he would very much like to see the amendment of the hon. member for Rockhampton carried. On the other hand, however, he was afraid, looking at the way the tariff

had been carried so far, that the hon. member had gone too far with his proposal. He would therefore suggest a compromise which it would probably be considered an act of good grace for the Treasurer to accede to, seeing that so many members desired to reduce that duty. He (Mr. Unmack) had, as the Committee were aware, given notice of an amendment to reduce the duty to the old rate of 2d. per lb. If the Treasurer, who had carried his measure so far, would make that concession it would no doubt be appreciated.

Mr. ARCHER said the hon. member who last spoke seemed to have misunderstood him. He did not propose that oatmeal should be put on the free list, but only that it should be omitted from that paragraph with the view of putting on a smaller duty later on.

Mr. UNMACK: I did not understand that.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the paragraph—put, and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 34.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Nelson, Morehead, Black, Macrossan, Donaldson, Stevenson, O'Connell, Morgan-Laya, Jordan, Dunsmuir, Allan, Stephens, Stevens, Foxton, Gannon, Dalrymple, Campbell, North, Little, G. H. Jones, Annear, Corfield, Agnew, Plunkett, Adams, Watson, Rees R. Jones, Lyons, Crombie, Pattison, Murphy, and Groom.

NOES, 32.

Sir S. W. Griffith, Messrs. Ratledge, Drake, Paul, Hodgkinson, Glassey, Barlow, O'Sullivan, Archer, Grimes, Philp, Sayers, Smith, Murray, Macfarlane, Powers, Lissner, Hamilton, Goldring, Palmer, Cowley, Buckland, Smyth, Tozer, McMaster, Hunter, Hyne, Unmack, Wimbale, Isambert, Salkeld, and Mellor.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. MELLOR said, with reference to oatmeal, he would like to see the duty retained as at present—2s. per cwt. He knew a good deal about oats, having had a good deal of experience in connection with that product in the old country, and he had never seen any grown in Queensland that oatmeal could be made from. He thought it would be a great hardship on the working classes if the duty were increased, as they used oatmeal very largely indeed. He, therefore, moved that the figure "4s." be omitted with the view of inserting "2s."

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the question had just been settled by division that the duty should be 4s. per cwt. The understanding upon which they had gone all through was that when it was decided that a word should stand in the tariff it was affirmed to stand with the duty as proposed, otherwise there would be no end to the matter.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said the hon. gentleman was quite correct as to the understanding, but, as a matter of form, the amendment could be moved.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said if the proposal of the hon. member for Gympie were agreed to, to substitute "2s." for "4s.," it would affect saltpetre as well as oatmeal. It was only prolonging the discussion.

Mr. MELLOR said he did not want to alter saltpetre, but he certainly understood, when the last division was taken that, although oatmeal was retained, it was quite within the scope of the Committee to alter the duty from 4s. to 2s. per cwt., or to any other sum.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said he understood the intention of the hon. member for Rockhampton to be to make oatmeal free.

Mr. ARCHER said he moved that the word be omitted for the purpose of inserting a lower duty.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said he did not think it was worth while raising the question again, because the last division substantially decided that the duty should be 4s.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he would like to understand from the leader of the Opposition what was the effect of the last division. According to the understanding upon which they had been going all through, the result of that division was that oatmeal was to be 4s. per cwt. What, then, was the use of taking another division?

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said he had suggested that it was undesirable to take another division, although, as a matter of form, the amendment could be put.

Question—That the paragraphs, as read, stand part of the tariff—put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved—

That there be raised, levied, and collected on—Soap per cwt., 10s.

Mr. PHILP said he had an amendment to move in regard to "cordage and rope."

The COLONIAL TREASURER: That has just been passed.

Mr. SALKELD said it was inconvenient to take more than one line of the tariff at a time. Several hon. members had been misled by so doing. They were not aware that "cordage and rope" had been passed. It would be much better to take one line at a time. They would then know what they were doing.

Mr. PHILP said he had already moved as an amendment that there be a reduction on cordage and rope.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said it was too late to go into that question now. The three paragraphs had been put from the chair and passed.

Mr. HUNTER said he heard the hon. member for Townsville put his amendment with regard to rope; but as the hon. member for Rockhampton said he had an amendment to come before it, the hon. member for Townsville's amendment was postponed until that had been disposed of.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the item had been passed, and there was no rule by which they could go back to it.

Mr. MACFARLANE said there was no doubt the three paragraphs were put from the chair, but it was equally certain that some hon. members understood they were voting for only one. The suggestion of the hon. member for Fassifern, to take the items one by one, was a good one.

Mr. GRIMES said he had been misled by the three paragraphs being put together. He had intended to move an amendment in one of the items, and now found himself blocked out.

Mr. PHILP said he thought it was not yet too late to discuss his amendment.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said it was quite impossible, according to the forms of the House, to do that. If the hon. member wished to move an amendment on an item that had passed, he must wait until the Bill got into committee.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said there were two other opportunities of moving amendments—on the motion that the report from the Committee be adopted, and again in Committee on the Bill.

Mr. ISAMBERT moved, as an amendment, that the words "and silicate of soda" be inserted after the word "soap." Silicate of soda was only used for the manufacture of cheap, adulterated

soap. If the Colonial Treasurer would admit caustic soda free it would answer the purpose far better.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said it would be much more convenient, if hon. members had any new duties to propose, that they would do so at the end of the printed tariff. That was the way he had arranged to call upon them.

Mr. ISAMBERT said that in that case he would, with the permission of the Committee, withdraw his amendment.

Amendment withdrawn accordingly.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved—

That there be raised, levied, and collected upon—Coal, per ton, 2s.

Mr. GLASSEY said he intimated some time ago that when the question of the duty on coal came before the Committee, he would move as an amendment, that it be increased from 2s. to 3s. per ton. Coal-mining was not a prospective industry, but one that was already established. The mines were here and the people were here to work them, and it was desirable that the industry should receive more encouragement than it had received in the past. When he told hon. members that during the years 1885, 1886, and 1887 there had been imported into the colony 77,299 tons of coal they would see the necessity of increasing the duty. In the year 1885 there were imported into the colony 39,270 tons 9 cwt. 2 qrs., the value being £23,542, and the duty collected £2,721 12s. 10d. In the year 1886 there were imported 21,122 tons 7 cwt., the value of which was £14,616, and the duty collected £1,452 1s. 9d. In the year 1887 there were imported 16,906 tons 12 cwt., the value of which was £9,964 and the duty collected £1,209 7s. 9d. The total quantity imported was 77,299 tons 8 cwt., the total value of which was £48,122, and the duty collected £5,383 2s. 4d. He hoped that the statement made by the hon. member for Gympie that no recommendations made from the Opposition side were accepted, would not be borne out upon the present occasion, further than that he might mention that the increased amount imported had occasioned a considerable falling off in their railway receipts. In the year 1886 the quantity of coal brought down from the mines in the Bundamba district was 163,238 tons, while in the following year it was only 139,303 tons, or a difference of 23,935 tons. He considered that the industry required further encouragement, and therefore moved that the words "2s." be struck out with a view of inserting "3s."

The COLONIAL TREASURER said figures were very dangerous, unless they were used properly. He could have used the figures quoted by the hon. member to have proved the very opposite to what the hon. member wished to prove. The hon. member had proved that under the impost of 1s. 6d. per ton the importation of coal had decreased, and that the output of coal had steadily increased. He also tried to support his argument by saying that there was less coal carried by the Southern and Western Railway last year than during the year before, but he knew very well at the time that so much more coal came down by river. The amount of coal produced in the Southern districts had wonderfully increased, and the importation had steadily decreased. All that proved that the tax of 1s. 6d. per ton had acted pretty well. That was the proper use of the hon. member's figures. He (the Colonial Treasurer) had had a great deal of consideration as to whether he should impose that extra 6d. or not, as it was a matter that required treating with considerable caution. If the dis-

tribution of Queensland coal were pretty equal all over the colony it would have been different, but at the present time, if they increased the duty, they would be increasing the output of coal in the South at the expense of the North. Nearly all the coal that was imported went to the North. The present output of coal cost about 7s. per ton, and 2s. duty extra would be a pretty fair protection. He was quite sure that the coal miners themselves thought it was a fair thing, and they did not expect any more. At all events, that was all the Government saw their way to put upon it, and would vote against the increase proposed by the hon. member.

Mr. ANNEAR said he would call the attention of the Colonial Treasurer to a matter he referred to a few days ago. That hon. gentleman had just stated that the North consumed most of the imported coal. The matter he referred to did not affect the Northern people at all, but only one or two companies. He alluded to the conveying of coal from Newcastle to certain hulks along the coast, which coal paid no duty. He believed that over three miles from the coast coal was not liable to pay duty, and that was an injustice to the coal proprietors and the coal-miners. The Treasurer should impose a duty upon all coal coming into Queensland waters. It was known to every hon. member that the A.U.S.N. Company had coal hulks in every port north of Rockhampton, and that they procured the coal at Newcastle. There had been a steamer, or steamers, continually employed in conveying coal from Newcastle to those hulks, and no duty was paid upon it. There were two of those hulks at Townsville.

Mr. LYONS said he did not like to ventilate his own private grievances, but might mention that within the last few days it had come to his knowledge, and to the knowledge of the Government, that good coal had been found in the North, near Rockhampton, on the Styx river, and within four miles or five miles of deep water. He did not believe in bothering the Government, and simply asked them to make a survey. If the advice he had got was correct, he believed the harbour-master, after he made his survey, would do what he said. He took that public opportunity of expressing his appreciation of the assistance he had received from the Government in the matter, and he might add that those for whom he was dealing were satisfied with the tariff as it stood.

Mr. POWERS said he took it the increased duty on coal was put on for protectionist, and not revenue purposes. For his own part, he did not believe that the extra duty of 6d. a ton on coal would keep out the Newcastle coal; though that must have been the Colonial Treasurer's intention, as he did not want the increase for revenue purposes. There was a good deal in the remarks of the hon. member for Maryborough, with respect to the storing of coal in hulks at Thursday Island and Townsville. The steamers brought the coal to those places, landed it in the hulks, and used it afterwards without paying duty upon it. He hoped that now the attention of the Colonial Treasurer had been called to that matter, he would make inquiry into the practice followed. He would support the extra duty proposed by the hon. member for Bundamba, because he was satisfied that the increase of 6d. a ton in the duty, as proposed by the tariff, would not shut out the Newcastle coal. There was another thing which must be borne in mind—that after the strike which had taken place in Newcastle, the coal-mine proprietors of that place would have to make a trade when work was started again. Coal was now being imported into Melbourne in

as large quantities as before the strike, and that meant that other mines had been developed and the output of coal largely increased. It was patent, then, to everybody that when work was again started in Newcastle the people there would have to make great efforts to make a trade to get back to their position before the strike, and he was satisfied that they would find them under-selling the Queensland coal to do it. To enable them to compete with the Newcastle coal under the circumstances it was necessary that they should increase the duty on coal. The matter certainly deserved the serious consideration of the Committee. Another important matter was, that in connection with the coal industry there was only a very small margin of profit. It was not like gold or other minerals, as nearly all the profits from coal went into the miners' pockets, and the industry supported a large population and merited the consideration of the Committee. Again, in the coal lands in the Burrum district, and he supposed elsewhere, there was a tax upon every ton of coal raised from Crown lands; so that, though they were to be protected to the extent of 2s. per ton, they were on the other hand taxed by a royalty. For those reasons he hoped the Colonial Treasurer would see his way to increase the duty by 1s., as he believed that would be found necessary to keep the coal industry of the colony even in its present condition.

Mr. PHILP said he hoped the Premier would not be induced to increase the duty, as it was quite high enough. It was all nonsense for the hon. member for Burrum to say that by increasing the duty they would be able to keep out the Newcastle coal. The Newcastle coal brought to the colony was consumed in the Northern part of the colony, simply because it was the only coal that would stand shipment. The coal shipped from Brisbane and from Maryborough was half dust before it got to the North. He had tried the Burrum, the Brisbane, and the Newcastle coal, and he believed that if a duty of 10s. a ton was put upon coal the people of the North would rather have the Newcastle coal, and would find it cheaper then. The hon. member for Maryborough talked about coal being stored in hulks without paying duty, but he took it that coal might be stored in bond just like whisky or any other article, and that duty need not be paid upon it unless it was used in the colony.

Mr. ANNEAR: But it is used in the colony.

Mr. PHILP said that he could tell the hon. member that that coal was not used in the colony. The bulk of the coal brought from Newcastle went to Thursday Island, and the A.U.S.N. Company used mostly Brisbane coal at Townsville; though he believed they did so at a loss to themselves. There was another hulk there, the property of another firm who used Newcastle coal and sold it to the gas companies and small steamers about the place. He repeated that if the duty was increased to 10s. a ton he believed the people of the North would use Newcastle coal, because after being shipped to the North a ton of it was equal to from a ton to a ton and a-half of Brisbane or Burrum coal.

Mr. ANNEAR said the hon. gentleman, no doubt, spoke from a Townsville point of view. The hon. gentleman told the Committee that the Burrum and Brisbane coal went into dust, but he could tell the Committee that he had travelled from Southport the other day with the Hon. A. C. Gregory—a gentleman who was generally acknowledged to be a good authority upon coal—and that gentleman had told him that, from different analyses he had made from time to time, he could say that the Burrum coal was equal to any found in Australia. It

had been tested time after time, ton for ton, with the Newcastle coal, and the Burrum coal had proved equal in every respect to the Newcastle coal. He believed also that the Ipswich coal was quite equal to the Newcastle coal. It surprised him that hon. members who got so wealthy through doing business in this colony did not leave such a place where everything was inferior to what they could get in the other colonies. He hoped the proposed increase to 3s. per ton would be passed by the Committee. What did more for the progress of the colony than to have a large body of men located, as they had in the Southern and Central districts of the colony at the present time, engaged in that industry? They had plenty of coal in the colony, and where a hundred men were now employed they could employ a thousand, if they got some such encouragement as was asked for. He would have failed in his duty if he allowed the hon. member to make such an assertion as he made when he knew it was utterly untrue.

Mr. PHILP said he had tried the Burrum, the Brisbane, and the Newcastle coals, and there was no comparison between them. The Burrum and Brisbane coals might be very good if used without transhipment. He could tell the Committee a little story about Brisbane coal. Only last week large shipments of Brisbane coal were sent from here to Melbourne. One parcel was sold to arrive to the gas company at 40s. per ton. They forfeited 15s. a ton rather than take it. That was some that was shipped only a week or ten days ago. No doubt the Burrum coal was very good if used in Maryborough, but it was so soft that it would not stand shipping.

Mr. LYONS said, although he did not know a great deal about coal, he spoke on the authority of a scientist, and therefore had a right to speak, and he was assured that the coal he had referred to was equal to the best English or Newcastle coal. Mining operations to obtain that coal were conducted through kerosene shale, so that there was no dust about it. He had it on the authority of a gentleman in Rockhampton—a man whose business it was to test coal for the Government—that a great deal of Queensland coal was of a similar quality.

Mr. PAUL said he had had some little experience of the coal trade in Newcastle, and he felt confident that a protective duty of 2s. per ton would not interfere in any way with the coal industry of Queensland. He had seen the coal of the Burrum and Ipswich districts also, and was convinced that the former, at any rate, was equal to any produced in the Newcastle district.

Mr. WATSON said he had used Ipswich coal for the last ten years, and had found it had changed remarkably for the better each year. He could assure hon. members that Newcastle coal was not as good as some of the Ipswich coal. He had travelled in the mail boats and coasting steamers, and was informed by the engineers that there had been a great change for the better in the Queensland coal of late years. He trusted that a duty of 3s. would be put on.

Mr. GOLDRING said he hoped there would be no further increase in the duty on coal. He could support the remarks of the member for Townsville that Maryborough and Ipswich coal would not stand carrying and handling. It might be very good if used on the spot, but when it was transhipped it lost its goodness, and Newcastle coal was preferred. If the coal was as good as some hon. gentlemen stated, he did not see any reason for its requiring protection. He did not see any reason why the North should be called upon to pay for protecting a few people in the South. The hon. member for Maryborough mentioned that it would be better to see a number

of people settled here than that the industry should be injured by the importation of Newcastle coal, but he certainly thought that the people of the North had a perfect right to use Newcastle coal if they preferred it.

Mr. GLASSEY said they had been told an extra duty on coal would be put on at the expense of the North. That, he presumed, meant that the Southern coal was of no use in the North, and that opinion was supplemented by the member for Townsville, Mr. Philp. That hon. member cited a case in which coal, purchased by the Melbourne Gas Company, had been rejected, owing to it being soft, but he would point out to the hon. member that that coal had been lying at the pit's mouth at Bundamba for some time, and, of course, had deteriorated in consequence. The reason for that was that there had been no demand for that coal, and when the rush came lately it was sold, and doubtless to some extent would injure the Ipswich district. The Treasurer also said that, notwithstanding the duty of 1s. 6d., the coal did not go down by rail, but by river; but he would point out that since 1886 the increase in production had been little more than 20,000 tons. That coal had been tested in Brisbane over and over again, and had been proved to be as good as any coal that had yet come into the colony. Whatever the hon. Treasurer might say, he intended to divide the Committee on the question.

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

AYES, 37.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Nelson, Black, Palmer, Morehead, Macrossan, Donaldson, Luya, Hamilton, Hodgkinson, Murphy, Stevenson, Pattison, Crombie, Dunsinure, Paul, Lyons, Rees R. Jones, Adams, Plunkett, Agnew, Campbell, Murray, Corfield, G. H. Jones, Little, Battersby, North, Cowley, Smyth, Goldring, Dalrymple, Lissner, Archer, Allan, Smith, and Philp.

NOES, 25.

Sir S. W. Griffith, Messrs. Rutledge, Jordan, Groom, Isambert, Wimble, Foxton, Unmack, Ilyne, McMaster, Watson, Annear, Tozer, Powers, Mellor, Sayers, Grimes, Gannon, Stevens, Glassey, Barlow, Drake, O'Connell, Morgan, and Stephens.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph put and passed.

On the motion of the COLONIAL TREASURER, the House resumed; the CHAIRMAN reported progress, and obtained leave to sit again to-morrow.

MESSAGES FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

QUEENSLAND PERMANENT TRUSTEE, EXECUTOR, AND FINANCE AGENCY COMPANY (LIMITED) BILL.

The SPEAKER reported the receipt of a message from the Legislative Council, in reply to that of the Legislative Assembly, requesting that leave be given to the Hons. J. S. Turner, Esq., F. T. Brentnall, Esq., and W. H. Wilson, Esq., to attend and be examined before the Select Committee on the Queensland Permanent Trustee, Executor, and Finance Agency Company (Limited) Bill, and intimating that leave had been given to the said members to attend and give evidence if they thought fit.

SALE AND USE OF POISONS BILL.

The SPEAKER announced that he had also received a message from the Legislative Council, intimating that they had passed this Bill, and forwarding it to the Legislative Assembly for their concurrence.

1888—2 H

FIRST READING.

On the motion of Mr. FOXTON, the Bill was read a first time, and the second reading made an Order of the Day for Thursday next.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER moved—That this House do now adjourn.

Question put and passed; and the House adjourned at ten minutes to 11 o'clock.