Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 3 OCTOBER 1888

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 3 October, 1888.

Questions.—Motion for Adjournment—Answer to Question.—Motion for Adjournment—The Agent-General and the Imperial Federation League.—Australasian Natives' Trustees, Executors, and Finance Agency Company (Limited).—Error in Division List.—Day Dawn Gold-Mining Company's Branch Railway Bill—first reading.—Ann Street Presbyterian Church Bill—first reading.—Ways and Means—resumption of committee.—Adournment.

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

QUESTIONS.

Mr. SMYTH asked the Minister for Mines and Works :—

1. Is it the intention of the Government to assist local authorities in the construction of bridges?—If so, to what extent?

2. How much of the £100,000 loan for this purpose is now unappropriated?

3. In what manner have the various amounts been given, up to the present time?

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS (Hon. J. M. Macrossan) replied :—

1. Yes; of certain bridges, to the extent of one-third of their cost.

2. £28,016 6s. 3d.

3. Bridges carried out under the supervision of the department, by advances as the work proceeds. When grants are given to local bodies the amount is generally paid on completion of bridge, after inspection and approval.

Mr. DRAKE asked the Chief Secretary :—

1. Is it true that Mr. T. Archer, Agent-General for Queensland, was until recently a member of the Imperial Federation League?

2. Is it true that Mr. Archer has resigned his membership, on the ground that the league is presided over by Lord Rosebery?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon Sir T. McIlwraith) replied :—

The answer to both questions is, I do not know.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

ANSWER TO QUESTION.

Mr. DRAKE said: Mr. Speaker,—In order to put myself right, I will conclude with a motion for the adjournment of the House. I must say I am not satisfied with the answer given by the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government to my question. No doubt it is true that he does not know at the present time; but I submit that the question is of sufficient importance for the hon. gentleman to take some means of ascertaining whether the statement we have heard is true or not.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir T. McIlwraith) said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. member is out of order. He cannot discuss the question without notice.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said: Mr. Speaker,—The practice of the House of Commons is invariably to do so. I believe a ruling was once given here inadvertently, to the effect that such matters could not be discussed on the same day, but certainly it is the practice of the House of Commons when a member is not satisfied with an answer given by a Minister for that member to raise a discussion, provided he can secure (as now required by the new rules) the support of a certain number of members.

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker,—The practice here is that no question can be discussed on the same day. If the hon. member wishes to move the adjournment of the House to-morrow, he may do so. If it will save him any trouble, I will tell him at once that I will not spend one penny in finding out the information he wishes for.

The SPEAKER said: The practice in this House, so far as I am aware, is uncertain. Though there are instances where a motion of adjournment has been made after a question has been answered, in order that the matter might be discussed, it is against the practice of the House of Commons to raise, on a motion for adjournment, a discussion on an answer to a question, not only on the same day, but during the session in which the answer has been given. In connection with this, on the 357th page of the ninth edition of "May," will be found the following paragraph:—

"Sometimes when an answer has been given, further questions are addressed to the Minister upon the same subject, but no observations or comments are then permitted to be made."

Of course if no observations or comments are to be made there can be no discussion; and it has been ruled by Mr. Speaker Brand that the rule which forbids reference to a past debate of the same session applies also to answers to questions. Therefore, if we are to be guided by the rules of the House of Commons in a matter of this kind and follow the ruling given by Mr. Speaker Brand, there can be no discussion on an answer to a question on a motion for adjournment. I think the matter is one which, having been allowed to pass unnoticed previously, might well be left to the decision of the House, rather than to the Speaker's decision; but if I am called upon to decide I must decide in accordance with the decision of the House of Commons, seeing that we have no rule of our own.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I was not aware that you were going to give a decision or I would have spoken on the point of order. You say there have been certain precedents for a member raising a debate on an answer by a motion for adjournment; but though I have been a member of the House a long while I do not remember one. It is quite possible there may have been instances—and I am quite sure you are right, or you would not have made the statement—but they must have occurred through inadvertence. I will direct your attention, however, to the many times when debates were attempted on answers given to questions and the House refused to hear them, and the members attempting to debate the answers have been ruled out of order. Those instances are innumerable. But we do not require to go to the House of Commons for precedents. Standing Order 79 is plain enough:—

"In answering any such question, a member shall not debate the matter to which the same refers."

I do not think anything could be plainer than that. Supposing we were to relax this rule or depart from it in any way, what would be the consequence? A member might ask when the Government intend to commence a line of railway from the Gulf of Carpentaria to Roma; and if he were to get what he considered an unsatisfactory answer he might start a debate. In that way the whole of the time of Parliament might be frittered away on business not legitimately before it; and it was for that reason that the 79th Standing Order, which has always been obeyed, so far as I am aware, was inserted. The circumstances under which you say the Order has been departed from must have been small instances that escaped the attention of the House; but I know that the attention of the House has frequently been directed to the matter, and it has been ruled out of order. And so it ought to be. From what I have said it will be seen that we cannot possibly fall back on the custom of the House of Commons. That has been decided by Speakers previous to yourself. I remember having supported, for the purpose of getting information, the custom prevailing in the House of Commons of asking questions on the answers given by Ministers. When a Minister does not give his answer in the shape of a written reply, any legitimate question requiring a further answer is allowed to be asked, and he answers it; but that is a perfectly different custom from ours. I remember some years ago being ruled out of order for putting questions in that way—I believe it was by Mr. Speaker Groom, but I forget—and I thought it was a good practice at that time; but since then I have changed my mind, and now I think it is not.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said: Mr. Speaker,—The practice of this House has varied. I remember that the Speaker—I think Mr. Speaker King—once ruled, on a member moving the adjournment of the House to discuss an answer to a question, that he could not do so on the same day. Of course it is the rule that in asking a question no speech shall be made, and that is what the passage in "May," quoted by Mr. Speaker, refers to:—

"Sometimes, when an answer has been given, further questions are addressed to the Minister upon the same subject, but no observations or comments are then permitted to be made."

Under no circumstances are observations allowed to be made here, where the answer is written and read out. In England it is the practice to make a speech in answering a question, and that is what the paragraph quoted refers to. It does not refer to moving the adjournment of the House. The other passage you read simply means that if you do not raise the question on that day you cannot do so on any subsequent day—that if a discussion on the answer takes place at all it must take place on the day it is given. In the House of Commons, on an answer being given, a member may move the adjournment of the House, and that is the practice in the other colonies. In "Brand's Decisions" I find this, which, if not directly, bears indirectly upon the question:—

"It is not usual to move the adjournment of the House on a question in the absence of the member interrogated.

"Parliament—Leitrim County Election.—Question: Captain Nolan rose to ask the Secretary of State for War a question.

"In the absence of the Secretary of State, no answer being given,

"Captain Nolan moved the adjournment of the House, in order to make some observations.

"Mr. Speaker said it was an unusual course for an hon. member to move the adjournment of the House on a question when those who alone were able to give explanations on the subject were not in their places."

I do not remember any further authority bearing on the subject at the present time.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. B. D. Morehead) said: Mr. Speaker,—Every old member of the House must know that it has

been the practice—though no doubt sometimes broken by inadvertence—as pointed out by the Premier, to prevent any motion for adjournment being made on an answer to a question. I know I have myself broken the rule on more than one occasion, but when I did so I was running the blockade, and knew that it was not the rule and practice of the House. I think the practice should be here, not what seems to prevail in the Parliament of Great Britain, but what prevails in this House. I feel sure the hon. member for Toowoomba, who is, I believe, the oldest member of this House, will endorse what the Premier has said as to the practice of this House in dealing with such questions.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said: Mr. Speaker,—I think the decision given by you as to the practice of the House in these matters is not a correct one. I am as old a member of this House as the hon. member for Toowoomba, Mr. Groom, or any other hon. member——

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Not continuously in the House.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: And I know what the practice has been since I came here. That an answer, if not referred to on the day on which it is given, cannot be referred to next day or during the session, may be clearly the ruling of the House of Commons, but it has not been the practice here. Why, only the other day an answer was given to the hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Macfarlane, by the Minister for Works, and a day or two afterwards the hon. member for Ipswich replied to it on a motion for the adjournment. According to the ruling, you, Mr. Speaker, have given, that could not be done, and unless the discussion on the question took place on the spot it could not take place at all. It has been the common practice here for an hon. member to get up and move the adjournment of the House whenever curt and unbecoming answers have been given. What will be our remedy in such a case if we carry out the rule laid down by you? Then, again, it appears this rule may be broken or taken advantage of at any time by Ministers themselves, or other members. The Colonial Secretary has acknowledged that he breaks it whenever it suits him—whenever he wishes to run the blockade, or anything of that kind. What will happen if this rule you lay down is carried out to the letter? The result will be that no hon. member will ask a question at all, but will put the question in the shape of a motion; and what difference will there be between speaking to a motion involving a question and doing the same thing on a motion for the adjournment of the House? That will be the effect of carrying out the rule. With regard to the matter that has brought this thing about, I am not prepared to say anything about it at the present time. I do think, however——

The PREMIER: The hon. member is out of order. He must speak to the point of order, and not to the merits of the case on which it has arisen at all.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I was going to refer to the second question, which, I think, is not to the point, and is not true.

The PREMIER: That is part of the question on which the point of order has been raised.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: If we must only speak to the point of order, it will be for the hon. member to put his question in the shape of a motion for to-morrow, or some other day. I have the right to speak to the point of order, because it is not yet withdrawn. Where a curt answer has been given, what remedy has a man but to get up and speak upon it as the hon. member for Enoggera was doing? The hon. member did perfectly right in calling attention to the answers given to his questions, and I hold that if a shilling is not to be spent to find out whether a subject of this House has misconducted himself, simply because he does not happen to be within the colony, it is right that the matter should be brought before this House in some way. I hope the hon. member for Enoggera will bring the matter up. I do not suppose that a Grand Nationalist like the leader of the present Ministry is going to support an official at home in assisting Imperial federation, which we do not want. I will not say anything further upon the point now, though I may have something to say upon it if it is brought up again.

Mr. GROOM said: Mr. Speaker,—I am glad the Colonial Secretary made the admission he did just now, for his statement as to his action on previous occasions was a correct one. The Standing Order quoted by the hon. member at the head of the Government has been more honoured in the breach than in the observance of it, and that by both sides of the House. The practice adopted has been—I will not say always, but very frequently—when a question has been put and the answer to it is not considered satisfactory, that the adjournment of the House has been moved at a subsequent part of the sitting, usually before general business has been entered upon, in order to elicit a more satisfactory answer, or an explanation from the member of the Government to whom the question has been put. Nor is that practice inconsistent with the practice of the House of Commons, and I will give a case in point: When a certain distinguished Frenchman was appointed ambassador to the Court of St. James a question was asked by a member of the House of Commons as to whether that gentleman was not a member of the Commune that gave the order for the assassination of the Archbishop of Paris. The question was intervened by the Minister to whom it was addressed raising the point as to whether a question could be put in the House of Commons regarding the appointment of an ambassador from a friendly Power. It was debated throughout the House, and the question was referred to Mr. Speaker Brand as to whether a debate could take place on that or on any question.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Was the original question answered?

Mr. GROOM: The question was never answered; but Mr. Speaker Brand gave a ruling which it is as well this House should hear. This is the ruling he gave:—

"That the practice of moving the adjournment of the House, if a member is dissatisfied with the answer to his question, is within an hon. member's right, though highly inconvenient."

That was Mr. Speaker Brand's ruling on the 18th March, 1878. He gave the same ruling on the 25th March, 1878, and on the 14th June, 1880, he gave precisely the same ruling. I am one of those who think this House should be exceptionally jealous of being deprived of the advantage of any of the forms of debate, however small they may be. Those forms have been established for centuries, and I think they are the only protection the minority have in the House against the stronger party in power. They affect both sides alike, for we are in Opposition to-day and may be on the Government side some other day. We provide for the ventilation of grievances by moving the adjournment of the House. There are two ways in which this can be done: Either by intercepting a motion that the Speaker leave the chair to enable the House to go into Committee of Supply, or by a motion for the adjournment of the House when the discussion is capable of great expansion. I must say this, however, that all who have had any experience of parlia-

mentary government, whether as occupants of the Treasury benches or as leaders of the Opposition from time to time, know well that it is exceedingly inconvenient that a member, being dissatisfied with a reply given him, should move the adjournment of the House to try to get further information from the member to whom his question has been addressed. The member may not have the necessary documents by him to enable him to give the hon. member asking the question the information he seeks. So that, while an hon. member is distinctly within his right in moving the adjournment of the House under such circumstances, the inconvenience of the practice will be palpable to every member of experience. At the same time, it must not be forgotten that it is exceedingly undesirable to seek to abridge the rights hon. members have in endeavouring to obtain information through the forms of the House. There is also another point to which I would refer, and that is, Mr. Speaker, that in quoting some portions of "May" it must be borne in mind that, whatever the practice of the House of Commons in recent years may be, it has no bearing upon the proceedings of this House. What we have to rely upon is the practice of the House of Commons at the time our Standing Orders came into operation. You, Mr. Speaker, will require to remember that.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Then your reference to Mr. Speaker Brand does not apply.

Mr. GROOM: In the appeal case of Barton against Taylor, where the hon. member, Mr. Taylor, was suspended, it was clearly laid down by the decision of the Privy Council that the Standing Orders then in force in the House of Commons, which Mr. Barton was of opinion were in force in the New South Wales Parliament, did not operate in that colony. But the point I wish to call the attention of the hon. member for Enoggera to is that he is perfectly within his right according to the ruling of Mr. Speaker Brand——

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In 1878

Mr. GROOM: I say that according to that ruling the hon. member is perfectly within his right in moving the adjournment of the House.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: And upon that point the rules of the House of Commons have not been altered.

Mr. GROOM: No; the rules have not been altered upon that point. The absolute right of members has not been at all abridged from the time of the institution of the House of Commons up to the present time. The right of moving the adjournment of the House has, however, been abridged in form because, instead of an hon. member moving the adjournment of the House at his own will, he has now to obtain the consent of forty members, which is shown by their rising in their seat on the motion being made. If that is not done a member cannot now move the adjournment of the House.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS said: Mr. Speaker,—All the references which the hon. member who has just sat down, and the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition have made to decisions of Speakers of the House of Commons at different times up to twenty years ago, have no bearing whatever on the practice of this House. We have to be guided by the rules which we ourselves have made for this House, and by the practice of the House. It does not matter to us at the present moment on this question under discussion what the practice of the House of Commons may have been in 1878, or even what it is at present, in 1888. I can quote a case much later than those referred to by the hon. member for Toowoomba. I can quote it from memory, as I read it only last week. A question was asked of Mr. Balfour in the House of Commons regarding something relating to the management of Irish prisons. The question was answered in a manner unsatisfactory to the Irish members, and one of them got up to move the adjournment of the House to debate the matter, but was stopped by the Speaker. During the same evening, however, and almost immediately afterwards, another member of the same party, Mr. Justin McCarthy, managed to get the question discussed upon a motion for adjournment. But what has that to do with us? We have here a rule laid down for us which we must follow, unless we abrogate it.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: Where is it?

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: It is in this book, and I will read it to the hon. gentleman presently. But before going to the rule I will say something about the practice of this House. I cannot say that I am as old a member of the House as the hon. member for Stanley, or the hon. member for Toowoomba, or the Colonial Secretary. But I have been a member of the House for fifteen years continuously, and as the House has not been in existence thirty years, that is half of its whole existence. I think I can speak with some confidence as to the practice of the House. I can confidently say that I have never yet heard of a motion for adjournment being allowed to discuss an answer just given to a question if the Speaker's attention has been drawn by any member of the House to the impropriety of the question being discussed. Whenever that has been done, the Speaker has immediately stopped the member moving the adjournment, and the House has strengthened the hands of the Speaker. It has, however, been done inadvertently at times, or as the Colonial Secretary has said, when a member was running a blockade, but that really is no guide for the House. We must not make such a practice as that our guide; what we must take account of is what is the real practice of the House, and what is the rule of the House, not of what is done in running blockades or playing the part of privateers. The rule is plain enough, and should be made applicable to all members of the House. But before quoting the rule, I would say that the hon. member who moved the adjournment of the House seemed annoyed at the answer he got to his question. He could get no other answer, because no member of the Government is aware whether Mr. Archer was a member of the Imperial Federation League or not.

Mr. DRAKE said: Mr. Speaker,—I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is discussing the subject on which the point of order was raised.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: I am not going to discuss the subject. I simply say that the answer given to the hon. member was not an insolent or improper answer, and that it was the only answer that could be given under the circumstances. The hon. member can, if he likes, move the adjournment of the House; but though he may have the question discussed, he cannot possibly get any more information from the Government. The rules relating to the point of order that has been raised are Standing Orders 77, 78, and 79. The 77th Standing Order says that—

"At the time of giving notices of motion, questions may be put to Ministers of the Crown, relative to public affairs, and to other members"—

That is not generally known by members of the House—namely, that one member of the House can question any other member if he chooses, as well as a Minister—

"relating to any Bill, motion, or other public matter connected with the business of the House, in which members may be concerned."

The next rule is as follows:—

"In putting any such question, no argument or opinion shall be offered; nor any facts stated, except so far as may be necessary to explain such question."

That answers what the leader of the Opposition contended for—namely, that the decision of Mr. Speaker Brand applied only to making a speech upon asking a question. No speech can be made in putting a question. But rule 79 states that—

"In answering any such question, a member shall not debate the matter to which the same refers."

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: That is, the member who is answering the question cannot debate the matter.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: No member is to debate the matter to which the same refers.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: It does not say so. It says that the member answering the question shall not make any speech.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS said it applies to all members, and the practice of the House has been in accordance with that rule. During the fifteen years I have been a member of the House I have known no other practice; I have never known the answer to a question to be debated in the House unless it has been done inadvertently.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: Lots of answers have been discussed.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS said the hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Macfarlane, recently discussed the answer I gave to a question by him some days after it was asked, on a motion for adjournment. I took no notice of that, though I might have raised the point of order had I so chosen. Every member of the House could, if he wished, very often call other members to order, but we are accustomed to allow one another a great deal of latitude. But when the Speaker's attention is called to a rule being broken, that latitude ceases, and the rule must be enforced.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said: Mr. Speaker,—I should like, with the permission of the House, to say a few words more on this question. It is now contended by gentlemen on the Treasury benches that an answer to a question can, under no circumstances, be discussed. That is a position that has never been taken up before. Mr. Speaker King, or Mr. Speaker Walsh—I forget which, but I believe it was Mr. Speaker Walsh—once ruled that a question could not be discussed on the same day that it was answered, but that it may be done on a subsequent day. For that there is no authority. It was a decision given inadvertently, and it is quite true, as the Colonial Secretary says, that that hon. member, as he calls it, running a blockade, has sometimes raised a discussion the same day. I was aware at the time the decision was given that it was an erroneous one, and when I was in the position of leader of the House I never took advantage of it. I do not think I ever objected, because I always knew it to be wrong.

The PREMIER: Can the hon. gentleman adduce one instance in which he allowed a debate to go on on a question that had been asked that day?

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said: I cannot at this moment, but, if so, it was because I was aware of the true rule. My hon. friend, Mr. Groom, reminds me of a case within his recollection—the case of the Cooktown railway; but I do not remember it. There is a distinct decision of Mr. Speaker Brand, however (p. 5),—

"The practice of moving the adjournment of the House, if a member is dissatisfied, is within an hon. member's rights; but is highly inconvenient."

That decision was given on three separate occasions. The inconvenience is obvious to everyone. The Standing Order that the hon. member for Townsville has referred to simply prescribes the duty of the asker and the answerer of the question. The asker of the question must not make a speech, and the answerer of the question must not make a speech either. That is all it deals with. The question of moving the adjournment of the House is quite distinct. The incident of the question being asked is over, and then comes the right of a member to move the adjournment to ventilate a grievance, if he has one. That is so important a right that I should be very sorry to see any ruling given which might limit that right, although it may be inconvenient at times that the right should be exercised.

The PREMIER: I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that precedents from the House of Commons have no standing whatever in reference to this case because we have plenty of precedents of our own, and for the further reason that precedents from the House of Commons are not applicable because their motions for adjournment are made by leave of a certain number of members.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: That is a new rule.

The PREMIER: The invariable rule is as I have mentioned, and the youngest member of the House will admit it. Take the case of the hon. member for Cambooya, who asked a question recently. He was dissatisfied with the answer he received. Did he, as a member knowing the rules of the House, rise and move the adjournment of the House. No, he knew the practice, and did not.

The HON. P. PERKINS: I have seen it done though.

The PREMIER: The hon. member wrote out another question for the next day. Whenever an hon. member asks a question without notice to which there is no reply, the answer usually is that notice should be given. That is the way I would meet anything of the kind. Then there is another point—the peculiar turn given to Standing Order 79. Every member who asks a question is not allowed to debate the matter, but the rule laid down by the leader of the Opposition is that everybody else can.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: Not without a motion. I did not take any such point. When a motion is moved anyone can debate it.

The PREMIER: The object of the rule is plain, and has always been acted on. We have plenty of precedents. When a question is put and an answer given, the matter is over for the time; but if the member does not like the answer, he can at some other time move a motion for the adjournment of the House.

Mr. ANNEAR said: Mr. Speaker,—I will call your attention to a case that will be within your recollection. I think it occurred two or three sessions ago, when the hon. member for Cook, Mr. Hamilton, gave notice that on a certain day he would ask the then Minister for Works, the late Mr. Miles, I think, a question in connection with the Cooktown Railway. The hon. member was dissatisfied with the answer he received, and moved the adjournment of the House, and I believe that debate lasted nearly two hours.

That is a precedent that was established and allowed by the then Speaker, the hon. member for Toowoomba, Mr. Groom.

The PREMIER: On what date was that?

Mr. ANNEAR: About two sessions ago. The hon. member for Cook will remember it.

Mr. HAMILTON said: Mr. Speaker,—I do not think that case occupied such a long time. I think the case referred to by the hon. member was when Mr. Dutton was Minister for Railways, and I asked him a certain question, to which he replied. I mistook his reply. I considered it was impertinent, and moved the adjournment of the House, and I had made my remarks, I believe, before anyone had time to take exception to them. I afterwards apologised, when I found I had made a mistake. The case occurred, I find on referring to *Hansard*, on the 1st December, 1887, and the discussion must have lasted about a minute and a-half.

Mr. MORGAN said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. member for Cook, Mr. Hamilton, on the occasion referred to put a question, and the answer was, "I do not know." Immediately afterwards he rose and moved the adjournment of the House. He expressed the hope that the Minister was not "fencing" with him, and proceeded to discuss the question. That occupied a very short time, but still no objection was raised by the Speaker or by any member of the House. The case now before us is exactly parallel.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said: Mr. Speaker,—I would point out that the hon. member for Warwick has omitted a small item, which is possibly of some little importance, and that is, that the member for Cook did not at once move the adjournment in regard to the reply given to him by the Minister for Works, but that another member, the present hon. member for Cunningham, Mr. Allan, intervened with a question.

Mr. MORGAN: On the same day.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was on the same day, I admit, but I think the hon. member might have stated the whole case. The facts were not identical with the present case, because the hon. member, Mr. Hamilton, did not jump up immediately the answer was given and move the adjournment of the House. He waited until another question had been asked, but even then I hold that he was quite out of order.

Mr. DRAKE said: Speaking to the point of order, I would point out that if it is merely a question of convenience or inconvenience, it is certainly very much more convenient that I should be permitted to move the adjournment of the House to speak upon this subject in the same way as the hon. member for Cook was allowed to do so last session.

The PREMIER: If you had made as short a speech there would have been no objection.

Mr. DRAKE: I was stopped before I had time to make a speech.

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Cook only spoke eight lines.

Mr. DRAKE: I am sure I had not spoken eight lines when I was stopped.

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker,—What is the point of order before the House.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is, whether the hon. member for Enoggera was in order in moving the adjournment of the House to discuss an answer to a question. If no hon. member wishes to speak on the question——

Mr. GROOM: With the permission of the House I will quote a case that will show what the practice here has been. I find in vol. I. of *Hansard*, 1886—a case with which the hon. member for Cook is no doubt familiar. The hon. member had asked a question with regard to the second section of the Cooktown Railway, to which the Minister for Works, the late Hon. W. Miles, replied in the ordinary way. The hon. member was not satisfied with the reply, and put a further question, which he was prefacing with a speech, when he was interrupted by the Speaker saying—

"The hon. member must not make a speech in asking the question.

"Mr. HAMILTON: I wish to explain the question I desire to ask, and to do so I must point out that my constituents do not understand what part of the line is referred to by the term 'second section.'

"The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I rise to a point of order. I have answered the hon. member's question.

"Mr. HAMILTON: No; my question is this: My constituents do not understand——

"The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I rise to a point of order.

"The SPEAKER: It will be much better for the hon. member to conclude with a motion, as he will then have an opportunity of addressing the House in a regular manner. It is certainly irregular in asking a question of a Minister to preface it by a speech. It is in accordance with the practice of the House of Commons; but it is not so here."

Then the hon. member moved the adjournment of the House to reply to the answer given by the Minister for Works, who would not reply to him, but told him to give notice of a vote of censure upon him. So that the practice has been to move the adjournment of the House to discuss answers to questions.

The PREMIER: That ruling teaches only one thing: That the Speaker ruled the hon. member for Cook, Mr. Hamilton, out of order, but allowed him to speak in spite of his ruling.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No, no!

Mr. DRAKE said: Mr. Speaker,—Rule 78 says:—

"In putting such question, no argument or opinion shall be offered; nor any facts stated except so far as may be necessary to explain such question."

I think the question I put to the hon. gentleman comes within that rule. The answer he has given is really no answer at all, and I only wish to move the adjournment of the House in order to state my grounds for asking the question. It appears to me that that should not be considered objectionable, especially if it is merely a matter of convenience or inconvenience, the practice of the House having been hitherto uncertain.

The SPEAKER said: I would point out that the 78th and 79th Standing Orders of our House refer immediately to the asking and answering of questions, not to what takes place after a question is answered. They refer simply to the putting of questions by a member, and the answers given by the Minister or member to whom the questions are put. That point, I think, is clear. We have no other Standing Orders of our own which forbid or consent to the adjournment of the House being moved to debate a question which has been answered. The only other Standing Order we have that bears upon the question is the last, No. 387, which provides:—

"In all cases not herein provided for, resort shall be had to the rules, forms, usages, and practice of the Commons House of Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland, which shall be followed so far as the same may be applicable to this Assembly, and not inconsistent with the foregoing rules."

I may say that I have much hesitation in referring to the practice of the House of Commons, because our own rules were adopted in 1860, and do not include the rules which have been adopted by the House of Commons since that time. The case I quoted, giving the decision of Mr. Speaker

Brand, has occurred since that time. The other decisions in the House of Commons that have been referred to have also been given since 1860. If this House is to be guided by the rules and decisions of the House of Commons previous to or up to that time, the only one I know of is a decision given by Mr. Speaker Lefevre in May, 1845, as follows :—

"Captain POLHILL put a question to Sir J. GRAHAM.

"Sir J. GRAHAM having answered it at some length,

"Captain POLHILL thanked the Right Hon. Baronet for the explanation he had given. He was anxious to say a few words ['Order.']

"Mr. SPEAKER decided that, as the question had been answered, the hon. and gallant member could not further address the House upon it."

There is no doubt the practice of moving the adjournment of the House in order to discuss an answer to a question, when an hon. member is not satisfied with the answer, has been allowed on some occasions. It was done on one occasion in this session, but attention was not called to the matter, and I did not feel called upon to interfere with the hon. member for Ipswich, who moved the adjournment of the House, because I knew that the same course had been adopted on previous occasions. The matter was, therefore, allowed to pass. I would point out, however, that the regular course when a member is not satisfied with an answer, is to request leave of the House to ask another question in order to explain, and get a fuller answer. If that is objected to either by the House, or by the Minister to whom the question is put, then the regular practice is to table a notice of any further question to be asked on a subsequent date. The practice of moving the adjournment of the House to discuss an answer to a question is, therefore, irregular. The reason I expressed an opinion that the House itself would be the best judge of what should be done in cases of that kind is, because so many rules and Standing Orders have been adopted by the House of Commons since our own were adopted. It is very inconvenient for us to have to fall back upon old precedents where our own rules do not apply. However, if it is the wish of the House that I should give a distinct ruling on the matter, I think it is irregular to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing an answer that has just been given to a question. The regular form is, I think, to ask a fuller explanation by consent of the House immediately after the answer has been given, or to give notice to ask further questions.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

THE AGENT-GENERAL AND THE IMPERIAL FEDERATION LEAGUE.

Mr. BARLOW said: Mr. Speaker,—I shall conclude with the usual motion for adjournment. I desire to bring under the notice of the House certain paragraphs which have appeared in the local papers, to the effect that the gentleman who occupies the position of Ambassador for Queensland at the Court of St. James has resigned his membership of the Imperial Federation League. I have not the slightest objection to the Ambassador belonging to any society or league that he pleases. He may belong to the Royal Antediluvian Order of Buffaloes if he likes; but I perceive that the cause is assigned that he has resigned his membership of the Imperial Federation League—which, I suppose, means a league having for its object the promotion of Imperial federation—I see that it is stated he has resigned his membership on the ground that this league was presided over by Lord Rosebery, who is aiding in the dissolution of the union between Great Britain and Ireland; and another contemporaneous paper says this retirement has taken place in consequence of the Home Rule sentiments expressed by Lord Rosebery. It is not my intention to express any opinion upon the unhappy state of affairs in the mother country; but I do think that the Ambassador at the Court of St. James, in mixing himself up with any political questions affecting matters with which we have no direct concern, has seriously compromised the colony and the Government which he represents. I therefore beg leave to move that this House do now adjourn.

Question put.

Mr. PAUL said: Mr. Speaker,—I think it is a most reprehensible thing that the hon. member for Ipswich should delay the time of the House in speaking on such an absurd subject. What does it interest us whether any person is a member of the Federation League or not in the old country? We are here to debate the tariff, and I think the hon. member should apologise to the House for interfering with the business of the House. Everyone is saying outside, "Why do you not get the tariff shoved through quickly, because it is stopping business?" I hope and believe that every hon. member will not delay the business in this way,

Mr. DRAKE said: Mr. Speaker,—I would like to remind the hon. gentleman who has just sat down that only a few days ago the adjournment of this House was moved for the purpose of giving hon. members—especially on the other side of this House—an opportunity of expressing their opinions with regard to the state of affairs then existing between the Governor and the Government of this colony. That was moved by the hon. member for Barcoo, and the Ministry at that time expressed no disapproval of that course.

Mr. MURPHY: That was a Constitutional question.

Mr. DRAKE: I do not agree at all with the hon. member for Leichhardt, that this is a trivial matter, and that the tariff is a matter of more importance. I think this is a very important matter indeed. Some hon. members may not know what this Imperial Federation League is.

The PREMIER: And a great many people do not care either.

Mr. DRAKE: It seems to me that even on the Ministerial bench there are some who come out strongly in the "don't know" line. If they will go into the library and get a magazine called the *Imperial Federation*, they will pick up some idea of the schemes and devices of that league.

The PREMIER: That is more than anyone has succeeded in doing.

Mr. DRAKE: They will not find out exactly what it is, because I believe the members do not clearly know at present; but everyone who takes the trouble to read that magazine will get some inkling of what they mean to do, and there is no doubt in my mind that they intend to do something which will have the effect of crushing the freedom and independence of certain parts of the British Empire. I think that it represents high Toryism and Imperialism in the highest degree, and we have a right to know whether a gentleman closely connected with the Ministry of this colony—this Ambassador at the Court of St. James—has been a member of that league. I think it would be interesting to know whether any other gentleman connected with the Government is, or has been, connected with the league. It seems to me that we have a right to know if these reports are correct. If the reports are correct, the reason which has induced Mr. Archer to resign is a very important matter, as it makes matters much worse. The reason given for his resignation is that this Imperialistic society is not Imperialistic enough for him. This league has

had the audacity to appoint as president a nobleman who is known to be associated with the Liberal party in England, and has no sympathy with the Tory and coercion policy of the present English Government; and because that gentleman has been appointed president, Mr. Archer, the Agent-General for this colony, has brushed off the dust from his feet, and will have nothing more to do with the league. If that does not concern this colony, I do not know what does, and I think, in bringing this matter before the House, I have acted as much in the interests of the Government and their party, as in the interests of anyone else, by giving them an opportunity of explaining the matter. They are supported by the party which rejoices in the title of "National," and we know very well that a great number of politicians down South have expressed the opinion that the title, and the Nationalist sympathies expressed by the party, were only assumed for the purpose of carrying them through the late general election, and that they were not genuine. Now, that opinion will have ever so much more weight given to it by the fact that this "National" Government are employing as Agent-General a gentleman who has renounced the Imperial Federation League because it is not sufficiently Imperialistic for him. I think it is a matter which this House may very well take into consideration; and I think it is desirable that hon. gentlemen sitting on the other side, and who support the Government, should have an opportunity of expressing their opinions about this League.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS on the Government side: We want the tariff.

Mr. DRAKE: I may hurt the feelings of hon. gentlemen opposite by my remarks, but I do not make them for that purpose, and I say I think it desirable they should have an opportunity of expressing their opinions about this league, and of the conduct of the Agent-General, who was until recently, if the reports are true, a member of that body. Some of the hon. gentlemen lately, when before their constituents, expressed very strong opinions about Imperialism and Anti-Imperialism. Some of them were going to tear out Imperialism and Monarchy by the roots, and establish a Republic. Now, I want to know what they think of the Government who have as Agent-General a gentleman who has renounced his connection with the league because its president is not Imperialistic enough for his taste.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said: Mr. Speaker,—I have scarcely anything to add to the very able speech which has just been delivered by the hon. member for Enoggera, although the word "reprehensible" has been applied by a gentleman sitting at my elbow to an hon. member who actually brought forward a motion to relieve the House of a difficulty, and supply a deficiency. The second question was this:—

"Is it true that Mr. Archer has resigned his membership, on the ground that the League is presided over by Lord Rosebery?"

That is not the real reason. The real reason was that Lord Rosebery was in favour of dissolving the union with Ireland. Before this question arose, I was not aware that the Agent-General was a member of any political society at home. Nor was I aware that the Government of this colony employed their Agents-General to urge on the business of "Imperial Federation." I can only tell them, or anyone else in this House, that if they think that they have done well in that, they will find their mistake. The better plan would be for this sage old gentleman at home to get knighted and then clear out. This Imperial federation business has a great deal of that about it, and there are a few colonists who are fond of receiving knighthood, and by-and-by this gentleman will be added to the list. Then we can send men home who will mind the business of the colony and not poke their noses into matters which are going on at home. This is the first time I have heard of an Agent-General interfering in these concerns, and if the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government does not see about it, and get at the truth before the Estimates come on, I shall be very happy to reduce this gentleman's salary. I think that is all I need say, except that if the hon. member for Enoggera had been allowed to move the adjournment of the House, as has been the practice, the debate would have been over at least half an hour ago, and we would have started the tariff.

Mr. BARLOW said: Mr. Speaker,—I felt that there was sufficient justification for taking up the time of the House on a matter of this kind. There is no one more anxious than I am to get on with the tariff; but I feel certain that the best safeguard for the best interests of this colony is to keep clear of interfering with internal matters belonging to the United Kingdom. That I believe to be the true policy, and on that account I moved the adjournment of the House, which motion I now, with the consent of the House, will withdraw.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

AUSTRALASIAN NATIVES' TRUSTEES, EXECUTORS, AND FINANCE AGENCY COMPANY (LIMITED).

Mr. REES R. JONES said: Mr. Speaker,—I have to present the report from the Select Committee appointed in connection with the Australasian Natives' Trustees, Executors, and Finance Agency Company (Limited); and move that it be printed.

Question put and passed.

On the motion of Mr. REES R. JONES, the second reading of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for Thursday, 11th inst.

ERROR IN DIVISION LIST.

Mr. McMASTER said: Mr. Speaker,—I wish to draw attention to a little irregularity in taking down the names in a division which took place in this House on last Thursday evening, in regard to the debate on the case of H. C. Ransome *v.* Brydon, Jones, and Co. I voted with the "Noes," but my name was omitted, and that of Sir T. McIlwraith inserted. That hon. gentleman was not in the House at the time the division took place.

DAY DAWN GOLD-MINING COMPANY'S BRANCH RAILWAY BILL.

On the motion of the MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS, leave was given to introduce a Bill to authorise the construction of a branch line of railway from the Day Dawn Gold-mining Company, Charters Towers, to the Northern Line at Charters Towers.

FIRST READING.

On the motion of the MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS, the Bill was introduced and read a first time, and the second reading made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

ANN STREET PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH BILL.

On the motion of Mr. REES R. JONES, leave was given to introduce a Bill to vest in new trustees the lands comprised in deeds of grant Nos. 2847, 2848, and 2849, being allotments 8, 9,

10, and 11, of section 26, parish of North Brisbane, and to enable the trustees for the time being thereof to sell, mortgage, or lease the same, and for other purposes.

FIRST READING.

On the motion of Mr. REES R. JONES, the Bill was introduced and read a first time.

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.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved—

That there be raised, levied, collected, and paid on—Potatoes, hay, and chaff, per ton, 15s.; onions, per ton, 20s.

Mr. GROOM said he would now move, in accordance with amendments of which he had given notice, the omission of "15s," with the view of inserting "20s." He did not think it was an unreasonable request to ask the Committee to increase the duty by 5s.; nor could it be said that potatoes, hay, and chaff could be placed in the same category as bacon, ham, and butter. They could be grown in the colony to a very large extent, but the producers were handicapped to a great extent as against Southern producers. Some time ago the railway charges were excessive, and though they had been modified to a considerable extent of late, still the steamer freights were so much lower that two tons of produce could be brought from Sydney to Brisbane at the same price as the farmer had to pay for one ton from the Downs to Brisbane. The original tariff of 10s. per ton was no protection to the farmers. With respect to potatoes, they were shoved into the hold of a ship 300 or 400 tons at a time, at Warrnambool, landed on the wharf at Brisbane, and sold at a price that the farmer on the Darling Downs could not compete with. And the same might be said with respect to hay and chaff. The facilities afforded for shipment in the other colonies were so great that the local producer was prevented from entering into competition with the other colonies. He admitted that in some instances hay and chaff had been sent from the Downs in an unfit condition, but the farmers there were introducing improved machinery, and of late the produce they had sent to market was as good as could be expected. The Treasurer proposed to put a duty of 20s. per ton on onions, and he (Mr. Groom) asked, as a concession to the farming industry, that the same duty might be placed on potatoes, hay, and chaff. He moved the omission of the amount "15s.," with the view of inserting "20s."

Mr. STEVENS said, before the motion was put, he wished to oppose the putting of the three articles together in one amendment. He did not agree to that, and he might as well say that that was shown by amendments which he had printed and circulated to hon. members.

Mr. GROOM said he did not catch what the hon. member said, but he was sorry that he had inconvenienced the hon. member in the action he intended to take; he had no intention of doing so.

Mr. STEVENS said the hon. member's amendment included the three items, and it was his opinion that they should be taken seriatim. He would oppose the amendment on that ground.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that if the hon. member for the Logan allowed the amendment to go he would not have another opportunity of dealing with it. The hon. member must bring forward the amendment he intended to propose before the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Toowoomba was put.

Mr. STEVENS moved that the word "potatoes" be omitted. He did so with the view of inserting it in the next paragraph, and making the tariff 20s. instead of 15s. His reason for moving the amendment was that potatoes formed an article of consumption which could be produced readily in the colony, and the impost he proposed effected two purposes, as it would assist in collecting revenue and would also protect their productions. From the statistics furnished to them he found that in 1887 there were imported from New South Wales, 9,295 tons; from Victoria, 1,996; from South Australia a small quantity only; from Tasmania, 471 tons; from New Zealand, 1,259 tons; and the total amount of potatoes imported for the year was 13,024 tons, valued at £44,553. He held the opinion that but for the want of protection on that article a large quantity of the potatoes imported would have been grown in the colony, and the money spent in their purchase would have remained here. Potatoes could be very well grown in the Darling Downs, Rosewood, Logan, and Albert districts, in the vicinity of Brisbane, and in many other districts. The reason such a duty would be of advantage to the farmers was, that having no sufficient protection at present, they might at any time be swamped by cargoes of potatoes brought from the other colonies. If they were moderately protected they would put down a larger area of land under potatoes, because they would then know that a fair price would be always obtainable. So long as they were open to having large quantities of potatoes sent in from the other colonies, the farmers were only half-hearted, and did not go into the cultivation of potatoes as they otherwise would. It could not be said that the impost he proposed was a prohibitive one, or even an extreme protectionist one. To protect the local production of potatoes from all foreign importations the duty would have to be three times, or at least double, as much as he proposed. The duty he proposed was only a moderate protective duty, and if passed would be beneficial in many ways. It would largely increase the production of the article here, and would save to the colony a large sum of money which was, under the present taxation, being annually sent to the other colonies for the purchase of potatoes.

Mr. MACFARLANE said it was well that the Committee should hear something on the other side of the question. Potatoes were very perishable articles, and those imported lost a fourth of their weight, including those shipped to the North. The farmers in his district were of opinion that, instead of the tariff being increased, as the hon. member for the Logan proposed, it should be reduced to 10s. per ton. The principal reason given for that was, that the Circular Head potatoes imported were almost, without exception, used as seed; and the tax the hon. member proposed would be a tax upon the farmers' seed, and so far from benefiting them would have the opposite effect. That was an argument used against the old tariff on potatoes and in favour of letting potatoes in free; simply from the perishable nature of the article, and from the fact that the potatoes imported were used as seed and not for food. They grew two crops of potatoes each, year and one crop must be planted with the Circular Head potatoes. It was clear from that that the imposition of an increased duty would defeat the object the hon. member had in proposing it, as it would be an additional burden on the farmers rather than a benefit to them.

Mr. ALLAN said the hon. member for Ipswich stated that he objected to the proposed increase in the duty upon potatoes, on the ground that the potatoes imported were used for seed; but he did not think they required 13,000 tons of seed potatoes in the year, and that was the quantity imported last year. They were well able to grow potatoes for themselves. He found that last year they grew 15,600 tons, and had 6,600 acres under cultivation, giving a return of 2·37 tons per acre —a fair return, and one that would pay the farmer. In his own district, though it was not a large potato-growing district, they had 650 acres under potatoes, giving an average of over a ton per acre. As to the constituents of the hon. member for Ipswich asking that the duty on potatoes should be reduced, the hon. member was in a somewhat peculiar position as a farming representative. He (Mr. Allan) might be excused for speaking a little about his own district, which was the largest farming district in the colony, and he would give the Committee some information as to the opinions of the farmers in that district. He had received several telegrams and letters on the subject, and he might as well refer to them now and save time when they came to discuss the items of hay, chaff, and other articles referred to in them. He would read one note which would serve for all, as they were all pretty much to the same effect, and he had letters from Warwick, Swan Creek, Allora, and other places in the district. Mr. Patrick Higgins, of Warwick, wrote him :—

"At a very large and influential meeting of farmers at Swan Creek, at which I presided, the undermentioned resolutions were passed, and I was requested to wire a copy of them to you, and to the member for the own."

That referred to Mr. Morgan, the hon. member for Warwick. The first resolution was to the effect that the meeting thoroughly endorsed the action taken by the Warwick people at a meeting held in that town on the 7th June; and the second resolution which was proposed and carried was that the duty on hay, chaff, and potatoes should be 30s. per ton. He would not follow that, as he considered that would be too high a duty to impose; but he did think some increased duty was required when they considered the high cost of carriage the farmers in that district had to pay, equal to 13s. 9d. per ton. As the hon. member for Toowoomba had pointed out, they could get two tons from Sydney for that amount. The third resolution was that the duty on maize should be 1s. a bushel. He had received a similar communication from Warwick, and also letters to a like effect from Allora. The consensus of opinion in his district was in favour of an increase in the duties on agricultural produce, especially on hay, chaff, and potatoes, and he trusted that the Colonial Treasurer would see his way and allow such increases to be made on those commodities which could be supplied in the colony.

Mr. UNMACK said he was really sorry to see such persistent efforts made on behalf of agriculturists to impose undue and unfair burdens on the consumers. He had not so much objection to raise the duty on hay and chaff, but with regard to potatoes he distinctly stated that to increase the impost on them would inflict an injustice on consumers. He was ready to admit that as good potatoes could be produced in the colony as were obtained in any part of the world, but that was not enough. They must look a little further than that, and he challenged any hon. member connected with the agricultural districts to show that if the duty was increased to £20 a ton they would be able to produce here the quantity of potatoes required in Queensland. They could not do so, because the potatoes grown in the colony would not keep all through the year. He spoke from an experience in handling that particular article, extending over twenty years, so that he thought he had a right to express an opinion on the subject. The potatoes produced in the colony would not keep, and they would not bear transit. They must import potatoes, and he challenged any hon. member to show that even if they made the duty £50 a sufficient supply would be produced, and that because of the reasons he had given. He supposed it would not for one moment be argued that potatoes were a luxury. They were a necessary, and he contended that to put a heavier duty on potatoes, which, next to flour, was the staple article of food, would be an imposition and a disgrace to the country. A 10s. duty was quite sufficient, but still, as the Treasurer had proposed 15s., he was quite ready to support it. It was, however, quite enough; he had given good reasons why they could not produce an adequate supply in the colony, and he defied anyone to prove different.

Mr. GRIMES said he was quite prepared to support the remarks made by the hon. member who had just sat down, with reference to the necessity of importing potatoes from the other colonies. Potatoes grown in this climate would not keep, and it fortunately happened that they could grow potatoes in this colony when they could not grow them in the Southern districts. The crop from the South therefore very seldom clashed with the crop grown by the local farmers, but came into the market when the Queensland crop was over. All the seed planted for the August crop had to be imported, as the potatoes of the last crop raised were too new, and they could not keep those of the previous crop in a sound condition fit for planting. It was absolutely necessary that they should import seed potatoes for the August crop. The duty proposed by the Treasurer amounted to about 25 per cent. He (Mr. Grimes) did not think that farmers—and he himself was a farmer—believed in heaping protection on articles of that kind, which were so very necessary, more especially as it would be of no advantage to the farmer, and would fall heavily on the consumer. He certainly should support the duty proposed by the Treasurer.

Mr. McMASTER said he quite agreed with the remarks made by the two previous speakers with respect to the quality of Queensland potatoes, and their not keeping. As a matter of fact, Queensland would be dependent on the Southern colonies for potatoes in the month of May, as the crop which had just been gathered would not keep in the summer time. No farmer would attempt to keep them during the summer months; they would not even keep underground. The seed that was planted in winter had, as the hon. member for Oxley had stated, to be imported from the Southern colonies, because the local winter crop was too new for that purpose, and the previous crop would not keep. Therefore he considered that a duty of 10s. a ton would have been ample. The tariff charge was not all the expense connected with imported potatoes. The hon. member for Toowoomba had stated that two tons of potatoes could be brought from Sydney for the same price as one ton from Warwick, and the hon. member for Cunningham had said that the freight from Warwick was 13s. 9d. a ton. Well, the freight from Sydney was 10s. a ton, and in addition to that, there was a charge of 1s. 8d. for wharfage, and other charges for exchange, cartage, and insurance; so that with a 15s. duty the total would be considerably above £1 a ton. Queensland potatoes could scarcely be shipped to the far north of the colony at present, although large quantities were grown here. The crop in this colony came in at a time when they could not get potatoes from the Southern colonies at any price. In fact, he

believed he remembered a quantity being once sent down from Queensland to Sydney in the winter. The local potatoes came in in the winter and sold well. He would very much rather have seen the duty 10s. than 15s. As to hay and chaff, he would not say so much about them. If the hon. member for Toowoomba could induce the farmers to do what he stated they were going to do—namely, to send their produce to market in a better condition than they had hitherto done, it would, no doubt, be more largely consumed in Brisbane. He (Mr. McMaster) believed that neither the dealers nor consumers of Brisbane were desirous of sending their money out of the colony for produce if they could get it properly supplied in Queensland. The consumers, as he had stated, would have a good article if they had to pay a higher price for it. He might state that the best potatoes that came down the line were grown at Laidley and Gatton. Therefore he thought that 15s. was ample duty. In fact, if some hon. member would move that the duty be 10s. he would support it, but he did not think the Treasurer would consent to that. At all events, 20s. was far too high, and he hoped that amount would not be imposed.

Mr. HUNTER said he agreed with the last speaker that the duty should be reduced to 10s. In New South Wales potatoes were free, and in the great protection colony of Victoria they came in at 10s. In North Queensland they bought potatoes in the best market and had to pay a very heavy price for them, and he thought it would be very hard if the 15s. was increased to 20s. He should feel inclined to support the amendment withdrawing potatoes, not with a view of raising the duty to 20s., but reducing it to 10s. He thought many of the Northern members would be with him on the subject. Potatoes were only imported when they were not grown, and it was no protection to exclude the article they could not grow at certain times themselves.

Mr. STEVENS said he could bring forward a great deal of evidence in support of his view, but he would not waste the time of the Committee. He would point out to hon. members who argued that Queensland had to import potatoes for seed that Victoria did the same thing. Vast quantities were imported from New Zealand and Tasmania for seed purposes, and Victoria—the protectionist country that exported more potatoes than any other colony—actually only imposed a duty of 10s. on them. Therefore, so far as seed was concerned, there was nothing in the arguments of hon. members. He could see that the feeling of the Committee generally was opposed to the increase, and it was of no use wasting time. He proposed therefore to withdraw the amendment on the word "potatoes," and move a motion on the next item.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. STEVENS said he would move that the word "hay" be omitted, with a view of imposing 20s. a ton upon it. A great deal that he had said in regard to potatoes was true in regard to hay. He could speak very strongly in favour of an increased duty, for the simple reason that hay could undeniably be grown in the whole of the coast districts of the colony. It had been said by hon. members that the farmers could grow other things with more profit, but an import duty would have the effect of inducing others to settle in the coast districts who did not care to follow the industry of getting gold from the ground, and other occupations. Now they imported an enormous quantity of hay annually from the other colonies. The imports for last year amounted to considerably over 1,000 tons, and the value was nearly £6,000. The whole of that hay could be grown in the colony. Along the whole coast hay could be grown, and the money paid for the imported article could thus be saved to the colony. In the other colonies hay was not protected in any way, because it formed one of their largest articles of export, and there was no reason to protect it, but it was very different here. They would, by putting on an extra duty, encourage persons to follow the agricultural industry, and he considered that they should give the farmers something to encourage them more than they had done in the past. It was said many years ago that a cabbage could not be grown in the Darling Downs, the expression was historical, but they proved every day that more and more could be grown in the colony. A few years ago people laughed at the idea of growing maize beyond the Downs, but it was now grown at Roma, and further away. The proposed increase was not a large one, it could hardly be called a protective duty, and he was confident that it would result in a very large benefit to the colony generally.

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

AYES, 37.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Morehead, Donaldson, Nelson, Black, Pattison, O'Sullivan, Archer, Murphy, O'Connell, Hodgkinson, Hunter, Macrossan, Smith, Paul, Philp, Palmer, Sayers, Smyth, Lissner, Gannon, Dalrymple, Goldring, Cowley, Little, G. H. Jones, Corfield, McMaster, Wimble, Unmack, Watson, Adams, Dunsmure, Crombie, Stevenson, Rees R. Jones, and Hamilton.

NOES, 28.

Sir S. W. Griffith, Messrs. Rutledge, E. J. Stevens, Plunkett, Glassey, Grimes, Salkeld, Perkins, North, Battersby, Macfarlane, Allan, Morgan, Murray, Powers, Tozer, Campbell, Annear, Agnew, Buckland, Mellor, W. Stephens, Luya, Hyne, Isambert, Groom, Drake, and Barlow.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. STEVENS moved that the word "chaff" be omitted with the view of inserting it in the next line. He said some of the arguments used outside the House against increasing the duty on hay were to the effect that the hay grown in the colony was too coarse to use as hay, but that would not apply to chaff. Some of the hay that was cut into chaff and sold in the other colonies was quite as coarse as that grown here. He must appeal again to hon. members to give the agriculturists something like a little encouragement. The whole legislation of Queensland ever since it had been a separate colony was to induce people to come from all parts of the world and settle as farmers upon the soil. What had always been the cry of their politicians—from the highest down to the smallest? Always the same thing—"Induce people to settle on the land." And what was to become of them? Were they all to become miners and cattle or sheep growers? That might be the view of some hon members, but he hoped it was not in accordance with the wishes of most of them. They had had lately something like a manifesto delivered from the North, to the effect that they should go on growing cattle and sheep and digging up minerals. That cry might have done many years ago, but he hoped it was not one that would satisfy the people now. He did not believe it would. He wished to encourage the farmers of the colony in every legitimate way, and considering that our climate was inferior in some respects to that of Victoria, how could they expect them to compete successfully against the Victorian and New South Wales producers without giving them any assistance at all? In some of the divisions that had taken place since the tariff had been under discussion they had seen some extraordinary anomalies. They had seen hon. members who had entered

the House as advocates of the strongest protective measures—not moderate protectionists, but out-and-out protectionists—voting very much in a freetrade way. They found hon. members who had pledged themelves to vote for increases in the tariff, when it came to the point voting dead against the very things they themselves proposed. What sort of protectionists were they? What sort of legislators were they? What sort of colonists were they? They had crept into the House under the guise of being protectionists, and then where were their principles? There were some members who had a set purpose and stuck to it hard and fast, without regard to what the effect might be upon any other portion of the colony but their own.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: It would not suit you.

Mr. STEVENS said it would not, and such a policy never would suit him. They lived in an age of progress, and he hoped that he would take advantage of it and keep on enlarging his ideas and being educated, and not get into a narrow groove and decline to come out of it. He had spoken with some heat; he did not apologise for it. He had spoken strongly because he felt strongly. He had always credited hon. members with being worth the value of their word, and he felt disgusted when he found that they were not. That might be taken as applying to some hon. members to whom he did not refer at all. Some of them had agreed that certain duties should be raised, but afterwards said, "We cannot go so far as that, and we won't." But there were others who had given no explanation at all, who had not spoken a word in defence of the flag under which they got into the House—namely, protection.

Mr. ANNEAR said he thought they were hurrying through the tariff too quickly altogether. He was sure that a great number of members on the Government side, and some on the Opposition side of the Committee, could not have understood the effect of the last division; that was, if any reliance was to be placed on their utterances when they appeared before the public, and especially before their constituents from time to time. He supposed it would be considered a piece of presumption on his part to criticise the conduct of any man, but it was part of their duty to criticise the conduct of their public men. Their public utterances became public property. Take the great historian, the hon. the senior member for Fortitude Valley. Why, throughout the late election his first word was always "protection"—protection for everything and every person in the colony. Then as to the hon. member for Victoria—he begged the hon. gentleman's pardon—for Barcoo, he had always thought that hon. member was a consistent protectionist. The last division would answer that. The senior member for Fortitude Valley—the leader of the protectionists who supported the Government—had not carried out his pledges to his constituents. Many other protective members had not carried out the pledges they had made to their constituents before they were returned. If the farmers had the same season this year as they had had last year, they would be forced to sell good lucerne hay and good oaten hay in the Brisbane market for £2 per ton. He had come down the line on Monday with a gentleman named Mr. Beresford Hudson, who had stated that this season he had got 600 tons of hay, which it would pay him to send to Brisbane in bales, or cut up into chaff, if they had a good season; but if the season were like the last he would have to let it lie on the ground and rot. The junior member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. McMaster, would never see anything, except in his own particular way—and that was to go to the Roma-street market, and combine with the ring there to buy everything they could as cheap as possible, and sell it as dear as they could. He did not think the hon. member for Logan, who was a gentlemen who was highly respected by all, had any need to apologise; and he (Mr. Annear) would not apologise for what he said or did. He should fail in his duty if he did not stand up and express his opinion as to the conduct of those who had pledged themselves as staunch protectionists—he referred particularly to the senior member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. Watson, who was now in his seat, and the hon. member for Barcoo. He had looked on those gentlemen as staunch friends in that matter, and he should like to know what had occurred since last night to change the minds of those hon. gentlemen. Something must have taken place to cause the sudden change. He hoped the hon. members who had pledged themselves to the different electorates to support a protective policy, would make that last division a record of what their words were worth. He thought they should pause before they went on, as the last division had done an injury to the most oppressed class of people in the colony—the farmers—and one which it would take many years to retrieve. If there were one thing in the tariff more than another that he thought every hon. member should have supported, it was the proposition to put a duty of £1 per ton on hay at the very least. Hon. members might say it would make no difference to them, but that division would show the people of the colony what their word was worth. Why, the ink was scarcely dry on the paper by which hon. members pledged themselves, if returned, to support a protective tariff.

Mr. WIMBLE said that as a Northern member who had been returned, pledged to support protection, he wished to say that he should exercise his own judgment as to what amount of protection he would vote for. He thought 15s. a ton on hay was sufficient protection for the farmers. It had been remarked that hon. members were not studying the question of protection generally, so much as the wants of their own constituencies. Now, he did not hesitate to say that he was quite prepared to stand to his pledges, but at the same time he would exercise his own judgment in voting upon the tariff, and not consider whether it was freetrade or protection, while at the same time he would consider whether it was favourable to his own constituents. Every hon. member had a right to vote according to his convictions without being twitted for doing so.

Mr. MURPHY said the hon. member for Maryborough had given him an *alias*, and so he might as well give the hon. gentleman one. He might call him the "hon. member for Messrs. John Walker and Co.," or some other iron foundry in Maryborough.

Mr. HYNE: Just the reverse!

Mr. MURPHY said it was a much better title for that hon. gentleman than the "hon. member for Maryborough." It struck him that ever since he (Mr. Murphy) had had a seat in Parliament the hon. gentleman had done nothing but look after the interests of some Maryborough firm. With regard to his (Mr. Murphy's) action in the tariff, his constituents would not take any more notice of the hon. member's utterances than of the idle wind that blew. He was not there as a delegate, but as a representative, and an independent one; and so far as his judgment on the tariff was concerned, he could vote as he thought fit, but he was not going to vote according to the dictates of any hon. member on the other side, and he was sure he would have the approbation of his constituents—he was not afraid of that.

Mr. ANNEAR said he was sorry he had offended the hon. member.

Mr. MURPHY: Not in the least.

Mr. ANNEAR said he would take that opportunity of assuring the hon. gentleman that when he went to Maryborough, before the general election, his programme was very clear, and every managing member of the firm of John Walker and Co. had recorded their votes against him.

Mr. MURPHY: What base ingratitude!

Mr. STEVENSON: What about the secrecy of the ballot-box?

Mr. ANNEAR said that to let the hon. gentleman see he was not a delegate of that firm, he would mention that he had told those gentlemen before the election took place he would prefer them to vote against him, after the way they had acted. They had all voted against him, and the result was that he was returned by a majority of 257 votes over a gentleman who had formerly held a very high position in Parliament.

Mr. UNMACK said they might just as well go back to the point at issue—whether they should put a duty of 20s. or 15s. on chaff. As one who voted for the lower duty on hay, he had done so with the conviction that he was doing the right thing, because there were hundreds of working men who could not keep the one or two horses they owned if a heavier duty was imposed; but, on the other hand, there was one point to which he wished to draw the attention of those who were ready to give extreme protection to the farmers. Whilst they had had a duty of 10s. a ton previously, it was now proposed to increase that by 50 per cent., and another point was that all along they had had additional protection, because no hay could be brought into the colony without further protection to the extent of at least 17s. 6d. a ton—that was in the shape of freight, wharfage, and expenses. He was putting it at the lowest possible figure, although he believed it was nearer £1 per ton. 17s. 6d. surely in itself was sufficient protection for an industry if it were worth cultivating at all, and 15s. added to that would certainly be more than ample for all requirements. The hon. member for Maryborough, Mr. Annear, had stated that hay had been sold in the Brisbane market last year at £2 per ton. If that was so, all he (Mr. Unmack) could say was that it must have been of such a quality that it was not worth more, because at the same time hay was sold at a much higher figure. Of course they could not expect to get the same price for a cotton coat as for a silk coat; good quality would always find its price. They were perfectly well able to produce as good an article in Queensland as anywhere else, and, if they did not spoil it in the making, they would receive as good a price for it as for the imported article. They all had to pay for their experience; but if they could produce a good article they would command a fair market price. There was only one doubt he had as to how he should vote if the question came to a division, whether the duty was to be 20s. or 15s. At present he was inclined to support the proposal of the Treasurer, but there was a large amount of labour employed in the production of chaff, in cutting it up, and that had to be taken into consideration.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Very little.

Mr. UNMACK: If hon. members representing farming districts could set him at rest upon that point he should vote for the 20s. duty.

Mr. STEVENSON said he hoped the hon. member would vote in accordance with his speech, which he did not do when the duty on candles was before the Committee. Upon that occasion the hon. member distinctly stated that he would support the Treasurer in the 2d. duty, and in the end he equally as distinctly voted against it. He was surprised to hear the hon. member for Logan talking about hon. members speaking one way and voting another. A few nights ago, when the duty upon jams was under discussion, the leader of the Opposition distinctly told the Committee that he would vote against any increase in the duty upon that article, because he considered jams were necessaries to bushmen in the country, and yet he distinctly voted the opposite way. In the same way the hon. member for Toowong spoke in favour of the Treasurer's proposal in regard to candles, and then voted the other way. In regard to the matter brought up by the hon. member for Logan, he (Mr. Stevenson) considered the farmers had received very great consideration under the tariff, and had had every concession made to them that possibly could be made. He was not a protectionist himself, but he recognised that a certain amount of money had to be raised for the purpose of revenue, and he would rather impose taxes upon articles they could produce in the colony than upon those they could not. Hon members were ready to exclaim "Hear, hear" and then vote in the opposite way to which they thus led the Committee to expect. They seemed to try and make the tariff a party question.

Mr. UNMACK said he merely wished to explain his vote in connection with the duty upon candles. He expressed his willingness to vote for the proposal of 2d. upon candles when there was no lower proposal before the Committee; but when he found there was a lower proposal he felt called upon to support it.

Mr. ALLAN said there appeared to be some doubt as to the ability of the colony to produce chaff sufficient for its own consumption, so he would refer to the Registrar-General's statistics on the subject. In the year 1886 they were able to grow 75,000 tons of hay; but last year there was not so much. Still the colony was able to produce sufficient for its own consumption, and those hon. members who went up to Killarney last week were able to see the amount of hay there was in that district. There were thousands of tons stacked there, but it did not pay to bring it down. He had seen the account sales come back to some of his constituents, and some of them were even brought in in debt. He did not wish to cast any aspersions upon the merchants in Brisbane; but the farmers had found it necessary to band themselves together and start a co-operative association and a store in Brisbane, in order to get a fair price for their produce. He used that hay, and had never seen any of it that was not equal to the average that came from the other colonies. He hoped that all hon. members who did not care much about the matter of hay would vote for the duty on chaff, as it would give great encouragement to the farmers.

Mr. MORGAN said that appeared to be about the last item upon which the farmers could place any hope of getting relief under that tariff. It was all very well for hon. members to say farmers had been particularly well treated in that tariff, as the hon. member for Clermont had said. It was clear that, if the farmers received 50 per cent. of protection, they were to be taxed 100 per cent. more upon articles they consumed than they were paying at present. The fact remained that the farmers hereafter would be in a very little better position than they

were at present if the tariff were passed in its present form, and the so-called policy of protection would not have benefited them at all. Members who called themselves "Opportunists"—who would not call themselves protectionists, or freetraders—argued that they would support the protection of certain items upon the tariff, on the ground that revenue was required, and that they ought to give encouragement to the articles that could be produced in the colony. There were other articles taxed because their manufacture in the colony would give employment to a large number of people. The hon. Colonial Secretary interjected a few minutes previously that a very few people were employed in the manufacture of chaff. He could tell that hon. gentleman that there were a considerable number of men employed in that way, and not only human beings, but a large number of horses and a large amount of machinery. Seeing that last year they only imported 4,000 tons of hay and chaff, and the consumption throughout the colony was 55,000 or 60,000 tons, no great hardship would be inflicted upon consumers by imposing an extra 5s. per ton duty.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Then you do not want protection at all.

Mr. MORGAN said he had stated that the quantity of chaff imported into the colony last year was small, and hon. members had laughed because they thought that was an argument more in favour of the present tax than of an increase; but the quantity of chaff and hay imported last year was below the average importation of those articles, and for the reason that last year they had a very bad hay season all over Australia, and, consequently, the prices ruled high in the Brisbane market as well as elsewhere. The fact that the prices ruled high enabled the Downs farmers to place upon the market not only the produce of last year, but the surplus produce held over for two or three years previous. If that had not been the case the importations would have kept out of the market the large stocks held on the Darling Downs and as near Brisbane as Toowoomba. It was not a right state of things that the men settled upon the lands of the colony and producing crops should be cut out of their own market by imported articles. It was all very well for some members to say they had sufficient protection already, but the facts were against that. Under the old tariff of 10s. they were not sufficiently protected, and could not rely upon the Brisbane market as a regular market, nor did he think they could under a tariff of 15s. per ton, though he was pretty sure they could with a tariff of 20s. per ton. The hon. member for Toowong pointed out that in addition to the duty the imported article had to pay freight, and light, and wharf dues, and one thing and another, but the local article against that had to pay railage and commission charges.

Mr. UNMACK: So has the other.

Mr. MORGAN said he did not think the imported article had to pay to anything like the same extent.

Mr. UNMACK: The railage is only 13s. 9d.

Mr. MORGAN said it was a good deal more than that from many parts of his district, and if the hon. member had seen some account sales rendered to the farmers he would see that the charges were out of all proportion to the price realised for the produce.

Mr. UNMACK: Five per cent.

Mr. MORGAN said that in some cases they amounted to 75 per cent. No doubt whatever, the local producers had a solid grievance against many middlemen in Brisbane, as the charges were in many cases most exorbitant.

Mr. BUCKLAND: Not as much as 75 per cent.

Mr. MORGAN said that in some cases the charges were even more than 75 per cent., and he had known instances in which they were over 100 per cent., and the account sales brought the farmer in on the debit side of the ledger. He believed there was no doubt also that some of the retailers in Brisbane took advantage of the prejudice that existed against the local article, and having bought it, retailed it at the price realised by the imported article. So that the profit, which of right belonged to the producers, went into the pockets of the middlemen. The fact remained, that the imported article had hitherto competed successfully against them in their own market, while the returns of production showed that if encouraged to the extent they asked, the producers would be able to supply the demands of the colony themselves. If that could be brought about as had been shown, cutting chaff in the colony would ensure the employment of large numbers of horses, a great deal of machinery, and large numbers of men and boys; for hay could be grown in almost all parts of the colony. It was not too much to ask that the people should bear the little additional impost of 5s. beyond what the Government made themselves responsible for. He hoped the amendment would be carried, as it would be of the greatest benefit to a large industry deserving of encouragement.

Mr. PLUNKETT said that as the representative of a farming constituency he would support the amendment. He had been growing hay for the past twenty years, and he always found, on taking his produce to market in Brisbane, that, owing to the large importations of similar produce, after he had disposed of his produce he generally returned about as poor a man as he had come up. One drawback to the hay he used to take to market was, that the land being humid the hay grew strong, and did not find as ready a sale as the finer hay from the South, but for cutting into chaff no hay from the South surpassed it. Anyone who went to the Nerang show could see the excellent quality of the hay grown in the district. Hon. members representing mining constituencies were chiefly those who opposed the increase; but in opposing the small increase asked for, he thought they were acting very much against the best interests of their constituents. Many miners in the future, if not at the present time, would be glad to see their sons and daughters settled on the land if they found that it paid; and he thought that any action the Committee might take to enable people to settle on the land at a profit would be the best thing they could do. He intended to vote for the present and other increases, because he believed they would tend materially to increase close settlement on the land, which was a most desirable thing to bring about.

Mr. COWLEY said it was the opinion of the hon. member for Warwick that a duty of 15s. per ton would not protect the local farmers against the Southern colonies. According to the hon. member for Cunningham, Mr. Allan, with the duty of 10s. per ton, 50,000 tons of hay were grown in the colony and 4,000 tons imported; and he (Mr. Cowley) thought that a duty of 15s. per ton would be ample protection, bearing in mind that the 4,000 tons imported went almost entirely to the North, and did not compete with the local growers. The member for Warwick also stated that the farmers suffered a great deal through the action of the middlemen, but was it fair that all consumers should be taxed to pay the middlemen? If the grievance existed the farmers should remedy it themselves, because no

amount of protection would do it. It would not be fair to increase the duty beyond the Treasurer's proposal, and, in the interests of the North, he should vote against the amendment.

Mr. WATSON said he happened to be out of the Chamber when the hon. member for Maryborough referred to him as a protectionist. He was a protectionist to the letter. His furniture was all made in Brisbane; one of his buggies was made by Ballantyne, of South Brisbane, and the other by McLean, of Elizabeth street. Could the hon. member for Maryborough say the same?

Mr. ANNEAR: Yes.

Mr. WATSON said he doubted it. When addressing his constituents he told them that he was a protectionist, but he was not going to foster any industry against the interests of the working men. He considered that if the duty on hay and chaff were increased the workmen of Fortitude Valley—the cabmen and draymen—would be the greatest sufferers. They were getting at the present time from 11s. to 11s. 6d. per day, and when 7s. came out of that for the men there was not much left for the horses to live on. He considered it was unworthy of the hon. member for Maryborough to attack an hon. member during his absence; he always looked upon the hon. member as an upright gentleman. He did not go about trying to sell freetrade goods. When he was building the wharves at South Brisbane, he could have saved £350 by getting timber from Sydney, but he preferred to spend his money where he earned it. He would spend it in Queensland to the best of his ability, as he was a protectionist to the backbone.

Mr. SAYERS said he was a moderate protectionist, and a moderate protectionist only; and he intended to vote for the 15s. per ton, his reason being, as stated by the hon. member for Herbert, that nearly all the imported hay and chaff went North. At the present time all the articles on which the duty had been increased were at famine prices; and small settlers who kept horses and cattle were at their wits' end to find money to keep their animals alive. He did not think it would be fair to increase the duty beyond the amount proposed by the Treasurer. Of course, he would rather see it left as it was before, but they would have to do the best they could.

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

AYES, 40.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Morehead, Macrossan, Black, Nelson, Donaldson, Pattison, Hamilton, Paul, Hodgkinson, O'Sullivan, Archer, O'Connell, Smith, Philp, Palmer, Gannon, Dalrymple, Goldring, Lissner, Cowley, Little, G. H. Jones, Corfield, Smyth, McMaster, Wimble, Luya, Hunter, Agnew, Sayers, Unmack, Adams, Lyons, Rees R. Jones, Watson, Dunsmure, Crombie, Stevenson, and Murphy.

NOES, 27.

Sir S. W. Griffith, Messrs. Jordan, Glassey, Barlow, Drake, Plunkett, Stevens, Grimes, Salkeld, Perkins, Allan, Macfarlane, Morgan, Powers, Battersby, Murray, Campbell, Annear, Buckland, Tozer, Mellor, Foxton, Hyne, Isambert, Groom, North, and Stephens.

Question resolved in the affirmative, and paragraph put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved—

That there be raised, levied, collected, and paid on—Cement, per barrel, 2s.; doors (wood), each 4s.; sashes, per pair, 4s.; and iron tanks, each 8s.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER, in moving—

That there be raised, levied, collected, and paid on—Castor oil, Chinese oil, cod liver oil, and colza oil (in bulk), per gallon, 1s.; and mineral oils, and all other oils not otherwise enumerated (except perfumed oils), and turpentine, per gallon, 6d.—

said he intended to move an amendment on that. He had omitted neatsfoot oil and linseed oil, which he proposed to put in the first paragraph. He proposed also to put a duty of 5 per cent. on linseed and castor seed, but that would come on afterwards. His reason for that was that he had been assured by men in the trade that if those articles—which might be considered raw material—were allowed in free, the consequence would be that they would have mills established in the colony for the purpose of manufacturing oil. Of course, that would be a very important industry, and it was very important too, in view of the contingency of cotton-growing becoming to some extent an industry of the colony. There was nothing that would contribute more to the success of that than having the cotton seeds utilised for the purpose of making oil.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: What will the duty be on cotton oil? Sixpence per gallon?

The COLONIAL TREASURER said it was a different oil from any of those enumerated in the first paragraph, and would come in at 6d. per gallon under the second paragraph.

Mr. PHILP said he hoped the Premier would see his way to make a reduction on castor oil, as the proposed duty would be equal to an increase of 75 per cent. Castor oil was not made in the colony; it was admitted free into New South Wales. Victoria only imposed a duty of 6d., and large quantities were used here for machinery purposes.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had met that by proposing to put castor-seed on the 5 per cent. *ad valorem* list.

Mr. ISAMBERT said cotton-seed oil was very nearly the same as Chinese oil, and was chiefly used in the manufacture of soft soap, and in its refined state was used for adulterating olive oil. It could be very justly classed among the oils enumerated in the 1st paragraph.

Mr. GRIMES said he might mention that castor oil was largely used for lubricating machinery, and the tariff upon it might very well be reduced.

Mr. ISAMBERT said it was well known that the castor oil plant grew with great facility in Queensland, and if protected it could very well be cultivated, and the oil manufactured. Up to the present time the plant had been cultivated more as a curiosity than anything else.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said in order to carry out his proposal he would move that the word "and" be omitted in the 1st paragraph.

Mr. PHILP said the Colonial Treasurer might consider that the freight on castor oil seed would be three times as heavy as the freight upon the oil, and there would, therefore, be no chance of importing the seed. He would like to know if castor oil was made in the colony now.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: No.

Mr. PHILP said the castor oil plant grew here like a weed, but they had not the labour to cultivate it.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the import list showed that 28,000 gallons of castor oil came from India, and about two-thirds of the oil used—namely, 45,000—came from New South Wales.

Mr. AGNEW said the duty on castor oil would not be a tax on the working man. He used castor oil probably as much as any man in the Committee, as within the last ten weeks the company he represented had used as much as fifty gallons of the oil. His attention had been

drawn to the fact that a local manufactory claimed to be able to sell an oil answering all the purposes for which castor oil was used at even a less cost than castor oil. He had tried it, and found it to answer the purpose admirably. He saw no reason why he should vote for the removal of the duty of 1s. per gallon, and, as one of those most interested, he should vote for the retention of the duty.

Question—That the word proposed to be omitted stand part of the paragraph—put and negatived.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved that the words "neatsfoot oil, linseed oil, and other vegetable oils," be inserted after the word "oil."

Mr. WIMBLE said there was an effort made some years ago, in Victoria, to manufacture linseed oil from the raw seed, and although a heavy protective duty was imposed to encourage that industry, it had to be abandoned. One of the principal reasons for that was, that the manufacturers of linseed oil in England had the advantage of being able to sell the refuse—he referred to the oil-cake. In England they sold the oilcake for stall-feeding purposes, but in Victoria the loss was so great, through not being able to sell the oilcake, that they were unable to establish the manufacture of linseed oil—a profitable investment. He knew of several industries that were dependent upon obtaining raw linseed oil. He himself had previously had occasion to use it for manufacturing purposes to the extent of from 800 to 1,000 gallons a month, so that he was speaking with some authority on the subject; and he was satisfied that if a duty of 1s. per gallon was imposed it would have the effect of preventing the establishment of several industries in Queensland which otherwise would probably be started at an early date. He referred to the manufacture of printing materials as one of them. Linseed oil was largely used in the manufacture of varnishes for carriage works, also by painters, and he thought it would be very much better to make the duty 6d., the same as it was in Victoria. By imposing 1s. they would prevent the establishment of several industries that would otherwise be established here. He hoped the Premier would take the matter into consideration.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said 6d. per gallon was the duty imposed on linseed oil in Victoria, and the manufacture of the article there fell through, in the first place, because the duty was not 1s., and in the next, because there was no outlet at that time for the oilcake. But there was a market for the oilcake now, and he thought the duty proposed a fair one.

Question—That the words proposed to be added be so added—put and passed.

Mr. BUCKLAND said, in reference to mineral oils, there was an oil imported from the Southern colonies called "brick oil," which was largely use by brickmakers and in pottery works. The cost in the Southern colonies was about 4d. per gallon, and if an import duty of 6d. per gallon was imposed it would effectually shut the article out of Queensland markets. He would suggest that it should come under the 7½ per cent. *ad valorem* duty. He was not aware that kerosene shale had yet been found in payable quantities in the colony, and as the proposed duty would be a great hardship upon brick and pottery manufacturers, he thought the matter was worthy of consideration by the Colonial Treasurer.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had had a communication from a brick factory down the river to the effect that a certain kind of oil got from Sydney was used for oiling their moulds. The amount used was not very considerable; he did not know whether it was th only oil that could be used for the purpose, and saw no reason to alter the proposed duty.

Mr. BUCKLAND said he did not say it was the only oil that could be used for the purpose, but he had been in the habit of importing it for one of the brick factories in the Brisbane district, and if a duty of 6d. per gallon were placed upon it, it would close the market against it.

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

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved—

That there be raised, levied, and collected on—

Sarsaparilla and bitters, if containing not more than 25 per cent. of proof spirit—per gallon, 6s.

Sarsaparilla and bitters, if containing more than 25 per cent. of proof spirit—per gallon, 12s.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved—

That there be raised, levied, and collected on—Wheat, 6d. per bushel.

He said he would take that item by itself, because it was one that had exercised him perhaps more than any other item in the tariff. In the first place, he might say that he had had numerous communications from millers, not only in this colony but in the other colonies, who stated that if a duty of £1 per ton were put on flour they would start mills in all the centres of population right off; and he believed they would have done so. However, gauging public opinion on the question, he thought he should have made a mistake if he had proposed a duty of £1 per ton on flour. That the effect of such a tax would have been for the good of the colony he believed, but, at the same time, he admitted that public opinion was against him on that matter; therefore, he had not proposed an import duty on flour. On the matter of the duty of 6d. on wheat he had had other communications from the millers, who said that if the 6d. were taken off the wheat they would start flour-mills on the sea coast in Queensland; and if they started mills on the sea coast, of course the result would be that they would compete strongly with the Adelaide millers, and they would open a market at the same time for the wheat-growers in the colony. Where they had those flour-mills at work there would always be an invitation to men to grow the wheat in the colony. He, therefore, would adhere to that duty of 6d. on wheat, although he must admit that he would not be sorry to be defeated on it, as he believed it was a mistake. Of course, some people might think it would injure those men who had established the industry on the Darling Downs. He had consulted some of those, and they thought, with him, that the difficulty they would have would be to keep their mills going if they were confined to colonial wheat, but that if they could get the imported wheat it would add to the value of the industry. There appeared to be no strong opinion against it by those persons most directly interested in it, so he thought the duty had better be left off.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said he was very much disposed to agree with the Colonial Treasurer. He believed with that hon. gentleman that the duty of £1 a ton on flour would not actually raise the price of bread, and that it would give rise to the establishment of a great many flour-mills in the colony. Public opinion, however, would not stand that yet. With respect to the duty on wheat, that was an anomaly. He believed Queensland was the only country in the world where the manufactured article, flour, was admitted free, while the raw product, wheat, was forced to pay a duty. That anomaly, he believed, had arisen in 1870 by accident. He had before him

a list of the tariffs on wheat and flour of various countries in the world. In the case of Turkey and Egypt the duty on flour and wheat was the same; in Turkey there was an *ad valorem* of 8 per cent., and in Egypt 7 per cent. In New South Wales both were free; but in every other case the manufactured article paid more than the raw article. In Russia wheat was admitted free, while flour paid a duty of 1s. 2¼d. per cwt.; in Norway, wheat paid 1½d. per cwt., flour 8½d.; in Germany, wheat 1s. 6¼d., flour 3s. 9¾d.; in France, wheat 2s. 0½d., flour 3s. 3d.; in Portugal, wheat 2s. 3½d., flour 3s. 8½d.; in Spain, wheat 1s. 8½d., flour 3s. 8½d.; in Italy, wheat 6¾d., flour 1s. 1½d.; in Austria, wheat 6d., flour 1s. 6½d.; in Switzerland, wheat 1½d., flour 6d.; in Greece, wheat 38s. 4¾d., flour 76s. 9½d.; in Turkey both wheat and flour paid an *ad valorem* of 8 per cent.; in Egypt there was an *ad valorem* of 7 per cent. on both; in Roumania wheat was admitted free, while flour paid a duty of 4s. 10½d. per cwt.; in the United States wheat 6s. 10½d. per qr., flour 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; in Cuba, wheat 6s. 8½d., flour 9s. 11½d.; in Porto Rica, wheat 1s. 8½d., flour 5s. 2½d.; in Mexico, wheat 10s. 7d., flour 23s. 3d.; in Brazil wheat was admitted free, flour 1s. 1¾d.; in New South Wales, wheat free, flour free; in Victoria, wheat 2s. per 100 lbs., flour 2s. per 100 lbs.; in South Australia both were the same as in Victoria; in Western Australia, wheat 4d. per 60 lbs., flour 20s. per 2,000 lbs.; in Tasmania, wheat 10d. per 100 lbs., flour 1s. per 100 lbs.; in New Zealand, wheat 9d. per 100 lbs., flour 1s. per 100 lbs.; in Queensland alone there was the anomaly—wheat 6d. per 60 lbs., flour free; in Cape of Good Hope, wheat 1s. per 100 lbs., flour 3s. 6d. per 100 lbs.; in Canada, wheat 7½d. per 60 lbs., flour 2s. 1d. per 200 lbs. He thought it would be a good thing to leave the duty on flour off, and he regretted that public opinion was not sufficiently far advanced.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he was very glad to find that public opinion had not gone so far as the leader of the Opposition wished it to go, and he was glad to find that the Colonial Treasurer was of the same opinion. He would be very glad to see that duty on wheat removed, and he should vote for that—but from a very different reason to that given by the two gentlemen who had spoken. He would vote for the removal of that duty in the interests of what was called the working man. He was perfectly certain that if that duty were removed the farmers on the Darling Downs would suffer, but the general community would benefit. What did they find at the other end of the world? They found the farmers of England clamouring for a duty on wheat. They wanted a duty put on the imported article to enable them to produce enough corn to supply, at least in part, Great Britain. The commerce of America, and the resources of America, would be almost crippled by putting on a duty, while that duty would only benefit the rabid protectionists of Great Britain—men who went in for protection in a form that would never exist in that island. What would be the effect of taking that duty off wheat? It would result in flour-mills being established in the coast towns. Those flour-mills would not use the wheat grown on the Darling Downs, because—and he did not think even the most rabid Darling Downist would assert the contrary—the wheat grown on the Darling Downs was not so good for gristing purposes as the flour grown in South Australia. It might be as good for use in the coast towns, but in the interior it would not keep like Adelaide flour, as it could not stand the climate. It was no use hon. members contradicting him, because he spoke from his own knowledge. He did not care how many bushels the Darling Downs might produce to the acre—that was not the question at all. The wheat produced there when made into flour would not keep in the Western districts like Adelaide flour. They would have to grow a hardier and stronger grain before it could compete with Adelaide flour. He did not object to having those mills in the coast towns, but he should vote for the removal of that impost. They would also have to look for a considerable loss as regarded the duty on bran and pollard, and the Darling Downs farmers, who were so much considered, would also lose the advantage they at present possessed of having differential rates of carriage in their favour, as against imported flour. They would have to grant the same rights and privileges to the flour manufacturer in the colony, although it might be made from imported wheat. As he had said, he would vote against that duty, because it would be to the interests of the consumers to do so, and he doubted whether it would not benefit the producers.

Mr. ALLAN said he was sorry to hear the antagonistic speech from the Colonial Secretary, who himself was a farmer on the Darling Downs. He wished to speak first as to one thing in his remarks as to the keeping qualities of the flour produced from wheat grown on the Darling Downs. It was only that day that he had reason to look up the copies of some old letters, and in one of them, which he believed was in the possession of a miller at Warwick now, he gave his experience in regard to flour. At that time he lived on the Culgoa River, and had occasion to get some flour from Charles Hayes, of Warwick. Before that supply was finished the floods came and Adelaide flour was brought up the Darling and landed at Brewarina, at a cheaper rate than it could be brought from either Brisbane or Warwick. He purchased a lot of it, and by mistake placed it above a few bags of Hayes's flour from Warwick, and the latter remained underneath until all the other was finished. When the second lot was gone they found to their disgust that they had forgotten some of the Warwick flour; but to their surprise they found that it was in a perfectly sound condition. He was so astonished that he made a point of writing to Mr. Hayes on the subject, and he had a copy of the letter still. That was the quality of flour that was made on the Darling Downs. The Colonial Secretary had remarked that it would be a bad thing for the farmers of the Downs if the wheat duty were removed; but it was an extraordinary thing that the farmers on the Downs were not of that opinion. When the matter first came up he put himself in communication with persons in his district where there were four flour-mills and which grew about 175,000 bushels of wheat, and at Warwick there was a public meeting, at which the unanimous opinion was that the wheat duty should be removed. At Swan Creek, another farming district, the Pastoral and Agricultural Association met, and had written to him that they were unanimously of opinion that the duty on wheat should be removed. He wrote also to Allora, but had not yet received any reply. He should therefore have no hesitation in supporting the Colonial Treasurer in his wish to be defeated upon the item before them. He did not think either the Treasurer or the leader of the Opposition would be wrong, or that public opinion would be against them if they moved a duty upon flour. If the colony were canvassed it would be found that people were in favour of a duty on flour for many reasons, and he believed the majority of members of that Committee were of the same opinion. They talked a great deal about the federation of the colonies; but before that they must have intercolonial freetrade. They were getting into a protectionist tariff, and would get more protectionist as they went on. New South Wales would become a protectionist colony also in

self-defence when protectionists are on either side, and after a time they would get tired of keeping up large staffs of officers to look after the duties and would say, "You let our flour in free, and we will take your sugar free," and so on. Last year 44,000 tons of flour were imported into the colony, the value of which was £443,000, and the duty upon that would be something considerable. He repeated that his constituents, so far as he could judge, were unanimously in favour of removing the duty upon wheat.

Mr. GROOM said he had given notice of his intention to move a duty of 20s. per ton upon flour, and then propose that the duty upon wheat be removed. He desired to relieve hon. members upon his side of the Committee of having anything to do with his amendment. He did not want it hereafter to be thrown up to that side of the Committee that they tried to tax flour, and he had proposed the amendment entirely upon his own responsibility; and whatever unpopularity there might be in connection with it, he wished to take upon his own shoulders. At the same time he did not believe it would be such an unpopular thing; but that there was a great deal of sentiment over it.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he was sure the hon. member would put himself in order. He had only incidentally mentioned flour. If the hon. member intended to move the amendment of which he had given notice, the proper time would be at the end of the list as had been agreed upon.

Mr. GROOM said at present the question was whether the duty upon wheat should be retained or not. He thought there was a great deal of sentiment in regard to the tax upon flour. The anomaly which hon. members had referred to, of there being a tax of 6d. upon wheat and none at all upon flour, arose from the circumstance that the duty upon wheat was proposed first, by the Treasurer of the day, in the year 1870, that Treasurer also proposed a duty of 20s. per ton upon flour, but the cry was raised about taxing the poor man's bread—that was the cry in 1870, just as it would be no doubt at the present time— and the House, by a division of 16 to 13, struck out the proposed duty upon flour. But the duty upon wheat was allowed to remain, and there it had remained ever since. As the hon. leader of the Opposition had pointed out, in Canada flour was taxed at the rate of 50 cents per barrel, and the cry of taxing the poor man's bread had not been raised there. He had been given to understand, by gentlemen who were well versed in the subject, that if the duty upon wheat were removed, and a duty of 20s. per ton imposed upon flour, flour-mills would be started in the coast towns, and in other towns as well. Whether that would be the effect of remitting the duty upon wheat he could not say; but, at all events, as he knew the feeling of the Committee was adverse to the duty upon flour, he would not waste time in discussing it. As a protectionist he believed in the tax and if there was a protectionist Parliament in Queensland, as he hoped there would be some day, the tax he referred to would be imposed. For what he had done he was prepared to take any unpopularity that might attach to it. He had suggested the amendment himself, and the party had nothing to do with it. In connection with the duty upon wheat, that was a vexed question. The hon. member for Cunningham had stated that two meetings were in favour of the remission of the duty; and as a rule he did not think they cared whether it was taken off or not. At the same time he would warn the farmers that there was danger ahead if that tax were taken off. There was danger of wheat being brought from India. Not long ago he had seen a full account of that danger in the *S. M. Herald*. It was stated that 200,000 bushels of maize were brought to the port of Melbourne from Natal, where it had been grown by coolie labour. When it was found that in Victoria they would have to pay a duty of 6d. a bushel on it, the ship bringing it was ordered to Sydney, and New South Wales being a free-trade colony the Sydney market was inundated with that large shipment of Natal maize, to the great injury of the local farmers. Large shipments were also being brought from Fiji, and there the maize was grown by coolie labour. In connection with the wheat duty, however, the great danger was from India, where the article was grown by coolie labour and sold at 15d. a bushel. If that article was brought here from India it could be brought at so cheap a rate as to entirely destroy the chance of any wheat-growing in the coast districts of the colony. He would very much like to see flour-mills established in every town along the coast, and he would like to see bran and pollard made in the colony, instead of being imported, as almost everything appeared to be, from the Southern colonies. Taking into account the enormous area of wheat-growing land in India, and the fact that the wheat growers there were already competing successfully with the American, Canadian, and English growers, the question as to whether it would be wise to remove the duty from wheat deserved careful consideration, and he would leave the decision of it to the majority of the Committee. He rose chiefly to say that he did not intend to proceed with his amendment proposing the tax upon flour, and he would leave the Committe to say whether the duty should be removed from wheat.

Mr. PHILP said with reference to the hon. member's remarks about the danger of wheat being imported from India, he would point out that Victoria, South Australia, and New Zealand were now exporting wheat to Great Britain, and competing there with the Indian wheat. They were guided, of course, by the price of wheat in Great Britain, but Victoria, South Australia, or New Zealand could supply Queensland with wheat just as cheaply as they could get it from India.

Mr. GRIMES said that, as the Colonial Treasurer had given an invitation to hon. members to move the omission of wheat, he would move it.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had intimated that he would vote against it himself, and only moved it as a matter of form.

Mr. GRIMES said that, as it agreed with his views in allowing necessaries in free, he would support the omission.

Question—That the word proposed to be omitted stand part of the paragraph—put and negatived.

The COLONIAL TREASURER, in moving—

That there be raised, levied, collected, and paid on—
Barley, per bushel, 9d.
Maize and oats, per bushel, 8d.
Malt, per bushel, 3s.
Bran and pollard, per bushel, 4d.
Beans and peas, per bushel, 1s.

said that when he put the 9d. per bushel on barley he did not anticipate the discussion that had arisen with regard to malting barley. In order to increase the amount of the duty on the articles used in the manufacture of beer, he was prepared to move that there be a duty of 1s. 6d. a bushel on malting barley, leaving barley which included feed barley as it was. His reason for that was that the duty on malt was 3s., and it was the

object of them all to try and encourage the growing of barley and the manufacture of malt. Making the duty 1s. 6d. on malting barley and 3s. on malt would, he thought, give encouragement to the farmer to grow the barley, and would leave room, at the same time, for the establishment of the manufacture of malt in the colony. Some propositions had been made to increase the duty on malt, but he was doubtful whether that would have the effect of establishing the industry. It might possibly have an effect in another way, and might tend rather to depreciate the quality of the malt made than to increase the legitimate trade. The duty proposed was the highest duty imposed on malt in the colonies, being as high as that in Victoria, while in South Australia the duty was 2s. 6d., and in Western Australia 2s.

Mr. GROOM said he wished to ask the Colonial Treasurer if he would allow Cape barley to be inserted in the schedule?

The COLONIAL TREASURER said it was better to let it stand as it was, because "barley" included feeding barley.

Mr. GROOM said that, as regarded malting barley, he would direct the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that the value of it should be borne in mind, as it varied from 3s. 6d. to 5s., according to quality. If the proposed tariff was passed a large area of land would be placed under cultivation for malting barley. The output of malting barley in Victoria last year, according to Mr. Hayter's statistics, was 2,000,000 bushels, and yet the farmers in Victoria were asking for more protection than they had already, and, through their representatives, they proposed an increased duty during the present session. In fact that was one of the questions on which Mr. Gillies was defeated. The duty on malting barley in Victoria was 1s. per bushel, and the New Zealand growers were in a position to go to Melbourne and successfully compete with the Victorian growers. In order to prevent that the duty on malting barley was raised during the present session from 1s. to 3s. by a majority in the Victorian Parliament, and in opposition to the views of the Treasurer. If it was necessary to impose a 3s. duty in Victoria, where the industry was an old-established one, it was much more necessary to impose a similar duty in Queensland where the industry was just started. A duty of 1s. 6d. was scarcely sufficient, while double that sum would give encouragement to start the growing of barley and the erection of malting-houses on the Downs and other places. The duty of 1s. 6d. was not commensurate with the value of barley. The feeding barley referred to was not more than from 2s. to 3s. a bushel, whereas malting barley ranged from 3s. 6d. to as high as 6s. a bushel. The hon. gentleman would be doing right to increase the amount from 1s. 6d. to 2s. 6d., or to 2s. at all events, and by so doing he would give the industry a fairly good start.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had given his reason for fixing the duty at 1s. 6d., and that was to divide fairly the amount of encouragement given to the farmer and to the maltster. That was a very fair position to take up. A duty of 1s. 6d. was a splendid encouragement to the farmers, and it left a margin for the maltster as well. He proposed that after the word "barley" the words "malting barley, per bushel, 1s. 6d.," be inserted.

Amendment put and agreed to.

Mr. ALLAN said he wished to omit the item "maize, per bushel, 8d.," with a view of moving afterwards that the amount be increased to 1s. Of all the cereals grown in the colony maize was the greatest stand-by the farmer had. It was, what all other crops were not, a perfectly regular crop, and farmers could always depend upon getting every year a fair return from their maize crops. Last year there were 73,000 acres of land in the colony under maize, which yielded an average return of 22·31 bushels to the acre. But that was below the average of the last ten years. In the best year, 1880, the yield was 32 bushels to the acre, and in the worst, 1884, it fell to 21½ bushels; the average for the ten years being about 26 bushels to the acre. On that question he was not speaking altogether as a Darling Downs representative. Maize was a crop that was grown in all parts of the colony, and better in the North than in the South. It had been objected by some Northern members that although maize could be grown in the North it would not keep. That could be very easily got over by kiln-drying it.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: How is the small producer to do that?

Mr. ALLAN said the small producers could do it by having a kiln amongst several of them. The quantity per acre of maize gradually got better and better as they went further and further north, and the yield also grew larger, until at Port Douglas last year there was an average return of no less than 45·95 bushels to the acre. The Registrar-General, in his report on agriculture and live stock, when commenting on maize, spoke of it as "the mainstay of the farmers," and further on in his report he said:—

"In the district of Douglas, the area planted in 1887 showed a very considerable decrease of 1,490 acres compared with the previous year: it is difficult to account for this when the handsome yield per acre in the year 1886 of 30·38 bushels to the acre is taken into account. Those agriculturists, however, who cultivated the crop in 1887 reaped their reward by obtaining the premium return per acre in the whole colony—viz., 45·95 bushels to the acre, being an increased yield over the previous year of 15·87 bushels to the acre. Reviewing the statement, it will be seen that the best yields per acre obtained in 1887 was in the Douglas district 45·95 bushels, in the Bundaberg district 34·61 bushels, and in the Tiaro district 32·54 bushels to the acre."

He hoped that in connection with the present amendment he should have the support of those gentlemen from Bundaberg who got such magnificent returns from the maize crop in their district. To show that protection was wanted, he need only allude to the fact that some little time ago large cargoes of maize, from Natal, grown by black and servile labour, were sent into the Sydney market and sold at 1s. 9d. per bushel, and even less; and much of that was sent to Queensland and put into the market here. The farmers here ought not to be put into such unfair competition. He trusted he should have the support of a majority of hon. members. The proposed duty was not sufficiently high to prevent unfair competition. He moved that "maize" be omitted from the paragraph

Mr. WIMBLE said he could endorse the remarks made by the hon. member for Cunningham. With reference to the report the hon. member had read, showing a falling-off in the amount of maize raised in the Port Douglas district, he could give a reason for that decrease.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: We do not want to know any reason. What we want to know is why the duty on maize should be increased.

Mr. WIMBLE said he would give a reason why it should be increased. The cause of the decrease in the production of maize in the Port Douglas district was the people there had changed their cultivation into rice. But he was quite certain, if the proposed increased duty was put

on maize, there would be a large area of land placed under that cereal. Therefore the increase would encourage industry.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Chinamen.

Mr. WIMBLE said, no, not Chinamen. There were several districts in the Northern part of the colony where maize was cultivated, not by Chinese, but by white labour. While speaking on this question he would like to correct a statement made by the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Philp, who had said the residents in the Herberton district were paying 10s. per bushel for maize, and even at that price the selectors did not grow maize, because they could engage in a more profitable industry. In making that statement the hon. member was at fault. Farmers in the Barron Valley had grown maize successfully, obtaining an average yield of from forty to fifty bushels an acre, but the reason why they did not continue the cultivation was they were robbed by the blacks. The difficulties the selectors in that district, and, in fact, all along the coast, had to contend with were mainly caused by the blacks, against whom they had to protect themselves, because sufficient protection was not afforded by the Government. He (Mr. Wimble) believed an additional duty on maize would encourage people in the North to place their land under maize, and he would therefore, support the amendment.

Mr. GOLDRING said he would certainly oppose any increase on maize or any other produce which was largely used in the North. There was quite sufficient protection to maize already with the extra freight that had to be paid by the North, and he did not think the farmers should ask for extra protection. If the proposed increase was carried it would fall most heavily on those living in the North, and he thought farmers should be perfectly satisfied with the tax proposed by the Treasurer. As to the remarks of the hon. member for Cairns with reference to selectors in the North having to protect themselves against blacks, he (Mr. Goldring) would say, let them wait till the blacks were out of the country, and then put on the extra duty if necessary; but there was no necessity just at present.

Mr. POWERS said he had not taken up the time of the Committee in discussing those agricultural matters, but as hon. members would have noticed, he voted on them, which was more important than speaking. However, he must say a few words on the subject now before the Committee. He hoped the Colonial Treasurer would see his way to allow the duty on maize to be increased to 1s. per bushel, because protection to the extent of 8d. only would not allow the farmers to compete with Fiji, New Guinea, and South Africa, where maize was being produced by black labour. Thousands of bushels were last year imported into New South Wales from Fiji. The white men of this country could not stand against competition of that kind without protection. Maize was admitted to be a stand-by of farmers in all parts of the Southern and Central districts of the colony, and if it was not now it would soon be a stand-by for those in the Northern districts also, and therefore they should protect it against unfair outside competition. On the extensive scrub lands of the North almost any product could be grown, and an extra duty of 4d. a bushel on maize would probably have the effect of causing maize to be largely cultivated in that part of Queensland. Persons interested in that matter in the district he represented complained that farmers were heavily handicapped by the railway freight they had to pay for forty miles carriage, as well as in other ways, and they were of opinion that an increased tax was an absolute necessity, as far as they were concerned. They had to face the fact that the sugar industry had declined. The land now under sugar would have to be brought under maize, but if the maize-growers were not protected against outside competitors who employed black labour, they would have a very bad time of it. In advocating the extra duty he was not talking to his constituents, but supported it because it was in accordance with his convictions, and he hoped that the majority of hon. members would see that the increased tax should be imposed. They were told that they had lost £1,326 on the duty on wheat. He hoped that would be met by an increased duty on maize. Last year there were imported into the colony 332,301 bushels of maize. If, then, they were going to protect manufacturers, shoemakers, and other industries, they ought also to give further protection to farmers; and, as far as farmers were concerned, they could not protect them better than by doing it on their staple product. New Guinea was now being settled by a German population, who would grow maize and compete against Queensland agriculturists, at any rate in the North. They had had several freetrade speeches and several protection speeches in the course of the discussion. He noticed that Sir Lyon Playfair, a thorough freetrader, who went over to America to see what protection had done for that country recently stated in a speech at Leeds that—

> "It has risen to this prosperity chiefly by this internal freedom of trade in a growing country, and it will continue to prosper as long as its manufacturers do not glut the internal market. That is until the production does not exceed the demands of the population, with its important annual increase."

In supporting that duty he did so because it would enable them to supply their own internal market, and stop the introduction of the 332,301 bushels of maize in the colony unnecessarily.

Mr. HUNTER said they had heard a great deal about the maize that could be grown in the North, whilst many hon. members had said that nothing could be grown in Queensland. Now, if there was one thing that could be grown in the colony it was maize. The reason for its importation was, that the farmers could grow other produce which paid them better, and it was simply nonsense to propose to protect maize. Maize paid the farmer very well at 2s. 6d. per bushel, and the imported article did not compete with the local produce. Queensland maize was generally sent to market green and in a very bad state, whereas the Southern maize was dry, and could stand carriage into the interior. As far as the North was concerned, he could state that in his district farmers could get 15s. for every bushel they grew, and he thought it was fully protected. On the Gilbert a large quantity of maize was grown, but the farmers, of course, were very strongly handicapped by having no railway, and they had to carry it fifty or sixty miles by horse-teams to market. He had always contended that Queensland required no protective duty to allow the farmers to compete with other countries. As for the maize grown by blacks they had never heard of it until that night. He had been in North Queensland for ten years and had never heard of it; certainly a shipment of that description was once brought into the country, but it fetched such a paltry price that it had never been brought there since. It only fetched 1s. 6d. or 1s. 9d. per bushel in Sydney, and there was an end of it. Another argument was, that they were losing certain revenue on one article and they should make it up on maize, and in the same breath they were told they were going to grow all their own maize, so that where the loss would be made up he did not know. There was no doubt that Queensland could hold her own in the direction of maize-growing, and he should certainly oppose any further increase of duty.

Mr. LITTLE said, in reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Burke, he should like to say a word or two. The hon. member referred to the maize grown on the Gilbert, but he could inform hon. members that he could eat as much corn as was grown there. There was no manner of doubt that the district he (Mr. Little) represented produced a great deal of maize, but even there tons upon tons of it were imported yearly. The maize produced in the district fetched from 6s. 6d. to 8s. a bushel, and when the season was over, that which was brought into the district fetched from 11s. to 15s. per bushel. The hon. member for Burke talked about having been nearly ten years in the North. That was quite possible, but he had been there for twenty-four years, and for every yard the hon. member had travelled he had travelled a mile, and he could inform the hon. member that all the corn grown on the Gilbert he could carry on his back.

Mr. BARLOW said, as one of the representatives of the chief maize-growing district in the colony, he might say that they were very thankful to the Treasurer for the proposed duty of 8d., and would be better pleased with 1s. per bushel. The duty would steady the market, and he did not think 1s. a bushel would be anything very unreasonable. A very large area of land had been laid out in corn, and no doubt a larger area still would be cultivated. His hon. colleague and himself were entirely at one in appealing to the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government to assist the farmers to the extent of 1s. a bushel. He did not think a duty of 1s. a bushel would be very much felt in the North. His votes during the discussion of the tariff had shown that he had consistently supported the cause of the agriculturist, and had redeemed the pledges he had made to his constituents, and he trusted that one of the staple industries of the colony would be assisted to the extent asked for. If there was anything they could grow it was maize, and he sincerely trusted that the proposed amendment would be carried.

Mr. UNMACK said he was more than ever convinced that the representatives of the agricultural districts were so greedy that they were overstepping the mark and defeating their own objects. They did not know where to stop. They asked for 1s. per bushel on maize, but he said that the 8d. was more than the 1s., and he would show why. The cost of freight from Sydney to Brisbane was 4½d. per bushel, and that would make the duty 12½d., and from Sydney to the North the freight was from 6d. to 8d. per bushel. If the representatives of the agriculturists were not content with the duty of 8d. he did not know what would satisfy them, and any industry that wanted more protection than that deserved to go the wall.

Mr. ANNEAR said African maize had been referred to, and he might inform hon. members that when three weeks ago, in Brisbane, maize was selling at 4s. 8d. a bushel, 700 bags of African maize arrived in the market, and the colonial product immediately fell 7d. or 8d. a bushel. His authority for that statement was Mr. Barnes, of Barnes and Co., who were selling large quantities of maize three times a week in the Brisbane market. The hon. member for Fortitude Valley had said that 700 bags of maize had come to Brisbane in one steamer. That was African maize, and was the shipment referred to by the hon. member, Mr. Groom. He should support the proposed duty, seeing the outside competition they had, and the inside competition as well. Perhaps the Treasurer would inform hon. members whether maize was a semi-tropical product. He believed maize could be grown in England, yet he knew that sugar planters on the Mary River were growing maize with their kanaka labour and competing with white farmers. That he knew to be true. The planters said it was a semi-tropical product, but he did not think it was, so that the farmers had not only to compete with blacks outside but inside the colony as well.

Mr. PHILP said he intended to oppose any urther increase of duty on maize. It was already heavily taxed. He found that in New South Wales it was admitted free, and the farmers of that colony last year sent 330,000 bushels to Queensland besides supplying their own requirements. In Victoria the duty was 1s. per cental, about 6d. per bushel, and it would be quite sufficiently protected here by the proposed duty. He knew that the Northern people did not want any coddling in the matter; they got on very well without any spoon-feeding of that kind.

Mr. McMASTER said the hon. member for Maryborough went at things in such a manner that one would think he knew all about everything. He had told them that maize had dropped from 7d. to 8d. per bushel within the last few days. He (Mr. McMaster) was in a position to say that it had not altered 7d. or 8d. for the last three months. It had not altered more than 2d. within the last five or six weeks. The reason why the 700 or 800 bags came up from Sydney was because the farmers up the line, seeing that the hon. member for Toowoomba had given notice to increase the duty to 1s. per bushel, held back their maize, and the produce merchants in Brisbane, who had a certain trade to supply, were bound to get a supply from somewhere. They, therefore, wired down to Sydney for a quantity. Now maize was coming down again, but the farmers were still hanging back waiting to hear what the tariff was going to be. The hon. member had, therefore, been misinformed, or had misunderstood Mr. Barnes, because maize had not altered more than from 2d. to 2½d. during the last five or six weeks. As he said last week, he should very much like to assist the farmers, but really, as the hon. member for Toowong had put it, they had been assisting them very fairly indeed. They were not there for class legislation, and while they were willing to assist the farmer they must consider other people as well. What about the hundreds and thousands of men who had to earn their daily bread with a horse and dray? Were they to be put aside? Those men had gone through very hard times last year when maize was selling at 5s. 6d., 6s., and even 6s. 6d. per bushel, and they had hard work sometimes to keep themselves and their families. As the hon. member for Toowong had put it, 1s. per bushel on maize practically meant protection to the extent of 16½d. He thought 8d. was a very fair protective tariff to assist the farmers, and what they should do was to see the Minister for Railways and try and get their produce brought as reasonably as possible to market. He should support the duty on maize as it stood. In fact, he was of opinion 6d. per bushel was ample. He thought it was hardly fair that oats should be taxed the same as maize, because there were only 40 lbs. to the bushel of oats, while there were 56 lbs. to the bushel of maize. That would come rather hard on those who used oats. In fact, since the new duty had been put on, and owing to the scarcity of oats down south, they had become very expensive.

Mr. GRIMES said the hon. member for Maryborough had referred to some plantations which had turned their attention to maize-growing by using coloured labour. He thought the hon. gentleman must be mistaken, because he could not imagine that any planter, who had a mill upon his estate, would turn from sugar-growing to

growing maize, except it was a small quantity for his own use. Low as the price of sugar was at present, it paid better than growing maize, where there was a mill already on the estate. With regard to the proposed duty on maize, they must consider others besides the growers, and 8d. per bushel, together with freight and other charges, would be a very fair protective duty. If they could not compete with the producers of other colonies under such a tariff as that, they ought to be able to do so.

Mr. JORDAN said it was quite natural and consistent that the freetrade members of the Committee should oppose any increased duty proposed on farm produce. He was not a freetrader, but a protectionist, and he hoped to see some protection extended to the agriculturists of the colony that would be of material benefit to that industry. He had supported the farmers in the increased duties proposed, but he could not go the length of the hon. the senior member for Toowoomba in proposing to impose a duty upon flour. He had supported the duty upon oatmeal, because he was satisfied from the remarks of the hon. the senior member for Toowoomba, and the hon. member for Cunningham, that oats of the description best suited for the manufacture of oatmeal could be grown successfully in the colony—that if they had only sufficient enterprise they could grow that kind of oats, and manufacture oatmeal in the colony. On that ground he had voted for the tariff as it stood with regard to that item. He did not think they had done much for the farmers in the tariff up to the present. He had hoped, from what the hon. the Premier had said, that he would have consented to some of the increases proposed by the hon. member for Toowoomba, Mr. Groom, but he had not consented to one up to the present. He did not think the freetraders of the colony had any occasion to complain of the partiality of the Premier towards the farmers. He thought the hon. gentleman might have done something more for them. He (Mr. Jordan) would not go to the extent of putting a duty on flour, because he could conceive the possibility that there might be some persons, however few, in the colony who might be in such indigent circumstances that they could hardly afford to buy bread enough for the consumption of their families. Therefore, he could not support that duty. He did not think they had done the farmers full justice, and he regretted it very much. In the first place, in the early days, instead of being allowed to settle in suitable agricultural areas, they were driven far away, or had to pay a high price for their land. The farmers had chiefly settled beyond the range, and they had been seriously handicapped up to the present time by the heavy railway freights. It was true that the previous Government had reduced the freight by about 25 per cent., but he would like to see it still further reduced. He had hoped that the Colonial Treasurer would have consented to some of those increases, and he regretted that he had not done so. He would support the amendment of the hon. member for Cunningham to increase the duty on maize to 1s.

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

AYES, 37.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Morehead, Macrossan, Nelson, Donaldson, Black, Pattison, Paul, Hodgkinson, Hamilton, Archer, Smith, Philp, Hunter, Gannon, Goldring, Dalrymple, Buckland, Cowley, Little, Lyons, G. H. Jones, Corfield, Smyth, Palmer, McMaster, Grimes, Lissner, Sayers, Unmack, Adams, Watson, Agnew, Rees R. Jones, Crombie, Stevenson, and Murphy.

NOES, 30.

Sir S. W. Griffith, Messrs. Jordan, Plunkett, Glassey, Barlow, Drake, North, O'Sullivan, Salkeld, Macfarlane, Allan, Perkins, Stephens, Rutledge, Foxton, Dunsmure, Morgan, Murray, Campbell, Powers, Annear, Wimble, Battersby, Luya, Tozer, Hyne, Isambert, Groom, Stevens, and O'Connell.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the paragraph, as amended, stand part of the tariff—put.

Mr. GLASSEY asked if it were competent to move a further amendment to the duty on maize?

The CHAIRMAN : No.

Mr. GLASSEY said, if it were possible, he would propose to make the duty 10d. instead of 8d.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that could not be done according to the plan they had been following. It had been affirmed that the words stand after a division. That was the understanding on which they had started, and it would be a waste of time taking a division if, after having by that affirmed that the words stand at "maize 8d. a bushel," they allowed any further amendment to be proposed.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said no doubt that was practically what was intended by the last division, although actually an hon. member might move amendments on word after word ; but it was practically understood by the last division that the duty on maize should be fixed at 8d.

Mr. GLASSEY said it was just possible that some hon. members who could not see their way to vote for an impost of 1s. would vote for 10d. He had no wish to waste the time of the Committee at all, but if it were competent he would move that amendment.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH asked if bran and pollard should not be treated the same as flour and wheat? He only wished to know the reason why they were not to be admitted free.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: It is just the same reason that applies to all the other items.

Mr. PHILP said he thought 2d. was quite enough duty to put upon bran and pollard. There were large quantities of those articles used in the colony, where they could not be manufactured in sufficient quantities. At the present time in his district the price of bran was 2s. 6d. to 2s. 9d. per bushel, and very large quantities of it were used by dairy farmers and others to keep stock alive. The tax would be only upon those people, and it would not hurt the farmers upon the Darling Downs. He would therefore move that the word 4d. be omitted with a view of inserting 2d.

Mr. COWLEY said he sincerely trusted that some of the gentlemen who had expressed so much sympathy with the North would continue to extend that sympathy in the present case, and vote for the reduction of the proposed duty upon bran and pollard, which could not be manufactured in sufficient quantities in the colony.

Mr. GRIMES said the proposed increase not only affected the Northern constituencies, but also the large towns all over the colony. Those articles were largely used for keeping dairy cattle alive, and he was sure the additional tax would cause an increase in the price of milk.

Mr. GROOM said he would have no objection to vote for the total abolition of the duty, as they had abolished the duty upon wheat, and dairy farmers had to use bran and pollard to keep their cattle alive. Last year there were imported into the colony, 644,119 bushels of bran and

pollard, representing a value of £25,517, and the duty at 2d. amounted to £5,381 10s. 8d. That amount would be exceeded during the present year. The duty should be omitted altogether now that cattle and sheep were dying by hundreds through want of grass, and he hoped the hon. member for Townsville would amend his amendment and have those articles included in the free list. Such an amendment would have his sincere sympathy.

Mr. SAYERS said he could agree with what had fallen from the hon. member for Townsville. He was sure the Colonial Treasurer would see that there was a feeling upon both sides of the Committee that bran and pollard should come in free, as he had already allowed wheat and flour. It was only a small item, and the articles in question were used all along the coast to keep cattle alive.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he did not see that there was any indication on both sides of the Committee, that the articles referred to should be admitted free. The object was to get money, and hon. members had no reason to suppose that he would knock off the duty at present existing upon bran and pollard. He was surprised that the hon. member for Toowoomba should propose it.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said if there were any articles on the whole list that would affect the working classes and the poorer people, they were the ones before them. There was not a house in the country that was not using bran and pollard. He was sure that in his district those articles were used every day. He hoped the Treasurer would see his way to abolish the increase.

Mr. MORGAN said he sincerely hoped the Treasurer would adhere to his proposal. There was no doubt whatever that it would be unwise, after having taken the duty off wheat, to abolish the duty upon bran. The only thing the Queensland miller had to pay him was the profit he made upon the bran, and if the duty upon that article were removed the milling industry would be ruined, and all the mills would be laid up. At present there was not sufficient wheat grown in the country to keep the mills going all the year round. He thought the duty was a very wise one, and hoped the Treasurer would stand firm and stick to it. He wished to draw the attention of the Treasurer to the danger of pollard being allowed to come in as household flour, and thereby evade the duty. There was a very great danger of that, and if the Customs authorities were not sharp, the revenue would be defrauded.

Mr. HAMILTON said when they had such an authority as the hon. member for Toowoomba, one of the strongest supporters of the farming interest, in favour of taking off a duty, they ought to attach some weight to his opinion. It would be too much good fortune to expect to get those articles in free, because they were getting an important revenue from them. Last year, with the duty at 2d., they got a revenue of £5,382, and the Treasurer now proposed that the duty should be 4d. He trusted the duty would be allowed to remain as hitherto, at 2d. As the hon. member for Stanley had stated, the duty on those articles affected every working man. They were used by dairymen, and an increased duty on them would increase the price of milk. It would be also a tax on labour in many ways, as carriers used those articles for their horses. In addition to that, he might state that pollard, as an article of consumption, was used more than flour in a portion of the district he represented—namely, on Thursday Island. He received a telegram from there some time since stating that it would be a direct tax on them, as they used larger quantities of pollard than of flour. He hoped the Treasurer would see his way to leave the duty on those articles as at present at 2d. per bushel, instead of being increased, as proposed, to 4d.

Mr. POWERS said it was rather amusing to hear those wishing to vote for the farmer who had voted against him just now. The revenue expected from the proposed duties would be something like £10,000, and those who had suggested their reduction had not made any proposals for making up the loss that would be entailed. It was hardly fair under the circumstances to ask the Treasurer to take off the extra duty he proposed on those articles.

Mr. DRAKE said those items appeared to him as amongst those in which the differential duties suggested earlier in the debate would work well. There was no doubt the duty of 4d. a bushel on bran and pollard would be felt as a heavy tax in the North, and would not confer upon them any corresponding advantage. He was glad to hear hon. members say that the duties were not wanted for protective purposes in the South. The hon. member for Warwick had said it would be a great loss to the milling industry if the duties were removed; but he had forgotten that a great advantage had been conferred upon that industry by allowing wheat to come in free, and under the circumstances that industry might dispense with the duties upon bran and pollard. He would be glad if the Treasurer could see his way to remove these duties

Mr. MURPHY said hon. members lost sight of the fact that wheat was to be admitted free. Flour was also allowed in free, and bran and pollard being with flour the products produced from wheat, would also be virtually admitted free. With the advantage of free wheat, where they had before to pay a duty of 6d. per bushel, there ought to be sufficient inducement for the establishment of flour mills, and that would result in the production in the colony of bran and pollard

Mr. ALLAN said he was glad to hear the hon member for Barcoo bring that up. One of the great inducements offered to the millers by the introduction of wheat free, would be that they would be able to supply bran and pollard cheaper. By allowing wheat to come in free they would have mills started in Brisbane, Rockhampton, Townsville, and Normanton, and, he believed, all along the coast, as they would be able to supply cheap flour, and would get their profit on the bran and pollard. He trusted the Premier would not give way on that matter.

Mr. HYNE said he had only spoken once on the tariff, and he had made up his mind, if any gentleman anticipated his views, he would not speak again. But he had lost all patience with the hot and cold way in which members were voting. He was surprised at the suggestion made by the hon. member for Toowoomba just now. One of the principal arguments used for introducing wheat free was that it would result in bran and pollard being free. If they were successful in establishing wheat mills the effect would be that they would get bran and pollard free. He hoped the Premier would stick to his proposal, and he would support him heartily.

Mr. PHILP said he did not want bran and pollard to come in free; he would be quite satisfied if he could get the proposed tariff reduced by one-half—that ought to be quite a sufficient inducement to the millers. Hon. members must remember that there were only 20 lbs. in a bushel of bran, and the duty he proposed would be equal to a duty of 6d. a bushel on maize. The Committee, he supposed, wished to legislate for the people in the colony, and not for those who were supposed to be coming to the colony. The hon. member for Barcoo talked

about millers coming here, and that they ought to protect them; but he was not so sure that they would come. The tax upon bran and pollard was a very heavy tax in his part of the country; and it must be remembered further that the freight on bran and pollard was charged as freight and a-half, and sometimes they had to pay two freights on it.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Why do not you reduce it?

Mr. PHILP said he had nothing to do with the freights, and he had to pay it himself. He believed there was no chance of mills being established in Rockhampton, Townsville, or Normanton, but there was a chance of one large mill being established in Brisbane to do all the milling required for the colony, and those in the North would have to continue paying the big prices from Brisbane to Townsville and Normanton.

Mr. UNMACK said he felt himself in a difficulty in connection with the way the questions were put. He thought there ought to be some way devised of putting questions that would give them a chance of arriving at a compromise. At present when a member moved the omission of certain words in the tariff, the question was put "that the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the question," and when that was decided one way or another the Committee had to accept the whole thing. Was there no way in which they could arrive at a compromise. There were many questions upon which he had voted where he would gladly have given a small increase, but owing to the way in which the question had to be put, he felt debarred from doing so because he was not prepared to give the unreasonable increase asked for. The question before them now was that the tariff on bran and pollard should be 2d.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the question was "that the word 'fourpence' be omitted." If that was carried any member of the Committee could put in anything he liked, if he could get a majority to carry it.

Mr. UNMACK: But if the 4d. is not left out?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Then the 4d. stands in.

Mr. UNMACK said that was what he complained of, that they had no chance of arriving at a compromise and arranging for another rate. They were deceived the same way last night on the question of hops. If the present motion were negatived they could not further interfere with the item.

Mr. PHILP said his intention in moving his amendment was that the word "fourpence" be omitted, with the view of inserting the word "twopence" afterwards.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the amendment was that the word "fourpence" be omitted. If it was omitted any hon. member could fill up the blank as he pleased if he had a sufficient majority with him.

Mr. BUCKLAND said he trusted the Treasurer would see his way to accept the amendment. It was a well-known fact that the entire milk supply for the city of Brisbane was dependent on the supply of bran and pollard. Sweet potatoes were nearly done for the season, and it was entirely on that source that they were dependent for their milk supply.

Question—That the word proposed to be omitted stand part of the question—put.

The Committee divided:—

AYES, 39.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Nelson, Macrossan, Black, Morehead, Donaldson, Pattison, Luya, Hodgkinson, Paul, Allan, Annear, Jordan, Stevens, Dalrymple, Morgan, Little, Stephens, Foxton, O'Connell, Tozer, Powers, North, Murray, Battersby, G. H. Jones, Hyne, Plunkett, Adams, Watson, Lyons, Dunsmure, Crombie, Corfield, Stevenson, Campbell, Murphy, Rees R. Jones, and Agnew.

NOES, 29.

Sir S. W. Griffith, Messrs. Rutledge, Glassey, Drake, Goldring, Grimes, Philp, Sayers, Salkeld, Hamilton, Lissner, Macfarlane, Smith, Gannon, O'Sullivan, Perkins, Palmer, Archer, Buckland, Smyth, Cowley, Mellor, McMaster, Hunter, Barlow, Unmack, Wimble, Isambert, and Groom.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph, as amended, put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved—

That there be raised, levied, and collected upon—

Ale, beer, porter, cider, perry, and vinegar (in wood), per gallon, 9d.

Ale, beer, porter, cider, perry, and vinegar (in bottle), for six reputed quart bottles, 1s.; for twelve reputed pint bottles, 1s.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved—

That there be raised, levied, and collected upon—

Tobacco, manufactured, per pound, 3s.

Tobacco, unmanufactured, per pound, 1s. 6d.

Snuff, per pound, 5s.

Cigars, per pound, 6s.

Cigarettes (including wrappers), per pound, 6s.

Mr. UNMACK said he rose to propose that the duty on manufactured tobacco be reduced from 3s. to the old rate of 2s. 6d. per lb. He acknowledged that tobacco was a luxury, because he had never used a quarter of an ounce of tobacco in his life, and he felt that he could do very well without it. The tax on tobacco was one of those taxes that was looked upon as a great hardship; in fact, next to the duty on flour the tax on tobacco was regarded as one of the severest on imports. No article in the tariff was protected more than tobacco. Manufactured tobacco of the ordinary sort was sold wholesale in bond at from 10d. to 11d. and 1s. per lb.; therefore the tax now paid amounted to about 300 per cent. He thought that was sufficient, without increasing the duty by another 6d. per lb., and he moved that the word "3s." be omitted.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said he hoped the proposed increase was not going to be agreed to. He did not see any reason why an article of such universal consumption should have the duty on it raised. As a matter of fact, the price of tobacco had been raised already. That increase was not like an increase of similar amounts on beer and wine. The effect of it would be to raise the price of every fig of tobacco, and that was distinctly a hardship pressing on a very large majority of the people in the community. That was not a fair thing to do. Certainly the circumstances of the colony were not such that they were obliged to put a tax on every man in the community in the direct manner that proposal would do. He was quite aware that the hon. gentleman proposed to reduce the tax on unmanufactured tobacco, but as the hon. member for Toowong pointed out, 300 per cent. was quite sufficient protective duty.

Mr. HYNE said he would support the amendment, as he considered 300 per cent. was a sufficiently protective duty for tobacco. The working classes consumed a large quantity of tobacco, and many men enjoyed their smoke almost as much as their food; in fact, some would

rather be without a meal than their pipe. He thought it would be a graceful act if the Treasurer would consent to the proposed reduction.

Mr. HODGKINSON said he thought they could very well dispense with that increase. He took it that bringing forward such a heavy increase in the duty on tobacco was a distinct premium on crime. Tobacco was almost the only solace a bushman had. They knew the influence of a pipe, and he was certain that he had with him the sympathies of a large section of the community in entreating the Treasurer to forego the additional revenue he would obtain from that enormous increase of duty upon one article of general consumption. It was the only luxury the bushman had at his command; he was deprived of almost everything in the shape of—he would not say luxuries, but the comforts of life; he was deprived of the opportunities of consulting books and of the pleasurable incidents of city life, and the only manner in which he could recall the more pleasant scenes of life was as he sat down in the evening and smoked his pipe. He thought that the execration which the Treasurer would, if he raised that tax, bring down upon his head from every bushman, from the Gulf of Carpentaria to Mount Lindsay, would be scarcely recompense for the extra revenue that would be raised from the increased duty. He asked the hon. gentleman, not as a joke but seriously, not to increase the duty on tobacco, but to make up any loss he might sustain through the proposed reduction by raising the tax on some luxury. By increasing the duty on tobacco they would increase the cost of what a bushman had often to substitute for a meal. He (Mr. Hodgkinson) himself had often to live for several days on tobacco, and there was not a station-holder on that Committee who did not know what an important adjunct was a good supply of tobacco in satisfactorily working a station. He hoped that the Treasurer would yield to their persuasions on that particular item, and leave the duty as at present. Sometimes the imposition of a duty might be more odious than the pecuniary advantage to be derived from it, and he thought that that was probably one of those duties. They would remember what an outcry there was when a Chancellor of the Exchequer of Great Britain attempted to impose a tax on matches. The tax was not a very great amount, but it was inflicted on an impoverished class in the community. It was in consequence of the unpopularity of that tax that that statesman was hurled from office. He (Mr. Hodgkinson) did not for one moment use that as an argument, because he was certain that whatever unpopularity the hon. gentleman might achieve from an unpopular tax, that would not deter him from doing his duty; but he asked the hon. gentleman to listen to the suggestions of the Committee, as he had done on more than one occasion, and agree to the proposed reduction of the duty on tobacco.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said hon. members who had advocated that reduction wished to retain the excise duty on the poor man's beer. The hon. member who last spoke seemed very frightened because of the unpopularity which would attach to him (the Colonial Treasurer) if the duty on tobacco were increased. He would be cursed because he increased the price of tobacco. Suppose he was cursed. If a man cursed the Premier of a colony because he raised the tax on tobacco to 3s. per lb. he ought to leave the colony. Let such a man travel over to New South Wales, and he would find that he would have to pay 3s. per lb. duty on tobacco in that colony, and if he crossed into Victoria, he would curse there, and going on to Tasmania he would still have occasion to curse, because the duty was 3s. Let him curse himself out, and then come back to business. He (the Treasurer) had a certain duty to do, and in doing it had to raise the duty on manufactured tobacco to a certain extent. The duty on all tobacco, manufactured and unmanufactured, was at present 2s. 6d. He proposed to raise the duty on manufactured tobacco to 3s., and lower the duty on unmanufactured tobacco to 1s. 6d. His object was to encourage the manufacture of tobacco. If one looked on the progress of manufactures in other countries, he would see at once that it had been a dead failure to try and introduce tobacco manufacture unless the manufacturers were protected to a certain extent. He was protecting them to the extent of 1s. 6d. per lb. He meant that to have the effect of starting manufactories here. The effect would be not to increase the price of tobacco but to lower it. He questioned very much the increased revenue he would derive. He did not expect anything at all, but he expected a great deal in the increased facilities that would be given to the manufacturers of the colony. The effect that he anticipated would be that manufactories would be established. They could not possibly establish tobacco manufactories for the manufacture of an article that people would smoke or chew or use in any way, unless the manufacturers got a certain proportion of unmanufactured tobacco that had been grown in old-established countries. They would be able to do that. The effect would be that gradually the local article would come in, because it was always to the interest of the local manufacturer to use as much as he could of the local article, because he got it entirely duty free. There was no excise duty on tobacco. Therefore every tobacco manufactory that was established encouraged the local industry. It encouraged the farmer to grow tobacco, because there was no excise duty, and the duty would encourage the manufacturers to bring a certain amount of tobacco from foreign countries, in order that the quality might not deteriorate. If it was wise to encourage the manufacture of tobacco here, it was well also to give encouragement to the importation of unmanufactured tobacco, and at the same time to give free scope to the farmers to supply the manufactories. He thought it was not very wrong to admit that the effect in New South Wales had been to a certain extent to depreciate the quality of the tobacco to the smoker, but that was got over by competition. It showed, at all events, that there was an immense amount of tobacco grown in the colony, and the competition would make it better year by year.

Mr. UNMACK said the hon. gentleman stated that he did not anticipate any great increase in the revenue through putting on the extra 6d. He furthermore stated that so far the raw tobacco had been taxed 2s. 6d. per lb. Considering that the manufactured article could be bought in bond at 10d. per lb., he must admit that that was a very heavy protective duty, and what had been the result? If the present tax had not encouraged the growing of tobacco, how much encouragement would now be offered to the farmers? If they would not produce tobacco with a protective duty of 2s. 6d. they would not produce it with a duty of 1s. 6d. per lb. He would suggest that the Treasurer accept his proposal to reduce the duty to 2s. 6d. on manufactured tobacco and reduce the duty on the unmanufactured article to 1s. That would give more encouragement to the manufacture of tobacco. He should be very pleased to vote for a reduction on the unmanufactured tobacco to 1s. per lb.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had informed the Committee that he did not

anticipate any increased revenue from his proposal, but he would anticipate a great decrease from the hon. member's proposal.

Mr. UNMACK: How so?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Because the manufactured article was to come in at the same duty, and the unmanufactured at a decrease. He had tried to preserve the position of the Treasury as much as he could. His object was to encourage tobacco manufacture here, and in doing that he must make differential duties, and to reduce the duty on manufactured tobacco and decrease the other duty would be a distinct loss to the Treasury to start with.

Question—That the figure "3" proposed to be omitted stand part of the paragraph—put, and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 43.

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

NOES, 24.

Sir S. W. Griffith, Messrs. Hodgkinson, Rutledge, Jordan, Drake, Barlow, Glassey, Grimes, Salkeld, Sayers, Goldring, Macfarlane, Smyth, Tozer, Foxton, Annear, Buckland, Hunter, Hyne, Unmack, Wimble, Isambert, Mellor, and McMaster.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. HAMILTON said he would move that 6s. after "cigars" be omitted, with the view of inserting 7s. It was admitted that tobacco was a necessity, but cigars were undoubtedly a luxury. An additional duty of 1s. would not be felt by consumers, while it would increase the revenue by about £2,400, which might be taken off articles of necessity.

Mr. HUNTER said he had an amendment to precede that. He thought that if they put an extra 6d. on snuff, and a like increase on cigars and cigarettes, they would be able to take the 6d. per lb. off tea. He therefore moved that the figure "5s.," after "snuff," which was entirely a luxury, be omitted, with the view of inserting 5s. 6d.

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

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

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved—

That there be raised, levied, and collected on—

Opium, 20s. per lb.

He said he had explained before, that in the tariff, as originally drafted, he proposed to increase the duty on opium, but it was practically impossible to do so, because the duty in the neighbouring colonies—New South Wales and South Australia—was 20s. If they attempted to increase it they would probably lose the duty altogether.

Mr. SAYERS asked the Colonial Treasurer if it was not possible to put on the same duty as they had in New Zealand, 40s. per lb.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had already explained that the duty in the adjoining colonies was 20s. per lb., and if they made it 30s. here, they would probably lose all the revenue, because the opium would be imported, or rather smuggled in, from the other colonies.

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

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved—

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

Coffee (roasted), tea, and chicory, per lb., 6d.

Coffee (raw), cocoa, and chocolate and chocolate confectionery, per lb., 4d.

Sugar (refined), per cwt., 6s. 8d.

Sugar (raw), molasses, and glucose, per cwt., 5s.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said he would suggest that it was desirable to put a heavier duty on glucose. It was a product not used for any beneficial purposes, and was it not desirable to put on a heavier duty? It was used in adulterating honey, and in making bad beer—it was used for adulterating, very much like butterine was used. It was not injurious in itself, but it was not used for beneficial purposes, and they did not want it used in making beer.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had been unable to get any definite information in the Custom-house as to the amount of glucose that came in, or as to its uses. He knew that the hon. member for Rosewood had informed him that it was used in adulterating certain articles; but the fact of the matter was he did not think it came in—at least, he could not trace it.

Mr. GROOM: It is not mentioned in the imports at all.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said they would be going quite in the dark, and he thought it better to leave it the same as sugar.

Mr. ISAMBERT said glucose was not much used in the manufacture of beer. He believed there was only one brewery which used it in the colony. It was used chiefly in confectionery. It should pay a duty of 10s. a cwt. He might inform the Committee that it was largely used in Victoria—glucose, as well as loaf sugar—to produce fermentation, and a large amount of fusil oil was produced, just as in new rum. Such a large amount of fusil oil had been produced from glucose that it had been prohibited from being used in fortifying wines on the continent. The purer the sugar the purer the spirit produced by fermentation from it. He would propose that the duty on it be 10s. per cwt. As yet the evil did not exist, and by putting the duty at 10s. per cwt. they would keep it away. Besides, it was used largely in the adulteration of honey. An investigation had been held in America, which showed that about 68 per cent. of the samples of honey submitted were adulterated with glucose. It was made from starch diluted with sulphuric acid, and the sulphuric acid had afterwards to be neutralised by carbonate of lime.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he was sure the hon. gentleman knew more about the matter than any other member. He had not been able to get any information as to whether the duty should be 5s. or 10s., but as the hon. member said it would be better to put the larger amount, he would propose that the words "and glucose" be omitted.

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

Paragraph, as amended, put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved that the duty on glucose be 10s. per cwt.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved—

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

Spirits or strong waters, excepting perfumed spirits, of any strength not exceeding the strength of proof by Sykes's hydrometer, and so in proportion for any greater strength than the strength of proof—per gallon, 12s.

Spirits, cordials, or strong waters sweetened or mixed with any article so that the strength thereof cannot be exactly ascertained by Sykes's hydrometer—per gallon, 12s.

Case spirits—reputed contents of two, three, or four gallons, shall be charged on and after the first day of March, 1889. Two gallons and under, as two gallons; and not exceeding three, as three gallons; over three, and not exceeding four, as four gallons.

Perfumed spirits, per liquid gallon, 20s.

Methylated spirits, per liquid gallon, 5s.

He had heard cries of "Adjourn," but hon. members must consider the time of the year and the progress they had made, and if they did he was perfectly sure they would be quite satisfied to go on as far as they could. They had been working very lightly so far, and nearly always adjourned shortly after 10 o'clock, so he thought they should go on with the discussion, and dispose of a great part of those items to-night. On case spirits at the present time duty had been charged at per gallon. They did not take the reputed quantity, but now they were going to do that, which amounted to an increase in the duty unless they increased the size of the bottles. The duty was to take effect from the 1st March next, so that they could have a chance of increasing the size of the bottles before the duty would operate.

Mr. ISAMBERT said he would like to get an explanation from the Colonial Treasurer as to what he intended to do with patent medicines which were largely composed of opium.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: We have not got to that yet.

Mr. ISAMBERT said they had dealt with opium, and when they came to those compounds of opium what would they do?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: We have passed opium.

Mr. ISAMBERT said that they had passed opium, but he wished to know how they were going to treat those medicines in which there was a certain amount of opium? Were they to be taxed more than ordinary medicines?

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that discussion would come on after "spirits." Opium had been disposed of.

The HON. P. PERKINS said he wished to know, if the clause were carried, would a case containing two reputed gallons be charged for as two gallons, even if it actually contained less.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Yes.

The HON. P. PERKINS said, in that case he would suggest that the quality should be up to proof, otherwise it would lead to impositions. The dealers in spirits would diminish the quality in a corresponding ratio to the amount of the deficiency in quantity, and that would lead to a great deal of trouble in the Custom-house.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I would like to understand the hon. gentleman; but I do not.

The HON. P. PERKINS said some spirits were from 10 per cent. to 25 per. cent. under proof, and it would be as well to prevent frauds upon the public that all spirits should be at least up to proof. He was referring to case spirits; they could do as they liked in regard to bulk spirits. When merchants were forcing business in a violent way there was a tendency to make the quality as weak as possible, but an alteration in the tariff would simplify matters at the Custom-house, and the public would be the gainers by the change.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that was what they were going to do. There was to be no reduction for anything under proof, but everything over proof would be paid for in proportion.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: Supposing the spirits were above proof, how would that be found out?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: All spirit is tested.

Mr. UNMACK said the hon. member for Townsville had given notice of an amendment upon the question of spirits, and he wished to know whether he intended to move it.

Mr. PHILP said he intended moving that the duty upon spirits be increased from 12s. to 14s. His reason for doing so was that the Treasurer, when he introduced the tariff, said he was doing so for revenue purposes, and he (Mr. Philp) knew of nothing that could better pay an extra duty than spirits. In New South Wales the duty upon spirits was 14s.; in Western Australia, 15s.; in South Australia, 14s.; in New Zealand, 15s. and 16s.; in Victoria, 12s.; and in Tasmania, 12s. He moved that the word 12s. be omitted, with a view of inserting 14s.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he would not, as he had intimated before, consider an amendment of that sort, moved by anyone, as a friendly amendment to the Government. The duty of the Treasurer was to state his wants, and if he had not told the Committee that he wanted more money, he did not think it was the duty of anyone to force more money upon him. He did not wish any hon. member to interfere with the tariff, and would stick to the 12s. upon spirits. The proposal was a departure from the principles upon which the tariff was based. The hon. member was quite right in stating what the other colonies charged; but he forgot to state the very exceptional circumstances under which those duties had been charged. There was no colony where spirits contributed so much in proportion to the taxation as in Queensland. He might mention that the duty paid upon rum, brandy, geneva, old tom, whisky, etc., amounted to 25s. per head, or 32 per cent. of the general taxation of the colony. In New South Wales the duty upon spirits amounted to 18s. 1d. per head, in Victoria to 13s. 8d. per head, in South Australia to 6s. 8d. per head, in Tasmania to 11s. 7d. per head, and in New Zealand to 13s. 6d. per head.

Mr. DRAKE said he trusted that the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government would give hon. members on either side what the Colonial Secretary termed a "free hand" in the present discussion.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said when he intended to make arrangement with his party he would do it himself.

Mr. DRAKE said that was the reason why he suggested that it was desirable to give hon. members a "free hand" in the present discussion, as they had had a "free hand" in the discussion upon wheat.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: We will give you a "free hand" in the matter of chaff directly.

Mr. DRAKE said he thought they were beyond the subject of chaff; but if the hon. gentleman wished to return to it there could be no objection. With regard to the hon. gentleman intimating that it was not right for the Committee to propose increased duties on certain articles and decreases on others, if he remembered rightly, the hon. gentleman, when introducing his tariff, stated that his object was to get a certain amount of money. It was understood also that the hon. gentleman was prepared to receive suggestions from members of the Committee as to the desirability of increasing the

duties on some items and decreasing them on others. Members did not exceed their right in suggesting means by which the Treasurer might derive more revenue, because the hon. gentleman had said over and over again that that was his object in framing the tariff. If the hon. gentleman could derive more revenue from a certain article, the duty on which the Committee generally considered should be increased, he would then be in a much better position to reduce the duties on some articles which would not have a protectionist operation, and which would increase the cost of living. It could not be doubted that the proposed tariff would greatly increase the cost of living, and under the circumstances members of the Committee were justified in asking the hon. gentleman not to impose any more duties that would increase the cost of living; and if they, at the same time, pointed out means by which the hon. gentleman could secure the additional revenue he required, there ought to be no difficulty about his accepting the suggestion.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said he hoped the hon. Treasurer would agree to adjourn. He understood it was proposed to sit on Friday, and if so, they could certainly clear off all the remaining items on the tariff by the end of the week. Hon. members had no desire to obstruct business, and were generally actuated by a desire to get the tariff through as quickly as possible. There were, he thought, only two or three disputed matters still to be considered. There might be one or two divisions on timber; the discussion on boots and shoes was not likely to take long, and there might be something said about machinery, though he did not think that would take long. There would not be much to be said about the free list. Most of the contested items had been already disposed of that afternoon. A great many members had gone away, and he could tell the hon. gentleman also that he would find sitting late on four nights in the week would entail considerable wear and tear. If they worked too hard at the beginning they would be unable to do anything at the end.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he would be only too glad if the hon. gentleman could guarantee the opinion he had expressed.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: I have not the slightest doubt about it

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had the greatest doubts about it. He could pick half-a-dozen men from either side of the Committee who did not care one straw about either the hon. gentleman opposite or himself, and who would be prepared to discuss certain items right on to Friday night. If it was an understanding that they would finish the tariff on Friday night, he would be prepared to adjourn that minute.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: I am sure the hon. gentleman can understand it. As far as any influence in my power is concerned, there may be a clear understanding that the tariff will be finished by Friday night.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the hon. member knew he did not go in for late nights and could not stand a long session any more than ordinary members. On the understanding that both sides of the Committee would endeavour, in perfect good faith, to finish on Friday night, he would have the greatest pleasure in moving the Chairman leave the chair, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed; the CHAIRMAN reported progress, and obtained leave to sit again to-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that this House do now adjourn.

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