

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 4 OCTOBER 1888

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 4 October, 1888.

Question.—Petition—Ann street Presbyterian Church Bill.—Formal Motions.—Water Bill—committee.—Sale and Use of Poisons Bill—second reading.—South Queensland Sandstone Quarries.—Return of Landed Proprietors.—Ways and Means—resumption of committee.—Adjournment.

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

QUESTION.

Mr. TOZER asked the Minister for Railways—

1. Have the Government any objection to opening for road traffic the Dickabram Bridge, Mary River?

2. If not, will they see that the officials, or body, whose proper duty it is, take the necessary action without delay?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. H. M. Nelson) replied:—

1. The Government have no objection to open the bridge in question for road traffic, provided the Divisional Board make the necessary regulations.

2. The Government have no power to compel them to do so.

PETITION.

ANN STREET PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH BILL.

Mr. MURPHY presented a petition from certain persons against a Bill entitled "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." He moved that the petition be read.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said: Mr. Speaker,—I think there should be some reason given for reading a petition against a private Bill. The Standing Orders provide that such Bills shall be referred to a select committee, and the petitioners have to make out their case before it. The select committees are appointed to investigate such cases, and save the House the trouble, by examining witnesses and so on. I do not remember an instance of a petition against a private Bill being read. In the present instance a select committee has not yet been appointed.

Mr. MURPHY said: Mr. Speaker,—With the permission of the House, I will withdraw the petition for the present.

Petition, by leave, withdrawn.

At a later hour, on the motion of the hon. member, Mr. MURPHY, the petition was received, and ordered to be referred to the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the Ann street Presbyterian Church Bill.

FORMAL MOTIONS.

The following formal motions were agreed to:—

By Mr. R. H. SMITH—

That there be laid upon the table of the House, copies of the Government Geologist's reports, together with all correspondence, in connection with the boring for coal in the Bowen River district.

By Mr. REES R. JONES—

1. That the Ann street Presbyterian Church Bill be referred for the consideration and report of a Select Committee.

2. That such committee have power to send for persons and papers, and leave to sit during any adjournment of the House; and that it consist of Messrs. Unmack, McMaster, Gannon, G. H. Jones, and the mover.

WATER BILL.

COMMITTEE.

On this Order of the Day being called,

The Hon. Sir S. W. GRIFFITH said: Mr. Speaker,—I am very anxious, before going further with this Bill, to hear the views of the Chief Secretary on the subject; and as it is not convenient to go into the matter to-day, I move that this Order of the Day be postponed till this day week.

Question put and passed.

SALE AND USE OF POISONS BILL.

SECOND READING.

Mr. FOXTON said: Mr. Speaker,—The objects sought to be attained by this Bill will commend themselves to every thinking person in the community. It will place hindrances in the way of the destruction of human life, whether it be by accident or design, and that must be admitted to be an advantage to the community at large. This Bill was introduced in another place some years ago, and about the same time as the Bill which has since become the Pharmacy Act was introduced. It was then withdrawn, and it was thought at the time that it would be embodied in the Pharmacy Act, as has been done with similar provisions in some of the other colonies. In New South Wales the Pharmacy Act as we have it here, or something analogous to it, and provisions analogous to those of this Bill, are embodied in one Act. In Victoria that is not so, and there the matter is dealt with by a special Act, of which this Bill is almost a rescript. There is little or nothing original in this Bill as at first introduced into the other Chamber, as, if not a rescript of the Victorian statute, it is an adaptation of that and those portions of the New South Wales statute bearing on the question of poisons. The ultimate object of the Bill is the preservation of human life by the prevention of accidents terminating in death by the taking of poison, and also the prevention of crime.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. B. D. Morehead): To limit the privilege of poisoning.

Mr. FOXTON: There is something in what the hon. member says, but it is still proposed to allow chemists and doctors to poison at their own sweet will. It will put a limitation upon the power of persons to poison themselves, unless they are duly qualified to deal with poisons. While making reference to the Acts in New South Wales and Victoria, I may as well say that Queensland enjoys the unenviable distinction of being the only colony which has not legislated on this subject. Acts similar to this Bill are in force in New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, New Zealand, Tasmania, and even Western Australia. On looking through this Bill hon. members will find that the first schedule has been divided into two parts. The first contains a list of certain poisons which are sought to be placed on a different footing from those contained in the list in the second part. They are, in fact, poisons as to which it is proposed to put a limitation on their sale—an obstruction, so to speak, upon their indiscriminate sale. Certain

formalities have to be gone through when these poisons are bought and sold. No particular reference is made in the Bill to the second part of the first schedule, but reference is made to the schedule as a whole—to all poisons including those contained in both parts of the schedule. I will not detain the House long in moving the second reading of this Bill, as I am aware that very important Government business is to follow. The second clause of the Bill provides that—

“Every person who shall sell any poison specified in the first part of the first schedule to this Act shall, before the delivery thereof to the purchaser, inquire his name, place of abode, and occupation, and the purpose for which such poison is required or stated to be required, and shall thereupon make a faithful entry of such sale,”

specifying the quantity of poison sold, and other particulars stated, in a book to be kept by the vendor for that purpose. The entry made in that book must be signed by the vendor and the purchaser, unless where the purchaser declares himself unable to write, and in such a case a statement of the fact must be recorded along with the entry by the vendor. Further, it is provided that whenever a witness to the sale is required by the Act the entry must also be signed by the witness. In the case of a sale by correspondence, the clause provides that the particulars of the correspondence must be entered in the book mentioned; and if the poison is sent by post the letter or packet containing it must be registered. It is also further provided that no person shall sell poison ordered by correspondence—

“To any person with whose signature he is not acquainted, unless such signature shall have been witnessed by a justice of the peace, or clergyman, or be authenticated by some person known to the vendor.”

I do not know why a clergyman has been introduced as a competent witness for such a purpose, but that is a mere matter of detail with which we need not deal just now. Clause 3 of the Bill provides that—

“No person shall sell any poison specified in the first part of the said first schedule to any person who is under the age of eighteen years, or who is unknown to the vendor, unless the sale be made in the presence of some witness who is known to the vendor, and to whom the purchaser is known, and which witness signs his name, together with his place of abode, to the required entry before the delivery of the poison to the purchaser.”

By clause 4 it is provided that—

“It shall not be lawful to buy or sell any poison for the avowed purpose of destroying rats or other vermin infesting houses and premises, unless the purchaser be a householder.”

Clause 5 is one to which some exception has been taken in other parts of the world, and it requires that arsenic and strychnine must be coloured. Arsenic is to be coloured by soot or some other black substance in proportions stated in the clause before being sold, and strychnine is to be coloured by Armenian bole or some other red colouring matter before sale. There is also a proviso to the clause to this effect—

“Provided always that whenever the purchaser states that such arsenic or strychnine, or any preparation thereof respectively, is required not for any pastoral or agricultural use or for the destruction of vermin, but for some purpose for which such other admixture would, according to the representation of the purchaser, render it unfit, such poison may be sold without the admixture hereinbefore specified.”

That is a very necessary provision, because colouring may in many instances operate against the purpose for which the poison is intended. Clause 6 is one to which possibly there may be some exception taken. By it patent or proprietary medicines are excepted from the operation of the Bill, although, as is well-known, some

patent medicines contain a large proportion not only of deleterious matter, but also of deadly poison. Of course the Bill does not apply to the vending of any poison, if it is compounded in any medicine according to the prescription of a duly qualified medical man; nor if it is included in any homoeopathic medicine unless of a particular strength, which is well understood by the medical profession; nor to the sale of photographic materials for the purpose of photography; nor to the sale of medicines dispensed by a veterinary surgeon for animals under his treatment. Some persons may think that these exceptions are very wide, but while doing everything which can be done for the purpose of attaining the general objects of the Bill, it is well to bear in mind that if the principle is followed too far it may hamper and interfere with various industries, and cause a great deal of unnecessary inconvenience. By clause 8 no person is allowed to sell any poison unless he holds a certificate from the Board of Pharmacy, or is a legally qualified medical practitioner, or a registered pharmaceutical chemist. Clause 9 provides that if a person produces a certificate from a legally qualified medical practitioner, or a police or stipendiary magistrate, that he is a fit person to be allowed to sell poisons, he shall receive from the Board of Pharmacy a certificate as a dealer in poisons. I think that is a provision on which there may be a great deal of discussion. If we are to place any restrictions at all upon the sale of poisons, it appears to me that we should be going too far in retaining this clause in the Bill. It would, in my opinion, to a very great extent defeat the main objects of the Bill. It would be a very simple matter for almost anyone to obtain from some duly qualified medical practitioner, or police or stipendiary magistrate, a certificate that he was a fit and proper person to sell poisons. I do not think this power should be placed in the hands of any individual member of the medical profession, because a disreputable member of that profession—and there are disreputable members in every profession—might make a business of the sale of these certificates of competency at so much per head. However, the matter is open for discussion. Clause 9 further provides that—

“Every such dealer shall keep all poisons in a cupboard of sufficient dimensions, and containing such shelves as the Board of Pharmacy may direct.”

I may mention that the Board of Pharmacy have power to make regulations, and the word “direct” may mean by the regulations. Possibly it might be as well to say that in the clause and make it quite clear. Clauses 10 and 11 deal with the labelling of bottles and vessels containing poisons, and so forth, and of course relate to the whole of the poisons mentioned in the schedule. It may be said that in many respects the proposals in this measure are somewhat crude, and that it will be very difficult to secure convictions under the Bill if it becomes law, because there is a great deal which will be matter of opinion with regard to whether certain drugs contain certain poisons. I can quite see where there may be a conflict of evidence regarding questions of fact, but notwithstanding that there may be difficulties in the way of securing convictions under the Bill, I would point out that the real safeguard lies in the formalities which it is necessary to observe in the purchase and sale of poisonous drugs. No man who contemplates suicide will care to go to the chemist and give full details of the transaction as required by this measure—the reasons why he wants the poison, and so forth—and sign an entry to that effect. If he does he will do it deliberately in cold blood, but I do not think an intending suicide will care to go through that ordeal. At all events these provisions will clog the way of a suicide. I do not think I need say anything

more about the Bill. I have endeavoured to be as short as possible in giving hon. members an outline of the general principles of the Bill. I certainly do think it is time a measure of this nature was adopted in this colony. Everyone must be aware, not only of individual instances where life has been lost through the want of such a measure as this, but also of a far greater number of cases where narrow escapes have occurred. Such instances have come under my notice. My own children had a very narrow escape on one occasion from being the victims of some hydrochloric acid left carelessly about by some plumbers.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: This measure does not provide against carelessness of that kind.

Mr. FOXTON: Yes, it does, in this way, that it will bring under the notice of persons using poisons the fact that it is not desirable to leave those poisons about. In that way it will, I think, have a very beneficial effect in such cases as that to which I have referred. I beg to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said: Mr. Speaker,—I think that in introducing a Bill of this nature the introducer should give the House some reason for bringing in the Bill. There has no reason whatever been given for the introduction of this Bill. If, as the hon. member says, such a law is in force in other colonies, and if he had shown this House that the death-rate per 1,000 of the population here was greater, through the use of poison, than it is in the other colonies, then there might have been some sufficient reason for introducing a measure to deal with the question of selling poison. But, even if that reason had been given, I think that this Bill is certainly one that does not meet the case. I think hon. gentlemen who have read the Bill will see that it is weak from beginning to end. Setting aside the colouring of poisons, we will go on to the 6th clause, the marginal note of which says: “Certain sales excepted from the Act;” but what is excluded—all patent medicines?

Mr. FOXTON: I pointed that out.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am pointing it out, too, for the information of the House. The clause excludes chlorodyne and various other medicines, and also proprietary medicines, which, I presume, would cover that æsthetic way of getting out of the world—the taking of “Rough on Rats.” I fancy that “Rough on Rats” would be included in this 6th clause. That is to say, there is nothing to prevent anyone who wishes to poison himself or anyone he has a desire to put out of the world from exercising his wicked will by administering a dose of “Rough on Rats.”

Mr. DRAKE: The 4th clause provides for that.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The 4th clause does not deal with the question unless the person concerned considers himself or his friends rats or vermin. If the hon. member reads the clause he will see it is exactly as I state.

Mr. FOXTON: Put “Rough on Rats” in the schedule.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: How many things will have to be put in the schedule? There is no doubt that very many of these patent medicines are poison, and the 6th clause will not cover them. Therefore I say the 6th clause gives power to sell poisonous compounds without any restriction. Then, with regard to another portion of that clause, of course it must be well known

that a very large quantity of strychnine is used in the poisoning of native dogs and other vermin, but the clause says:—

“Nor shall it extend to any sales by wholesale dealers in the ordinary course of wholesale dealing, if an order in writing signed by such purchaser shall be given for the supply of the same.”

That clause will have to be amended. The words “or his agent” will have to be inserted, because the purchaser really will be the owner of the station, and the purchase will be made by his agent. The clause goes on to say:—

“Provided that all such sales shall be entered in a book, and that the bottle or other vessel, wrapper or cover, box or case, immediately containing the poison be labelled as required by this Act.”

I presume, it will be entered in a book by the bookkeeper of the seller. Is any special book to be kept to record the sales of poison? Now, we will go on to the wonderful clause 9, and it is a clause that must be read not only with wonder, but with admiration. It is fearfully and wonderfully constructed.

“Any person who shall produce a certificate from a legally qualified medical practitioner or a police or stipendiary magistrate that he is a fit and proper person to be allowed to sell poisons shall receive from the Board of Pharmacy a certificate as a dealer in poisons, on payment of a fee of ten shillings per annum to such Board of Pharmacy.”

Well, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, was ever a more preposterous clause put in a Bill supposed to be of a restrictive character? In endeavouring in this Bill to protect the public from the undue sale of poisons, in a very real and shallow manner we here give in this clause 9 almost an absolutely free license to anyone, on the payment of 10s., to go into the market and sell poisons. And the hon. gentleman himself had to admit that it was possible to find a weak-kneed person to issue a certificate, but he did not say for what sum—we will say 6s. 8d. Now, we will go on further. He has to pay 10s. per annum to the Board of Pharmacy, that is 16s. 8d. for the first year for the privilege of selling poison. We will go on now to discover how this dealer in poison is to deal with the poison. We find he has to do this so as to safeguard the public:—

“Every such dealer in poisons shall keep all poisons in a cupboard of sufficient dimensions, and containing such shelves as the Board of Pharmacy may direct.”

Well, could anything be more absurd? Is there any provision that the cupboard shall be locked? Is that dealt with? All he has to do is to pay 16s. 8d., get a cupboard, buy poison, and sell it how he likes, when he likes, and to whom he likes. Now, I think I have said enough to show that this Bill as it stands is unworkable. I do not think it can be licked into shape even in committee, and I think it would be very much better for us to reject it at the second reading. It is badly drafted. It is drafted on the wrong lines, and will be no safeguard whatever to the public. I would be the very last to object to a measure which would attain the object this Bill has in view, but as it stands at present it would be a disgrace to our Statute-book. Talk about driving a coach-and-four through an Act of Parliament, why, a man and a jackass could walk through this.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear, hear!

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that, and I cannot congratulate him on his vanity.

Mr. FOXTON: The *Courier* says that the Minister of Justice constructed it.

Mr. DALRYMPLE said: Mr. Speaker,—Whether this Bill is framed with sufficient precision or not, I think a Bill of this sort is wanted. Now, I do not admit that it is a Bill that is at all calculated to prevent anyone

desirous of taking his life from doing so, because there are many means of accomplishing that act by the use of articles outside the scope of the articles that the public are not permitted by this Bill to purchase. I remember a case in which a man complied with all these precautions. He purchased poison, and I may observe that in order to disarm the seller he was very anxious to save 6d.; that is to say, he wanted to get 1s. worth for 6d., not because he had not the 1s.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Because he wanted to leave something to his family.

Mr. DALRYMPLE: Because of his native thrift. The seller did not take sufficient account that the purchaser was a Scotchman, and the consequence was that the sale was effected in spite of these precautions. But although a Bill of this sort, or one somewhat similar, could not be expected to prevent people from committing suicide, it is possible that it would diminish the risk of suicide; it is possible to prevent mistakes, or to assist in doing so, and also to prevent persons doing away with their neighbours without leaving any traces. It is with some such object I should be disposed to advocate the passing of a similar measure. It compels the purchaser to have his address placed on record, and to have witnesses; that to some extent would prevent persons committing crimes, because by these precautions these crimes would be traceable. That to my mind is one reason for the Bill. A similar Bill is in existence in Great Britain, in Victoria, and I believe in New South Wales. Its object is to ensure that people who sell poisons shall be to some extent responsible persons. Of course they may use their discretion. I know of a case that occurred at Rockhampton in which a young woman purchased something that she believed to be poison, intending to do away with her miserable existence, but the person who sold the supposed poison condescended to a little fiction. He did not give her poison at all; she went away, took this perfectly harmless substance, with the result of creating a great commotion and the calling in of a great number of medical men, but nothing came of it. Still, had she been able to get poison, she would probably have accomplished her object. With a Bill of this sort I think crimes, if committed, would be much more easily discovered, and persons knowing this would not be so disposed to commit crimes. As was pointed out by the hon. the Colonial Secretary, it is a very serious defect in the Bill that such poisons as “Rough on Rats” are not included. If you look at the statistics of deaths from poisoning, I believe it will be found that that is rather a favourite medium by which persons terminate their existence. Still, the fact of certain omissions occurring in the Bill does not go to show that some measure to diminish the risk arising from the sale of poisons should not be passed. I think, too, it would have been well had the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill brought in certain facts in connection with poisoning to show how frequently—we will say—accidents occur. The hon. the Colonial Secretary said that certain statistics had not been brought in to show the necessity for the Bill, but I think the existence of a Bill of this sort, or any limitation to the facilities by which the public can get poisons, would probably result in cases of poisoning being discovered and being placed on record that we cannot find out now. I myself have not seen the Bill before to-day.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Read the 9th clause.

Mr. DALRYMPLE: I say I have not had possession of the Bill until to-day, and have not been called upon to give any opinion upon it, but

I certainly do think a similar measure would be very useful. I admit, with the hon. the Colonial Secretary, that the 9th clause, under which any person is apparently allowed to sell poisons, provided he gets a certificate, is a very insufficient safeguard to the public. That, however, I am informed by the hon. member for Carnarvon, it is proposed to alter in Committee. With regard to clause 4, which has also been criticised by the hon. the Colonial Secretary—

"It shall not be lawful to buy or sell any poison for the avowed purpose of destroying rats or other vermin infesting houses and premises, unless the purchaser be a householder."

Well, Mr. Speaker, this seems really to confine the privilege of being careless with poisons, or in absolutely poisoning one's neighbours, to householders. Other people are forbidden to do so; but a householder can take either his own life, or apparently other people's lives, by means of this very common poison, "Rough on Rats." It seems to me that the criticisms of the hon. the Colonial Secretary are quite called for. I do not go so far as to say that a Bill of this kind is not necessary. I think the better course would be for the mover of the Bill to withdraw it, let it be examined by those competent to express an opinion on the subject, and then let it be reintroduced. I believe such a measure is necessary for the reasons I have given—that in cases of crime it would enable us to bring the blame home to the right parties, and possibly prevent misfortune to the community.

Mr. MACFARLANE said: Mr. Speaker,—I agree with the last speaker when he suggested that the best thing for the introducer of the Bill to do is to withdraw it and reintroduce it in a more compact form. Until I read the Bill I thought it would be likely to attain the object in view, which, I presume, is to prevent people poisoning themselves. But I believe that, if anyone went into statistics and investigated all the poisoning cases that have occurred in the colony, he would not find more than about one out of 100 of the poisons used covered by this Bill. Ninety-nine out of 100 of the articles that will produce poisoning are not mentioned in the Bill at all. Of course it is a chemist's Bill to prevent other persons from selling these things without a certificate. My principal objection to the Bill is that all the articles that ought to be mentioned in it are not mentioned; articles that do far more harm than any of the articles enumerated in it. The hon. member for Mackay mentioned the case of a girl at Rockhampton who wanted to poison herself, but the chemist gave her only some harmless medicine. Well, that girl must have had very little sense, because she could very easily have poisoned herself. If she had taken about two glasses of spirits of wine it would have finished her, or a bottle of brandy would have done the same. Pure alcohol—very little of it—will poison anybody, and you can get it from a public-house. If you take the pure alcohol out of a single bottle of brandy and give it to anyone in this Assembly it will kill them as sure as fate. Yet this is not mentioned in the Bill. Ninety-nine out of every hundred of the horrible deaths, murders, and poisonings are committed through this one article, and yet not a word about it in the Bill.

Mr. FOXTON: Move that it be inserted in the schedule.

Mr. MACFARLANE: It would not be carried. The Bill at all events is very crude, and I would advise the hon. member to withdraw it and introduce it again in a better form. A similar Bill was introduced a session or two ago and thrown out for very similar reasons, and it is hardly worth while wasting the time of the House in discussing this Bill in its present form.

Mr. FOXTON said: Mr. Speaker,—I am aware that I am not entitled to reply, but I wish to make a personal explanation. Hon. members have referred to me as the introducer of the Bill. I am not the introducer of the Bill. It was sent down to this House by message from the Legislative Council.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir T. McIlwraith): You are its godfather.

Mr. FOXTON: I am not the introducer, at all events. I never read the Bill until it had passed the other Chamber.

The PREMIER: I thought that.

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

The committal of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow week.

SOUTH QUEENSLAND SANDSTONE QUARRIES.

Mr. NORTH, in moving—

1. That a Select Committee be appointed, with power to send for persons and papers, and leave to sit during any adjournment of the House, to inquire into and report upon the sandstone quarries of the southern districts of the colony.

2. That such committee consist of Messrs. Annear, Morgan, Luya, Watson, O'Sullivan, and the mover.

—said: Mr. Speaker,—In moving for a select committee to inquire into the capabilities of the different quarries in South Queensland, I do so with the object of settling the question as to the supply to be practically obtained from them, as far as that can be ascertained by experts. Large quantities of stone come into Brisbane from the Southern colonies. There are at present eight quarries working in the electorate I represent, but those quarries are completely shut out of the market by the stone imported from the other colonies, which, I believe, is no better. According to the latest returns there are two quarries working at Goodna, and they turned out 2,000 tons of stone of the value of £750; seven at Gatton, with an output of 7,918 tons of stone of the value of £18,249; one at Brisbane, which turned out 2,184 tons of stone of the value of £1,716; one at Maryborough, the output from which was 2,866 tons, of the value of £286; and one at Warwick, with an output of 1,600 tons, of the value of £480. If all the Southern quarries were properly worked it would cause a large population to settle in the districts round about Toowoomba, Helidon, Goodna, and Brisbane; and the Railway Department would derive a large benefit from the carriage of the stone. Most of the stone used now comes, as I said, by water from the South. But a great portion of the stone that the Queensland National Bank is built of came from Helidon, and was considered quite good enough. I should be very glad if the House would grant me this committee to inquire into the quality of the stone in these quarries. I beg to move the resolution standing in my name.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I do not think anybody can have any objection whatever to a committee of this kind, for I am sure we shall all be glad to have the opinion of such gentlemen as Mr. Annear, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Luya, Mr. Watson, and Mr. O'Sullivan on this important subject. It is a pity the motion was not brought forward at an earlier period of the session; because, as the committee cannot sit after the prorogation, there will be very little time for them to pursue their inquiries. But I shall be satisfied if they proceed to work as soon as they can, and give us their opinion, whatever it is. I have not the slightest idea of interfering with the committee, but I think the object of the committee should

be to examine the different places where stone is found, compare the stone produced here with that imported from the other colonies, and then express their opinion upon it. They ought not to hold their sittings here and send for witnesses to express their opinions. That is not what is wanted; they should examine the stone themselves, and then present the report containing their opinions upon it as experts to the House. With that idea I am perfectly satisfied with the committee, and I do not think there can be any objection to it.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said: Mr. Speaker,—I entirely agree with every word said by the mover of this motion. I believe we have stone in this colony that can compete favourably with any stone in the other colonies. But I am diffident in acting on this committee, and I will give you some of my reasons. I am the owner of a stone quarry myself, and in any little transaction of mine in this House I should always like, if possible, to keep my fingers clean. I do not think I should be a competent judge in this matter. The probabilities are that I should recommend my own quarry as being better than any other man's. I do not think a party concerned should sit on such a committee, nor do I consider myself a very capable judge of stone, although I have had some dealings in it so far as the building of fifty or sixty houses in Ipswich is concerned. I would suggest to the hon. member a very able man, an old quarryman of thirty or forty years standing, who is not a member of the House. I do not think any member of this Committee is a quarryman, and some outside members, who are really good judges of stone and practical quarrymen, should be appointed. I would therefore suggest that the House should consent to the appointment of a quarryman whom I know myself, and who has been employed by almost every contractor in Queensland. He is a man named Bennett; there are three brothers of that name living in the neighbourhood of Ipswich, and one of them is famous as a judge of stone. I would suggest to the hon. member that that man be appointed in my place.

The PREMIER: You cannot appoint a man to a select committee who is not a member of Parliament.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Then I would rather some other member were appointed in my place, as I am the owner of a quarry which I believe to be a good one.

Mr. SALKELD said: Mr. Speaker,—I merely wish to allude to what I think is an oversight in the constitution of this committee. Since I have been in the House, all select committees have been composed as far as possible of an equal number of members from each side of the House. This proposed committee I notice is composed of six members, two being chosen from one side of the House and four from the other. I am very glad to see that the hon. member for Stanley is on the committee, as I believe he has practical knowledge that would be of great use to a committee of this kind; but I would suggest that another name should be added to make the number seven, and I would suggest the inclusion of the hon. member for Gympie, Mr. Mellor.

The PREMIER: Name him instead of the hon. member for Stanley, Mr. O'Sullivan.

Mr. SALKELD: I would suggest that the hon. member for Stanley should be retained on the committee, and that the name of the hon. member for Gympie, Mr. Mellor, be added.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I have no objection to act, but I wish the House to know my position.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said: Mr. Speaker,—I only rise for the purpose of suggesting that the motion be amended by giving the committee leave to move from place to place, as they can do more good by moving about than by sitting in a room down stairs. It would be better to add after the word "papers" in the second line the words "and move from place to place." It is not an uncommon thing to give that power to a committee, if it is desirable to do so.

Mr. NORTH said: Mr. Speaker,—I am quite agreeable to accept the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, and also to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Fassifern, to include the hon. member for Gympie, Mr. Mellor, in the committee.

Amendment agreed to; and question, as amended, put and passed.

RETURN OF LANDED PROPRIETORS.

Mr. SALKELD in moving—

That there be laid upon the table of the House, a return showing the names of all landed proprietors, whether individuals, syndicates, banks, or other corporate bodies, owning six hundred and forty (640) acres or upwards of freehold country lands, with the area in each case—

said: Mr. Speaker,—I may mention that this return was moved for during last session, and I believe it has been prepared, but was never laid on the table of the House, as the session ended before it was completed, so that this is really a formal motion, although the Premier called out "not formal," as he understood it had been called for some years ago. He has no objection to it, however, now, as the return has been already prepared, and is ready to lay on the table of the House.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. M. Hume Black) said: Mr. Speaker,—I believe this return was prepared last session after an immense amount of trouble being taken in its compilation, and that it was completed too late to lay it on the table of the House before the last session closed. As it is now actually in type, I think it would be a great pity if the type were distributed after so much trouble having been taken in the preparation of this return; and I informed the Premier to that effect just now, as he was under the impression that it would be a very voluminous return, and would require an immense amount of labour. The return is practically ready, and can be laid on the table of the House in a few days, if the motion is carried.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said: Mr. Speaker,—With regard to this motion of the hon. member for Fassifern, I would point out a serious omission in the resolution as it stands. It reads:—

"That there be laid upon the table of the House, a return showing the names of all landed proprietors, whether individuals, syndicates, banks, or other corporate bodies, owning six hundred and forty (640) acres or upwards of freehold country lands, with the area in each case."

At what particular date? That is not mentioned here, and therefore I do not think the motion can pass as it stands. The motion will have to be withdrawn and amended. The Minister for Lands pointed out that the return has been made up to a certain date last year, and, therefore, the resolution if it pass will not lead to those papers being laid on the table of the House, as they do not come up to the present time, but deal with the lands held at a certain fixed date, and this proposition does not deal with that.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said: Mr. Speaker,—I would suggest that the date be mentioned. The return, as prepared, must be made up to a certain date, and I would suggest

to the hon. member either to mention the date in the motion or to say, "as ordered by this House in the session of 1887." That will show that we do not want to incur the trouble of preparing a fresh return.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS (Hon. J. M. Macrossan): Leave a blank for the date, and fill it in afterwards.

Mr. JORDAN said: Mr. Speaker,—My impression is that in this return the figures showing the quantity of land held as indicated by the resolution, were brought up to the end of June last year. I think we should take the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition, and amend the motion so as to read, "as ordered by this House last year."

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS said: Mr. Speaker,—Seeing no one knows the date to which this return has been prepared, it would be better for the hon. member for Fassifern to postpone his proposition until this day week, and by that time he can have the date inserted in the amended motion. That would be better than to withdraw it, and not get the return. I would like, while speaking on this subject, to ask the Minister in charge to see that this return is kept up. A few years ago I called for a similar return, and the Minister for Lands of the day promised me to keep it up; yet the necessity has arisen to go through the same form now because it was not kept up, and so a large and unnecessary expense is incurred. If the return were kept up it would serve as a sort of perpetual Doomsday-Book for Queensland, and would be very useful indeed.

Mr. SALKELD said: Mr. Speaker,—There was no date mentioned in the return I moved for last session. I might amend my present motion by adding a few words to it. I do not wish to affix any date, as the return is already in type and printed, and altering the date would necessitate a great deal of extra labour. I will simply move that the words "as ordered in the session of 1887" be added at the end of my motion.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I do not think there is any occasion for the motion at all. The return is printed and will be laid upon the table of the House. It would be better to withdraw the motion and lay the paper upon the table by command. I am quite willing to adopt the suggestion of the Minister for Mines, that the return should be kept up.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said: Mr. Speaker,—I have a distinct recollection of a return of this nature having been laid upon the table some years ago, and it was considered a very valuable report all over the colony, and it met with the most favourable criticism from the Press. It was also then the wish of the House, although no motion was moved, that the return should be perpetual. The promise made to lay the present report upon the table is quite sufficient, and the hon. member might as well withdraw his motion.

Mr. GROOM said: Mr. Speaker,—The order of the House last year was in the following words, and was made on the 1st September:—

"1. That the order of the House made on the 11th August last, that there be laid upon the table of the House certain papers relating to lands obtained from the Crown by selection, auction, and pre-emption, be rescinded.

"2. That the House do now make the following order in place thereof:—That there be laid upon the table of the House a return showing,—

(1) The names of all landed proprietors—whether individuals, syndicates, banks, or other corporate bodies—owning six hundred and forty (640) acres and upwards of freehold country lands, with the area in each case.

(2) The number, average area, and total area of all selections in each land agent's district taken up in each six months during the first two and a-half (2½) years after the coming into operation of the Crown Lands Acts of 1868, 1876, and 1881 respectively, distinguishing grazing from agricultural farms under the Act of 1884.

(3) The area and price per acre of all lands sold by auction, and of all lands pre-empted under the Pastoral Leases Acts during each of the last eight (8) years."

From that the House will be able to see the importance and magnitude of the return, and as the Minister for Lands says the whole of it is in type, and has simply to be laid upon the table of the House, it would be a pity that that labour should be lost. I entirely agree that the return should be kept up.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Why should it mention 640 acres?

Mr. GROOM: I do not see why it should not be kept as a sort of Doomsday Book, as has been suggested, and show who are the proprietors of our lands. The return moved for by the present Minister for Mines and Works in the year 1876 was a very valuable one, and I hope the hon. member for Fassifern will consent to adjourn the debate.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: The promise to lay the return upon the table is quite sufficient.

Mr. SALKELD said: Mr. Speaker,—I will accept the promise that has been made, and, with the consent of the House, will withdraw my motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

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 question was:—

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.

On which it was moved, by way of amendment, that the words "twelve shillings" be omitted with a view of inserting the words "fourteen shillings."

Question—That the words "twelve shillings" stand part of the paragraph—put.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he was in favour of the amendment to increase the duty to 14s. per gallon, his principal reason being that very few people would feel the additional taxation, whereas the Treasurer would feel the benefit. Besides, he hoped the Treasurer would see his way to reduce some of the duties which had already been increased, such as the duty on oatmeal, for instance. There was a great row about the increased duty on oatmeal already amongst the people of Ipswich. £4 per ton was too much on oatmeal when flour was allowed to come in free. Though flour was the food of

some it was not the food of others ; and those who fed on oatmeal were taxed to an alarming extent, whereas those who fed on flour got their food free from taxation. Reverting to the question of spirits, he thought it would be good for the people themselves, and good for the country, if the tax were increased from 12s. to 14s. Besides, to use an argument put forward last night by the Treasurer with reference to tobacco, the increase would make the duty nearly equal to what it was in the other colonies. In Victoria the duty was only 12s. per gallon, but in New South Wales and South Australia it was 14s.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER : No.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he thought he was right. In Western Australia the duty was 15s. ; in Tasmania it was 12s. ; in New Zealand it was 16s. on spirits in bottles and jars, and 15s. on spirits in bulk ; so that by adopting the amendment the Committee would scarcely raise the duty to what it was in some of the other colonies. People were always ready to pay for drink. The grog score must be paid ; but the bootmaker, the grocer, the butcher—and someone suggested the printer—their accounts were frequently left unpaid.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said that the proposal to increase the duty by 2s. per gallon was an important one, seeing that it involved—if the consumption were not reduced—an increase of between £50,000 and £60,000. With regard to the general question, it was very difficult, at first, to discover any principle in the tariff proposed by the Treasurer ; and what had taken place since had not made it any clearer. It was not clear what the principle was, except that the Treasurer wanted to get money, and did not particularly care how. It did not seem to matter very much to him how the incidence of taxation would fall. The hon. gentleman desired to encourage local industries, but he was surrounded in the Cabinet by gentlemen who wanted the tariff so arranged that it should contain nothing inconsistent with the doctrines of free-trade. There was the anomaly of an hon. gentleman introducing a protective tariff, and at the same time being obliged to introduce one which his colleagues could say contained nothing inconsistent with the true principles of free-trade. That was like trying to eat the cake and have it too. If more money was required by taxation, its incidence should be as fair as possible. Many people thought it was a mistake to raise money through the Custom-house at all, but that was not the question now—nor were they now considering whether property ought to bear a greater share of the burden. If money had to be raised through the Customs there might be either a fairness or an unfairness of incidence, and the result of the tariff under consideration would be to make the burden fall in a larger proportion on necessaries than before. The burden on necessaries would be largely increased, while the burden on luxuries would only be increased to a small extent. That was not fair, and he thought they might properly, when they had the opportunity, endeavour to alter the incidence of taxation in the right direction. No one could say that spirits were not a luxury, in the sense in which the term was generally used. He did not object to consume them in moderation. Some gentlemen said it was sufficient to drink water, but that did not agree with his constitution. Spirits and all strong waters were luxuries, and could very well bear a duty of 14s. as in New South Wales. The Treasurer said last night that the contribution to the revenue through Customs per head on account of spirits was greater in Queensland than in New South Wales ; but that was probably owing to the greater number of adults in

Queensland in proportion to the total population. The result of increasing the duty might be to decrease the consumption of spirits per head. That was a matter by which the Northern part of the colony was particularly affected. They consumed a great deal of spirits in proportion to the population, because there was a much larger proportion of men there. He did not know that the men there consumed much more spirits per head than men in the South, but the amount consumed was greatly increased in proportion to the population, by the much greater proportion of adult males. The tariff, as framed, would be extremely oppressive upon the Northern part of the colony. Of that there was no doubt, and it was pointed out from the first. The discussions that had since taken place, all they had seen of the opinions of the people of that part of the colony, and all the consideration they had been able to give to the matter since, made it more and more manifest that the tariff would be excessively burdensome upon the Northern part of the colony. It would be burdensome everywhere, but its incidence would be specially heavy upon that part of the colony. There was no reason why they should, in the face of the unanimous opinion in the Northern part of the colony, deliberately do what a large number of members of the Committee thought would be an injustice. The opinion in the North was almost unanimous on the subject, and he believed the opinion of the Committee by a majority agreed with it. Why should they, in the face of that, do what was a manifest injustice? Why not take the opportunity of remedying it?—unless, indeed, they desired to do injustice for an ulterior object. They ought to do what was fair, and it was fair to so adjust the burden of taxation that the people of the North might not have to bear more than their fair share of the burdens. He believed that if the proposed increased tax was put upon spirits they could afford to remit some of the other duties on articles they had not yet dealt with, and which would be most unfairly oppressive.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that when the debate commenced they heard a great deal about the additional duties pressing very hardly upon the working man. When they got into the details they found the hon member who had just spoken voting consistently to increase the duties which were said to press very hardly on the working man. That had been the result of the debate up to the present time. The hon. gentleman now turned round and told the Committee that, up to the present time, they had very much increased the taxation on the necessaries of life, and that it affected particularly the population of the North. How, then, did the hon. gentleman propose to remedy that? By first telling them that the people in the North drank a great deal more brandy and spirits, and would, consequently, have to pay a large proportion of that duty ; and then he proposed to adjust matters by taxing spirits at 2s. per gallon more than was proposed in the tariff. Where was the hon. member's logic? The hon. member for Townsville, in proposing the amendments he did, was working out a perfect scheme, but it differed from his tariff and he could not accept it—the hon. member said, put so much more on whisky and take so much more off other things. The hon. member opposite not only consented to put a great deal more on other things, but he had also supported all the motions for increases. The reason the hon. member had given for supporting the increased duty on spirits had gone from him, as the increased duties had been carried on the articles he wished to see relieved—at all events, on a great portion of them. The Treasurer, therefore, did not require the money,

When they required more money he did not say he was going to stick to the 12s. as the proper duty on spirits. If he was Treasurer again he might want 15s. or 20s. on spirits, but he did not want it now. The leader of the Opposition had been perfectly illogical in the action he had taken. The first time the tariff came on he said it was oppressing the poor man; next he went and consistently voted for increases on every item where the poor man was affected, as laid down by the hon. member for Toowong. He did that, and then he laid down a proposition that the North was very unjustly treated in those items where the South was protected, and they had to pay for it. Then the hon. member laid down a further proposition, or fact rather, that the North paid a great deal more per head through the spirit duty than the rest of the colony, and the result he drew from the whole lot was that they should equalise things by putting a further additional duty on spirits, that would more injuriously affect the North than any other part of the colony.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said it was very easy to put up ninepins and knock them down again; but if the Colonial Treasurer had remembered better what votes he had given and what he had said, the hon. gentleman would not have made the speech he had just made. He had voted for several reductions of the burdens on the consuming classes, and he had voted against the hon. Treasurer where he had sought to increase them. In other matters, where the taxation would not have been burdensome on the consuming classes, and would have tended to encourage local industry, he had voted for increases. He had voted consistently throughout for the purpose of encouraging local industry and diminishing the burdens upon the consuming classes. It was, of course, difficult to reconcile the two principles throughout, but the Treasurer, while professing to desire the encouragement of local industries, had not been consistent at all. He (Sir S. W. Griffith) had voted, as he said, consistently throughout.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Hon. J. Donaldson): On candles, to wit.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: I gave very good reasons for that.

Mr. MURPHY: You tried to smother an industry already established.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said he had given very good reasons for his vote on that item. If the hon. Treasurer had taken the trouble to quote what he did say and do, he would not have made the speech he had just made.

Mr. GOLDRING said that, although the proposal to increase the duty on spirits had come from a Northern member, he intended to oppose it, as he thought, with the Colonial Treasurer, that the burden would fall heavily on the working men. The Colonial Treasurer should be supported in that matter, especially by those who were bringing forward the working man in every instance as their excuse for decreasing the proposed extra duties. The hon. member for Ipswich had said that the proposed increase in the duty on spirits would not fall heavily upon working men, as they stuck to the "nobbler"; but he might inform the hon. gentleman that many working men bought their spirits by the gallon, or two gallons, and in such a case they would have to pay 2s. or 4s. extra for it, and that very likely would prevent them from getting it. He knew several large contractors who were compelled to keep spirits in their camp as medicine for their men. Hon. members might laugh, but he was speaking from experience. He knew contractors who would not

themselves touch a spoonful of spirits, but who never left their camp to look after their men without a supply of spirits for them. The men might be caught in a heavy shower of rain and get wringing wet, and no member of the Committee being in the same position would object to a "nip" of brandy. Another objection he had to an increase in the duty was that it would probably lead to a large amount of adulteration. If a publican had to pay 2s. per gallon more for his spirits he would have to make that up in some way.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: He can put water in it.

Mr. GOLDRING said some might put water in it, but there were others who would have recourse to other measures so as to infuse extra strength into the spirit and counterbalance the extra water with which it was diluted. In view of the whole circumstances, therefore, he thought he would be doing his duty in opposing the extra tax proposed on spirits.

Mr. LITTLE said he thoroughly endorsed all the remarks but one made by the last speaker. The hon. member started his speech by referring to the Northern members and speaking of them in the plural number, whereas he should have used the singular number, as he was specially alluding to the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Philp. He (Mr. Little) spoke as a Northern member. He was not a great lover of spirits, but he could take his "nip" when he required it, and he should certainly oppose the proposed increase in the duty.

Mr. ADAMS said he was of opinion that an increase in the duty on spirits would have a very injurious effect. He was very much struck by the words which fell from the leader of the Opposition when the hon. member for Stanley asked "what are we to drink?" The hon. gentleman said "water."

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: Oh no! I said some people say that.

Mr. ADAMS said he understood the hon. gentleman to say "water," but that it did not agree with his constitution. Possibly water might not agree with the constitution of other persons any more than it did with the hon. gentleman. There was a great deal in what the hon. member for Flinders had said with regard to spirits being used at outside stations for medicinal purposes. Hon. members might laugh, but it was so nevertheless. People in cities and towns did not need them so much for such purposes, but in outside places where persons were liable to be bitten by poisonous insects or snakes spirits were very valuable. He (Mr. Adams) thought it would be very unwise to increase the duty on spirits, which were already very heavily taxed. He remembered that not very many years ago he was told by a person that he could get some extra good gin if he bought it in bulk. He inquired of his agent if that were possible, and was informed that he could get it if he liked to go to Spriggs. He believed that if they increased the duty they would have more persons like Spriggs manufacturing spirits out of drugs, and that was not what they wanted. What they wanted was the pure article, and if they put too much duty on the pure article, there was not the slightest doubt that people would be induced to manufacture spirits out of deleterious drugs, injurious to human life. The Committee ought to pause before they did anything which might lead to such nefarious practices. He certainly would do all he possibly could to stop any increase in the duty on spirits.

Mr. UNMACK said one hon. member had argued that an increased duty would have a very prejudicial effect in so far as a large quantity of spirits was consumed as medicine.

As medicine was usually dispensed by a teaspoon, or dessert spoon, he would like that hon. member to tell them whether he had made a calculation as to what difference an increase of 2s. per gallon would make in a dose of medicine. Really, that was an argument unworthy of any member of the Committee. He (Mr. Unmack) thought they had sufficient facts given them by the Colonial Treasurer to justify the proposed increase in the duty. The hon. gentleman told them the previous evening what was the quantity of spirits per head annually consumed by the population of the different colonies, and he stated that the value per head in Queensland was 25s. ; New South Wales, 18s. ; Victoria, 13s. 8d. ; and South Australia, 6s. 8d. Looking at those figures it appeared to him that, if they wished to decrease the consumption of spirits, the very best thing they could do was to increase the duty. He should be very pleased indeed to vote for the increase, because he thought nothing could be more injurious than to encourage an excessive consumption of spirits in a climate like that of Queensland. He could not doubt that spirits were a luxury, because no man need indulge in the luxury if he was not able to pay for it. If an increase of 2s. per gallon were passed, the price of a glass of whisky or brandy would be the same as before ; the only difference the increase would make would be a small decrease in the profit of the publican. Considering that they had consistently been called upon to vote increases in the duties on the ordinary necessities of life for the masses, he thought the least they could do was to vote for an increase on that which was a luxury.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the hon. member had referred to the figures he quoted as having proved his case, that a less quantity of liquor was consumed where the duty was 14s. per gallon than where it was 12s. The principal case the hon. member used was that of New South Wales. But the tariff in that instance was only altered last year, and all the figures he (the Colonial Treasurer) quoted related to the consumption under the 12s. duty and not under the altered rate of 14s. The figures under the operation of the latter duty were not yet available, so that the hon. member had proved his (the Colonial Treasurer's) case instead of his own. Figures were a most valuable argument, but persons using them must understand what they meant.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said he had always listened to the hon. member for Toowong with great respect, and believed he was a great acquisition to the Committee. He had the greatest possible respect for all the hon. member had said on the tariff. But it was possible that a man might sometimes be too clever, and he thought the hon. member had proved himself too clever. The hon. member quoted statistics to prove that the higher the duty the less was the amount of spirits consumed by the people, and that an increase on the tariff in this respect would contribute to make them sober. There never was a more false deduction drawn from any proposition in this world than that if they raised the duty on spirits people would drink less. Did the hon. gentleman know that he could make spirit in his own kitchen?

Mr. UNMACK : I do not know your ability.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said he had not ability enough to see the depths of the hon. gentleman's ability, but he must know that there were facilities all over the colony, and in every colony, for making liquor. He knew men who could make it in their own kettles.

The COLONIAL TREASURER : I wish you would give me their names.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said there was not the slightest fear of his giving the names. There never was a greater mistake than to suppose that a high duty would lessen the consumption of spirit. It encouraged potteen-making. Any farmer in the colony could make his own spirits.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER : Bad spirits.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN : Not necessarily bad. The high duties in the other colonies had not discouraged drinking. A great deal of laughing had been indulged in at the expense of an hon. member who sat behind him for saying he required spirits. He (Mr. O'Sullivan) required a little drop himself. He was very fond of that sort of medicine, and could take it when he could not take doctor's medicine. In that sense, therefore, spirits were not a luxury. They were a necessity. Last night, when the duty on tobacco was passed, it was said that tobacco was a luxury ; but there was no time he would not rather go without his dinner than without his smoke. If he was given a smoke and a drink of water he could go without dinner, but if he was given his dinner without a smoke he was not satisfied. He would guarantee that any old bushman could bear him out in that. The extra 6d. on tobacco was a mistake. Now, the hon. member for Ipswich was a fanatic on the subject of the use of spirits ; so much so that he never took the slightest notice of what the hon. member said. The hon. gentleman's argument was that the Treasurer would have the benefit of the increase and the working man would not feel it, but could not the same kind of salve be applied to every item they had passed? He thought it could. The Treasurer would get the benefit, but the working man must pay for it. It was clear that the very fact of prohibition encouraged the use of spirits or anything else. He knew that when a crusade was made in England by all the parsons against the people reading "Don Juan," and especially that the ladies should not read it, within a fortnight afterwards there was not a lady who had not a copy under her pillow. The ladies knew nothing of "Don Juan" before that crusade. What did Walter Scott say in "The Lady of the Lake?" When asked by Roderick Dhu what brought him into such a dangerous place, he replied that the very danger was the incentive ; and so it was with a prohibition, which was an incentive to drink. All he asked was to be let alone. Let him drink. He could not be made sober by Act of Parliament or by resolutions. The only effect that the increased duty would have would be to encourage the adulteration of liquor. So long as spirits were drunk pure the drinkers were all right in the morning. But he objected to being told what was good for him. Was he not old enough to advise himself and to drink anything he chose? He should certainly oppose any increase in the duty on spirits.

Mr. DRAKE said he was glad to learn that the hon. member thought the proposition to increase the duty on tobacco was a mistake, but he was sorry the hon. gentleman voted for the increase.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN : I was not here. If I did I must have done so by mistake.

Mr. DRAKE said he found in *Hansard* the question put, "That the word 'three' proposed to be omitted stand part of the question," and among those who voted with the "Ayes" was the name of Mr. O'Sullivan.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN : Oh ! I must have been drunk.

Mr. DRAKE said he was afraid that that was not the only mistake that had been made during the discussion of the tariff. He thought a great many other members had voted on the wrong side

through inadvertence, and, if the hon. gentleman was really repentant, he trusted that, after having given a speech in favour of the retention of the spirit duties at the present figure, he would now make amends for his wrong vote last night by voting in favour of the increased duty. As far as his (Mr. Drake's) vote went, he should assist the Northern members in their proposal to increase the duty on spirits.

Mr. MURPHY: It is not proposed by the Northern members exclusively.

Mr. DRAKE said he understood it to be one of the propositions of the Northern members. He had in his hand "amendments to be proposed by Mr. R. Philp."

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Is that the Northern members?

Mr. DRAKE said it was generally understood that that list of amendments was drawn up at a meeting of Northern members, presided over by Mr. Philp. He regarded that as one of the amendments proposed by Mr. Philp on behalf of the Northern members, and he thought the Northern members were doing a very graceful and proper act in proposing among their amendments one which would give the Treasurer some increased revenue in order to compensate him for the loss of revenue he would sustain by other amendments proposed by them. That was one of the grounds on which he should give them what assistance he could to pass the amendment. Of course there was the additional ground that he thought it was desirable to place an increased duty on spirits in the interests of the public. He believed himself, and had heard nothing to alter his conclusions, that the higher the duty imposed on spirits the less would be drunk. No doubt the increase in price would make the spirits more expensive to those who consumed them. Unless some difference really existed between the consumption of spirits and the consumption of other articles, the increased price must cause a diminution in the consumption. He should support the amendment.

Mr. HUNTER said, in reference to what had been said about the Northern members, he had been told that a meeting of Northern members on the other side of the Committee was held some time back; he made some inquiries as to whether it was of Northern members entirely, or exclusively those on one side, and was told that there was nothing in it except that certain amendments proposed by the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Philp, had been agreed to. But it seemed now that, because the Premier had announced his intention to oppose the increased duty on spirits, some of those Northern members had turned their backs upon the hon. member, Mr. Philp, and left him to fight alone so far as that matter was concerned. All the Northern members on the Opposition side agreed entirely with the increased duty on spirits. They had been told that the burden would fall very heavily on the North, but he thought it ought to be quite sufficient for those who used that argument to be told by Northern members that it was a burden the North was quite willing to take. The burdens the North asked to be relieved of were the taxes on the necessities of life. He was tired of speaking of the promises made to the licensed victuallers during the last election, and was not at all surprised at the hon. the Premier coming forward and strongly opposing the proposed increase, because they knew that the licensed victuallers had great expectations from the present Government regarding decreases and so forth. The hon. member for Woothakata had told them that he (Mr. Little) would go against the increased duty. Well, he had known men, he did not say anybody in particular, who had made themselves so

accustomed to spirits that they had to take a certain quantity every day to keep them alive, and if one of those men had only a certain amount of money to buy those spirits, he could quite understand that he would be against the proposed tax. He did not say for one moment that the hon. member for Woothakata was one of those, because he knew such a great deal. On one occasion that hon. member said that he had forgotten more than another person had ever learned. His opinion of the hon. member was that he had forgotten all of value that he ever knew. He was certainly old enough and ought to know better than to say many things that he said in that House. He (Mr. Hunter) did not usually take any notice of what he said, and should not do so in any other case, because he did not consider him worthy of notice—from the way he had pitched into him on several occasions. He was very glad to see that hon. members on the other side were amused over the matter. They might think the way the hon. member handled him the other night very clever, but he thought it ridiculous and absurd in every way, and it did not affect him in the least. The hon. member spoke of his beautiful flowing beard; he did not begrudge him his beautiful beard, and thought everything he said was perfectly ridiculous. With regard to the duty on spirits he had spoken very strongly and plainly upon the subject before thousands and thousands of men—he would almost say more than the hon. member had ever seen—and they were entirely in favour of the increase. He had expressed his view on the point before thousands, and it was always well received. He could affirm without hesitation that the people of the North were in favour of a heavier tax being put upon spirits. The principal money spent in spirits was spent when a man overstepped the mark; then he would spend all the money he could lay his hands on in drink, and the less he could get of it the better. It was all very well to talk about medicine, and spirits being made in kettles and that sort of stuff, but the question was, what was the wish of the people? He said the wish of the North was that the duty should be higher, and the people there would back him up in his statement.

Mr. LITTLE said that boy from Burke had insinuated that he (Mr. Little) was a great lover of grog. It was well known that Australia was proverbial for hospitality, and the usual thing on meeting a friend was to ask him to have a drink. It was done out of good feeling and friendship, and unless it was taken in excess it was not injurious. He thought that beardless boy from Burke—

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. LITTLE: If he met the hon. member at the Exchange he would ask him to have a drink. He took gingerbeer, or whatever he liked, and he (Mr. Little) did the same. When the hon. member said the people of the North were in favour of an increased duty on spirits, he (Mr. Little) distinctly and imperatively, and in defiance of contradiction, declared that he said what was false.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. LITTLE: The hon. member had sneaked in under the wing of the late Minister for Mines, Mr. Hodgkinson, but let him go back and see if he would be returned again. His advice to the hon.—

Mr. HUNTER: I don't want your advice.

Mr. LITTLE: The hon. member was young yet; the napkins were hardly off him yet; he had not the vigour of a man in him—

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Order, order!

Mr. POWERS said, with reference to the duty on spirits, the matter had been very fairly put by the hon. the Treasurer in bringing forward his tariff. He said that if certain duties were taken off then the excise duty might stand on beer, and in the same way, if certain taxes were taken off or reduced, he would consider the question of adding to the duty on spirits. If the proposed increase of 2s. per gallon had been brought forward the other day when the hon. member for Toowong asked if the question could be discussed, he (Mr. Powers) should have voted for the increase, but the result had shown that they did not know as well as the Treasurer what was wanted, because they found that the whole of the things placed before the Committee by the Treasurer had been passed by the majority of members present. Therefore there was nothing to take off, and he hoped to goodness they were not going through the whole tariff again. He should support the Government in that matter, for one reason, because he was not the Colonial Treasurer, who, of course, knew more about the tariff than hon. members; also, because the majority of the Committee had supported the tariff, and for the very patent reason that the proposed extra taxation was not wanted. The hon. the Treasurer had stated that he did not want further taxation; that the revenue he required would be obtained by his tariff without putting on further duties.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Take it off something else.

Mr. POWERS said of course it was well known that the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Philp, had brought forward the amendment with the view of getting the duty taken off machinery, and how protectionist members could support him in doing so, he (Mr. Powers) could not understand. What was there left, the duty on which could be taken off? Not timber, as far as he and many other hon. members were concerned; not boots and shoes; not jewellery; and as far as he and a large number of protectionist members were concerned, they did not want to see the duty taken off machinery. As it seemed hardly likely that more duties would be taken off, and as the Treasurer had stated that he did not want that revenue, he failed to see any reason for putting on a tax that was unnecessary. He did not see why they should add £50,000 to the taxation of the community, for that was what it would mean, when the Treasurer said he did not want it.

Mr. GRIMES said the hon. member for Stanley had repeated the familiar saying that men could not be made sober by Act of Parliament. But if they could not make men sober by Act of Parliament, they could, by Act of Parliament, remove a great many of the temptations to make men intoxicated. They might make it difficult for those who had an appetite to get intoxicated, to obtain drink, and that object would in some measure be achieved by the adoption of the amendment before the Committee. He sincerely hoped the hon. member for Townsville would not withdraw his amendment, and he could assure the hon. member that he would find many friends and supporters on that side of the Committee. He should support the amendment to impose an increased duty on spirits, which was an unmistakable luxury, because it would enable the Premier to make some concessions on other articles which were really necessities of life. It was not yet too late to make alterations that would assist very materially to reduce the burden on mechanics and men with large families, upon whom the tariff pressed with exceptional heaviness. In the case of a mechanic with a wife and four children, the effect of the new tariff would be to increase the cost of living by something like 7s. 6d. a week. They were

placing a very serious difficulty in the way of a large number of mechanics living around Brisbane and other large places. Under the old tariff those men could set apart a sum from their weekly earnings to devote to some useful purpose—not to spend in the public-house, for he was glad to say there was a change in that direction, but to invest in a plot of land and become their own landlords. They were able to spare 5s., 6s., or 7s. a week to pay their calls to the building societies. But by increasing the cost of living they were putting it out of the power of those men to pay their calls, and the result, in many cases, would very likely be that they would not only lose the money they had already invested, but their little properties as well, which would fall into the hands of the building societies. They had an opportunity of reducing some of the burdens that would fall upon persons of that kind. By placing that extra duty on spirits they might reduce the duty on boots and shoes and other items yet to be considered, which were really necessary to the comfort of the people to whom he had been alluding. He hoped the hon. member would press his amendment to a division, and he could assure him that it would have his cordial support.

Mr. SAYERS said he should have great pleasure in supporting the amendment. He believed if the question were put to the poll in his constituency there would be four to one in favour of it. He was sorry to see that certain hon. members, who formerly said they were going to vote for an increased duty on spirits, had now gone back on their word, simply, it seemed, because the Treasurer had said he did not want any more money. But by increasing the duty on spirits the hon. gentleman would be able to decrease the duty on the necessities of life. Spirits was not a necessary of life; it might be taken as a medicine, and no doubt many of them took more of it than was good for them as a medicine. The proposed increase of duty would make no difference to the consumer, excepting that, perhaps, the publican might add a little water. It had been said that the heavy duty would induce the publican to manufacture grog. But if that would be the effect of a 14s. duty, it would also have been the effect under a 12s. duty. Indeed, under the lower duty they had had such things as Spriggs's brandy manufactured in Brisbane and sent up North as Hennessy's brandy. He should like to see how members would vote on the division. As to items on which reductions might be made, the adoption of the amendment would enable the Treasurer to take £6,000 off the tobacco duty, which the hon. member for Stanley said he voted wrongly upon last night. During the debate upon that question remarks had been made by various speakers about the excessive quantity of spirits drunk in the North. He took exception to that. He did not think, if hon. members compared the adult male population in the North and South, that they would find any more spirits were consumed in the North than in the South, although he was of opinion that in both the North and the South they consumed more than was good for them. He thought that as a great many hon. members had been speaking all through that debate about protection, on that ground alone they should vote for that increased duty on spirits. They all knew that whisky was imported principally from Scotland and Ireland, and other parts of Great Britain. They were putting a duty upon malt to try and make the people of Queensland grow malt, and he did not see why, if they increased the duty enough, they might not be able to make whisky in Queensland. One hon. member said that any person who had a tin-kettle could make whisky. He would not go so far as

that; but he did not think it would raise the price of whisky or brandy to either the retail publican or the consumer, because in a very short time they should be able to produce sufficient whisky or brandy in the colony for their own use, if they had the higher duty. There was another question in connection with spirits—if the duty were increased it would assist the manufacture of wine in the colony. He would vote for the increase on the further ground that the publicans would be compelled to give smaller nobblers, and the smaller the nobbler the better for the drinker.

Mr. BATTERSBY said that as that was the first time he had spoken he claimed the indulgence of the Committee for a little. He had intended to vote for the increased duty on whisky. He had used it for many years, and he had known the evil of it in years past. However, since tea-time he had learned there was no chance of getting the duty proposed on machinery used in the North reduced, and as there was no chance of getting the duty on machinery reduced, he did not think it right to increase the duty on whisky.

Mr. SAYERS: Why?

Mr. BATTERSBY said because the increase on whisky was proposed to enable the duty on machinery to be reduced, and now there would be no reason for it. If the hon. member for Townsville had been able to carry his proposed reduction on machinery he would have voted for the duty of 14s.; but he had learned there was no chance of carrying that reduction. He had voted for every proposed increase except one—that was the vote upon butter. He happened to come in just as the Chairman was calling for the tellers, and he sat down with the ayes, though if he had had time he should have voted with the noes. That was the reason why he voted that way upon that occasion. As there was no chance of the Ministry giving way in regard to the tax upon machinery, he should certainly vote against the increased duty upon spirits.

Mr. HODGKINSON said it was his intention to vote for the increased duty of 2s. per gallon upon spirits, and he would do so for reasons which he would briefly explain to the Committee. He took it that the hon. member for Townsville who had proposed that increase was about as good a commercial authority as they possessed in that Committee, and he therefore accepted his proposition as being the proposition of an authority upon the subject as viewed from a commercial point of view. Then there arose the question as to the consumer. Of course, as the Colonial Treasurer said, the consumer in the end would have to pay the duty. That was a truism, but the profits of the trade were so great that the small amount of additional duty would not admit of any excess of charge. After the spirits left the wholesale dealer they were dispensed in the form of glasses, and the established price of a glass of liquor in the coastal districts was 6d. At greater distances from the coast, according to the cost of carriage, the price was 1s. Publicans in certain districts never lowered the price below 1s., and the question of the amount of spirit that a man received for 1s. was a matter of indifference to the publican. It was the custom of persons to help themselves, and the publicans found a sense of honour in most men that prevented them from taking an excessive quantity. Of course sometimes a bushman would come in who had not had a drink for a long time, and he would start his little bout with a good stiff "nip." Then, again, there were thousands of men who simply drank in compliance with the drinking customs of the North, and not from any love of liquor. He was glad to hear the hon.

member for Charters Towers stand up for the sobriety of the Northern population. So far as the mining community was concerned, it was certain that no man would be able to perform the duties of an able-bodied miner, who indulged in an excess of liquor. It was not a drinking community for many reasons. As a rule, the seat of a miner's operations was removed from public-houses, and he could only go into a township at the end of the week to procure supplies. Whatever drink miners had was concentrated within that limited period. So that a stranger going into a mining township during a rush would say they were a drinking class, and he would come to that conclusion simply because his knowledge of them was insufficient to enable him to form a correct opinion. Miners were not a drinking class, and there was no community in the colony who looked with greater contempt upon men who had the reputation of being drunkards than miners. The next view of the question was the revenue aspect. He did not know what additional amount of revenue would be forced upon the Treasurer by that increased duty; but even allowing for the supposed increase in illicit distillation, or other circumstances which might affect it, the Treasurer would be enabled to lay a lighter hand upon machinery. He had appealed to the Treasurer on the previous night not to increase the duty upon tobacco, and he was very sorry the Treasurer defeated him upon that question. But the tax upon machinery would be even more offensive than the tax upon tobacco, and if the Treasurer derived more revenue than he expected through the Committee carrying an increased duty upon spirits of 2s., the hon. gentleman could afford to listen to the appeal of the miners, and all who were directly or indirectly interested in mining, as nearly everybody was, to, at any rate, allow the duty on machinery to remain at its present rate of 5 per cent., and not attempt to crush that industry by increasing the duty to 15 per cent. Another matter which had been referred to by members of the Committee was that the increased duty would lead to a great deal of adulteration. There was not one hon. member in the Committee who was acquainted in the slightest degree with the spirit trade but who knew perfectly well that a glass of pure brandy was almost impossible to be procured in the colony. The only material from which pure brandy could be manufactured was the grape. The dimensions of the country suitable for the production of the grape—that was, in the brandy-producing districts of France—had not increased one acre for years past. The grape harvest of France had been continually decreased by oidium and phylloxera. The population of America had increased from a paltry 3,000,000 at the time of the declaration of independence to 60,000,000, and the population of Great Britain from 14,000,000 to 35,000,000, and there was no extra supply of brandy to meet the increased demand. There was no fear of the liquor being more adulterated than at present. He thought the hon. member for Townsville was a competent authority upon the commercial aspect of the question. The cost to the consumer could not possibly be increased on an article which was subdivided into such infinitesimally small quantities. He would vote in favour of the increase.

Mr. MACFARLANE said it was quite evident that the screw had been put on, and whatever hon. members tried to do, the proposal of the Treasurer would be carried. He had a majority at his back, and was evidently using that source of power. Hon. members who were pledged to support that increased duty upon spirits had changed their minds under that pressure, and as the 12s. duty could not be increased, they

might as well pass it at once and have done with it. It was not fair of the Treasurer to act in that way when such a great question was concerned as the drinking customs of society. Each individual member ought to be left to vote as he thought best for the community. Hon. members should take notice of what had been going on in the civilised world, especially the English-speaking portion of it, and they would see what great efforts were being made to deal satisfactorily with the liquor traffic. Every nation had its own way; and in every nation attempts were made to curtail the dangerous traffic. He looked upon the Premier as the head of the community, whose duty it was to protect the people and make their homes as peaceful and comfortable as possible. If he did not do that he was failing in his duty. Instead of doing that he was proposing to reduce as much as possible the price of intoxicating drinks, so as to make them easily obtainable, and give a monopoly to the brewers and distillers. It was all an example of class legislation—legislation for the rich against the poor. Why should the people's food be taxed and the people's drink be free? What were the best men in England doing at the present day? What was Canon Farrar doing but working for the people in attempting to curtail the traffic in drink? Cardinal Manning, about a month ago, in addressing a meeting connected with the Catholic Church, deplored the fact that he had so long delayed taking an interest in the cause, and that he would soon be compelled to leave the noble work unfinished. That being the case in the old country, he thought that the leading legislators in Queensland should take example by them, and try to do what they could for the world's reform rather than the world's degradation. The drink traffic was doing more harm to Queensland than all the other evils combined; yet there were leaders of public opinion in the colony actually doing what they could to degrade the people rather than raise them in the scale of morality and civilisation. A little while ago the hon. member for Stanley, Mr. O'Sullivan, said he wanted to be let alone, he wanted liberty to do as he liked; but the hon. member knew that liberty had its laws—he knew that he could not build a wooden house in a first-class section for instance.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: No; but you can.

Mr. MACFARLANE said the hon. member had referred to him as a fanatic on the temperance question.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I am sorry the hon. member should take it to himself.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he was proud of the appellation, and he considered that the hon. member could not apply to him a more honourable term. What was it to be a fanatic in connection with anything good but to be in advance of public opinion? He was surprised that the hon. member for Burrum should submit to the pressure of the iron hand, because he seemed to be a man who could think for himself. The hon. member was, physically, one of the fine examples of temperance principles, and that being so he could not understand how the hon. member could be in favour of letting other people get drink as cheaply as possible. Mr. Gladstone once said, in reference to drink, that it was worse on the community than the three historical evils of war, pestilence, and famine. He believed every hon. member would admit that to be a fact; and if that were so, what nobler aim could the Premier have than to attempt to mitigate that terrible amount of evil, and not only save the country, but set an example to the other countries of the world? He was glad that Queensland had set an example to the other colonies in the matter of

local option, but he hoped the licensing laws would be so amended as to do away with the injustice at present caused in connection with club licenses. He hoped that in dealing with the drink traffic the Premier would show himself to be a lover of the people rather than the opposite.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said he had no objection to the hon. member who had just sat down being a fanatic if he chose to accept the appellation; but he objected to the hon. member preaching there. When he wanted to hear preaching he knew where to go. He did not want the hon. member to pose there as one of the reformers of the world. The hon. member might be good, and he had nothing to say about him; but it so happened that they knew one another's characters in the colonies very well. It was of no use for the hon. member to try to hoodwink him, at any rate. He knew the hon. member thoroughly. He objected not only to his preaching, but also to some of his propositions. The hon. member said that drink had caused more crime than anything else in the world. He (Mr. O'Sullivan) utterly denied that, and asserted on the contrary—

Mr. MACFARLANE: You are against the world.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said that, on the contrary, the greatest crimes committed in the world had been committed by sober men, and a great many of them fanatics. He would like anyone to point out the drunken man who ever committed anything in the shape of the villainous crimes they read of in the papers. A drunken man might stagger and fall into the gutter, but that was all he could do. He repeated that a thoroughly drunken man could not commit a crime, and that all the heinous and villainous crimes in the world had been committed by sober men. He did not preach drunkenness—men ought to keep sober—but he said that the preaching of gentlemen like the hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Macfarlane, could make no converts to sobriety. He claimed the right to drink when he liked and leave off when he liked, so long as he had money to pay. All the preaching that hon. gentleman and others had done had never made a single sober man in Queensland. He now had something to say that possibly few hon. members could say. Since marching through the streets of Ipswich, wearing the blue ribbon, and preaching through the town had been the fashion, something had happened in the town he came from which never happened before during the forty-one years he had lived there. A boy under the age of eighteen was prohibited by the police magistrate a few weeks ago from getting grog. A boy like that could not get it in the public-houses which were under the law, and were watched over by the police, but at the shebeen-houses which took the place of respectable public-houses. Those boys, or children, for they were only children, went into those places which were under no control whatever, and got drunk and did worse, and that was the effect of that public marching and outside preaching. He could tell the hon. gentleman something about himself, but that was a long time ago. There was a time when he (Mr. O'Sullivan) used to drink sometimes, but lately he had found it very profitable to keep sober. He was getting too old for that kind of thing now; but whenever he took it into his head to get drunk, or take more than was good for him, he would not ask the permission of the hon. member for Ipswich to do it, and he would guarantee he would be quite as well off in the morning as the hon. member. He would refer now to a remark made by the hon. member for Enoggera, a gentleman for whom he entertained

some respect. He had himself that evening said that it was impossible to make people sober by Act of Parliament, and that could not be got over. The hon. member for Ennogerá, as a reply to him, said, "If not we will make them pay for it; we will make it more expensive for them." That was simply a compensation the hon. member was making a present of to the electors who sent him into Parliament, because they would have their grog if they wanted it, and the hon. member would make it more expensive for them to get it.

Mr. COWLEY said he would say but a very few words on the question, because he felt assured that nothing he could say would alter the votes. It was, however, only fair to himself to give his reasons for voting for the proposed increase in the duty on spirits. He did not believe spirits were necessary for food, and, in spite of what had been said by the hon. member for Stanley, he did believe they were incentives to crime and causes of poverty and indigence, and formed a legitimate object of taxation. The Northern members who had met and considered the tariff proposals of the Colonial Treasurer and their effect upon the North, had a perfect right to do so. The people of the North paid a large share of taxation, and their representatives had a right to consider the tariff proposals when they were brought forward. They had come to the conclusion that it was absolutely necessary to make revenue to enable the Colonial Treasurer to carry on; but, at the same time, they thought it better in the interest of the North that the incidence of the tariff as proposed should be altered so as to provide for the taxation of luxuries, and to remove it from machinery which was absolutely necessary to develop the North, and also from articles of food, as well as from hay and produce they could not grow in the North. For those reasons they had determined to submit certain amendments, and he hoped they would receive the consideration of members of the Committee. It was only fair that the North should receive a certain amount of consideration, as there were many people living there, and they paid a very large amount of taxation. They were hard-working people, and lived in a climate vastly different from the climate here, and which was not favourable to the production of the necessities they required. He sincerely trusted those members who had spoken just now so fluently in advocacy of the Northern claim to consideration, would speak as fluently when the amendment proposed by the hon. member, Mr. Philp, providing for the reduction of the duty upon machinery and other articles, came before them. If there was a division he hoped they would be found voting in accordance with the views they had expressed. The Committee ought to consider that the Northern members had shown that they had no wish whatever to embarrass the Premier by a reduction in the amount of revenue he was to derive from the tariff, in any shape or form. On the contrary, they were absolutely prepared to submit to increased taxation to the tune of £40,000 or £50,000. That showed that their only desire was to change the incidence of taxation, and if that was taken into consideration hon. members would admit the justice of the demand they made, and alleviate their present position.

Mr. BARLOW said he had not intended to speak on the question, but after the triangular duel which had been going on, he felt bound to assume the position of a mediator, and would say a word on the subject. He was beginning to think that there was a good deal of truth in the old proverb, "That one had to go away from home to hear news." An hon. gentleman the

other night, had given him some information about Ipswich; his hon. friend, the member for Stanley, had given one view of that town that evening, while his hon. colleague, Mr. Macfarlane, gave another. He did not think he himself was a fanatic, and he did not know of the terrible, dreadful evils which were said to exist in Ipswich. The argument used by the hon. member for Stanley with respect to drink appeared to be, that a drunken man did not commit crime.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: No.

Mr. BARLOW: That might be so, but the mischief was that a man got half drunk and then committed the crime. To follow the hon. gentleman's argument, he did not get drunk enough, and the mischief arose through his stopping short. One would think, to hear the hon. member for Stanley speak, that there were no public-houses in Ipswich at all, but that they were living there on the shanty and the "shebeen" system. He thought there were some three-and-twenty public-houses in Ipswich.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I did not say that.

Mr. BARLOW said he understood the hon. gentleman to argue that processions and limitation of the liquor traffic in Ipswich resulted in a state of "shantism," which had caused a prohibition to be issued against a lad sixteen years of age. He would invite the hon. member's attention to the fact that a similar case occurred at the Brisbane Police Court only the day before yesterday, when a lad of seventeen, who was found in Albert street beastly drunk, was brought before the court.

Mr. LYONS: Speak to the item.

Mr. BARLOW said he would consume as much time as he thought fit, and would not be shut up on any such question. He was speaking in vindication of the character of the town which he represented, and which had been traduced by statements which he believed to be untrue.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: State what was untrue.

Mr. BARLOW said it was untrue, or a misrepresentation, or a misapprehension, to say that there was such a bad state of things existing there. As for the charge brought against his hon. colleague, Mr. Macfarlane, of preaching in the House, the hon. gentleman had introduced nothing about religion. The hon. member had spoken on the question of the traffic in strong drink, and had introduced the names of two gentlemen, to whom all honour was due, but who were not associated on a line with that hon. member in any religious capacity at all. The charge of preaching urged against the hon. member was not fair.

Mr. LYONS: Speak to the item.

Mr. BARLOW said that he intended to vote for the increased duty. He did not think it necessary to give his reasons for doing so. He had risen chiefly to vindicate his hon. colleague in the representation of Ipswich.

Mr. BUCKLAND said he should support the amendment of the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Philp, believing as he did that as they required increased duties spirituous liquors were most suitable articles from which to raise revenue. An argument had been used during the debate to the effect that the increase in the duty would lead to adulteration of grog and smuggling. The same argument was used some years ago when the duty on spirits was raised to 12s. per gallon, so that that argument fell to the ground. It had also been stated during the evening by the Treasurer, or some members who supported the tariff as it was introduced, that as sufficient revenue would be raised by the articles that had already been passed by the Committee the

hon. gentleman would not require an increase in the duty on spirits. He thought that if that were so it would come with very good grace from the hon. gentleman, if, considering the large increase that had been made in articles of general consumption, he would reduce the duty on many articles which had been raised to 15 per cent. *ad valorem*, to the old duty of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. That would be very much better than increasing the taxation on many men who could not afford it. He (Mr. Buckland) had gone roughly into a calculation, and he found that if the proposed duties were all passed, any working man in Queensland earning £2 a week would be taxed to the amount of at least 4s. or 5s. per week by those increased duties. Reference had been made to the duties paid in the other colonies on spirits, but it was just as well that they should hear them again. In New South Wales the duty was 14s. per gallon, the same as was proposed in the amendment of the hon. member for Townsville. It was the same in South Australia, and in Western Australia it was 15s. In New Zealand it was 15s. or 16s., according to the packages or vessels in which the spirits were imported, so that in asking for the proposed increase of 2s. per gallon they were not asking for a higher duty than was imposed in the other colonies. Reference had also been made to the duty on machinery as it affected Northern Queensland. Well, he thought that, after what they had heard from so many Northern representatives, they would be doing a fair and just thing in increasing the duty on spirits by 2s. per gallon and reducing the duty on machinery.

Mr. UNMACK said he would like, for the sake of the reputation of the country, to have some explanation of the statistics which had been quoted the previous day by the Treasurer. Since the adjournment for tea he had taken the trouble to check the statement that the consumption of spirits in this colony amounted to 25s. per head of the population. He would ask the Treasurer whether that calculation included wines and beers? When he had the answer of the hon. gentleman he would proceed further.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he would read what he stated the previous evening. He stated that the taxation on brandy, rum, whisky, geneva, old tom, cordials, and other spirits, wine, beer, beer in bottle, colonial beer, and colonial spirits came to £458,081 4s. 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ d., and that amounted to 25s. per head. That was his statement, and there was no misunderstanding about it.

Mr. UNMACK said the hon. gentleman was speaking in connection with the duty on spirits, and he understood him to say that this colony consumed a quantity amounting to 25s. per head of the population, which was not a just statement to make as regards the reputation of the colony.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Who made it?

Mr. UNMACK: You did.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I read from the document I have now in my hand. While I made the statement I had this in my hand and read every item.

Mr. UNMACK: He had gone through the matter hastily, and he found that the consumption of spirits within the colony amounted to 19s. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per head; spirits and wine, £1 1s. 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per head; and spirits, wine, and beer very nearly £1 5s. per head. That was a vastly different statement to the one that appeared in *Hansard*, and he thought that, in justice to the reputation of the colony, figures so enormously large should be corrected.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he did not know what appeared in *Hansard*. He had not looked at *Hansard*. But the statement he read just now was the statement he made the previous evening, and it was made from the document in his hand. What he said was that on the items which he had read 25s. was the amount, not of the consumption per head, but the amount that each inhabitant of the colony paid in the shape of taxation on those articles. He never made any statement at all as to the amount per head of liquor consumed.

Mr. UNMACK said the statement was made by the hon. gentleman, and had been used as an argument in favour of the increased duty on spirits.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Does the hon. member mean to question the statement I made? I read the items from the document in my hand.

Mr. UNMACK said it might be so, but he had nothing but *Hansard* to go upon. He would read what the hon. gentleman was reported to have said, and if he chose to dispute *Hansard* he might do so. The hon. gentleman, speaking on the spirit duty, said:—

"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."

There was no word about beer or wine there. The hon. gentleman continued:—

"He might mention that the duty paid upon rum, brandy, geneva, old tom, whisky, etc."

There was no word about wines or beer.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: You are only quibbling.

Mr. UNMACK: The Treasurer proceeded—

"He might mention that the duty paid upon rum, brandy, geneva, old tom, whisky, etc., amounted to 25s. per 'head.'"

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. UNMACK said he had clearly shown that the duty on spirits alone was 19s. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per head.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the hon. member was perfectly wrong in what he said. The consumption did not amount to that. The document he read was exactly what appeared in *Hansard*, though the reporters had curtailed it towards the end, probably because he had read a little too quickly. But he had that document in his hand, and stated that the amount paid in taxation on brandy, rum, whisky, geneva, old tom, cordials, other spirits, wine, beer, beer in bottle, colonial spirits, colonial beer, came to 25s. per head of the population. It was correctly enough reported in *Hansard*, only they curtailed it by putting "etc." for the last four items. He was astonished at the hon. member, who tried to be fair, questioning his statement for a moment. He did not think there was another member of the Committee who would do it.

Mr. McMASTER said he would not detain the Committee very long, because he knew that no argument he could use would influence the vote of any member, but he could not help saying a word in reference to a remark made by the hon. member for Flinders, Mr. Goldring. The hon. member spoke about the proposed increase being an additional burden upon the working man, and about them buying their grog in quantities of one or two gallons. Now, he ventured to say that if the working men were polled they would find that the vote would

be in favour of an additional 2s. per gallon on spirits, and to show that the local option votes that had been taken—

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: What has that got to do with it?

Mr. McMASTER said he would show what he thought it had got to do with it. The majority of votes polled in the districts where the local option vote had been carried were polled by the working men.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: You are entirely out.

Mr. McMASTER said he was not wrong. The working men had carried the vote. The middle and higher class people would not take the trouble to go to the poll. The working men, he ventured to say, would prefer an increase of 2s. per gallon on spirits and a reduction of the duty on tobacco. The references to the working men in that debate fell flat, and he did not think they would take. Their food and everything they required had been taxed, and he was satisfied that the working men did not encourage drunkenness, nor would they encourage cheap grog. It had been argued that the Treasurer would have more money than he would know what to do with if the amendment was carried, but he (Mr. McMASTER) hoped the hon. gentleman would take some of the other duties off. He would surely never allow the 4s. 6d. boots to pay 1s. 10d. per pair and the 25s. boots to pay the same. So that he would lose revenue there.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. McMASTER said the question was all right. He knew what he was talking about. Cheap boots were to be charged the same duty as expensive ones, and if the Treasurer altered that, then he could make up the difference on spirits. It was his intention to support the amendment.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said if the hon. member had been wiser he would scarcely have introduced the question of polling under the Local Option Act. The way that was worked was thoroughly understood. It was conducted generally by a firm or three or four firms. They cooked the rolls. They appointed their own benches of licensing justices. They put in the right sort.

The Hon. Sir S. W. GRIFFITH: They cannot do that.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said he would ask the leader of the Opposition if he had any doubt about the statement to read the names of the nine members of the licensing bench in Brisbane which were published in yesterday's *Telegraph*.

The Hon. Sir S. W. GRIFFITH: They are chairmen of local authorities.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said there were nine gentlemen there who undoubtedly were of one class.

The Hon. Sir S. W. GRIFFITH: That is the fault of the ratepayers.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said one certain class was purposely excluded from the bench. Now he would go back to Ipswich. They had there three or four leading houses who managed all the local option elections. It was known that nobody could vote unless he had paid his rates up to the beginning of November, and there was a blue-ribbon collector of rates. The taxes of those who were in favour of drink were never collected until after November, and then if those who were going to vote in favour of the resolution could not pay up their rates, the firms he had mentioned paid them for them, booked them, and of course charged a certain percentage for the transaction. Thus the rolls were cooked. It was well known who voted in favour of local option in Ipswich last week, and that a majority was

actually forced up. Now, the way to prove the majority was this: Whether the inhabitants paid taxes or not, they drank or did not drink, and he said let all the town come and vote indiscriminately, and then see who would have a majority. That was the way to prove it. Now, look at the bench of licensing justices in Brisbane. Why, it was a disgrace to the whole colony. To say that a certain class of the community should be excluded was shameful, and the same thing was done in scores of other places.

Mr. SMYTH: Name the class.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Of course he could name the class, but it had nothing to do with the question. He was not afraid or ashamed to name the class. The Catholics were excluded from that bench.

Mr. SMYTH: You have got them on the other side of the House.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: What had that got to do with the bench.

Mr. PHILIP said if he had anticipated that such a discussion would have arisen he would not have proposed the amendment. Like a number of other members, he wished to see the tariff finished as quickly as possible, and he rose to make a proposition to the Colonial Treasurer. He had no wish to press the question to a division, and he would propose a compromise. He thought the hon. gentleman could fairly meet the Northern members if he increased the duty on spirits by 1s. per gallon, and took off that amount on machinery and some other articles. The hon. gentleman was wrong in saying, in reply to the leader of the Opposition, that nearly all the articles on which they asked for a reduction had been decided. Bran and pollard had been decided, but the largest questions had yet to come. Machinery had yet to come, boots and shoes, sugar bags, corn sacks, and wool sacks had yet to come. He, and those who were working with him, had no desire to prolong the discussion but he could assure the Treasurer that if he passed the duty on spirits as proposed, he would give the greatest dissatisfaction to the northern end of the colony. He thought it only fair that the Northern members should be met in some way. They had not asked for a great deal. At the commencement of the debate the Treasurer said that he (Mr. Philip) proposed to alter his tariff to the extent of £140,000, but he thought that was a very unfair way of putting it. He, with the other Northern members, argued that particular duties would fall unduly on the northern part of the colony, but, at the same time, they had no wish to embarrass the Treasurer, and they were prepared to propose increased duties which would far more than cover what they proposed to take off. Now, he had never heard of a Treasurer being embarrassed with too much money. They knew that the Treasurer in the late Administration came down year after year with additional taxation, because they were short of money. He hoped the present Premier would have no occasion to bring forward another tariff during his term of office. They wished to relieve him of that trouble. They would give him £40,000 or £50,000 more, rather than he should be £50,000 or £100,000 short, and have to come down, as the leader of the late Government had, with fresh taxation almost every year. What was more troublesome than to be constantly tinkering with the tariff, as had been done during the last four or five years? He had every desire to assist the Premier, and thought the hon. gentleman might listen to an amendment coming from ten or eleven Northern members. He was sorry to say the number had

dwindled away, but he could not help that now. It would be only an act of grace on the part of the hon. gentleman to meet the views of not only the Northern part of the colony, but also a great portion of the South, by acceding in some way to their wishes. The tariff was supposed to be discussed by both sides, and was expected to be amended, because the Premier was not a business man—he had no commercial knowledge—and it was not to be expected that any one man would be able to bring in a tariff that would be at once complete. It would be no discredit to the hon. gentleman to accept suggestions even from the other side on small matters. There was no principle involved in an additional tax on spirits. They were taxed already, and if the tax were raised or lowered 1s. or 2s. there was no principle involved in it. He could understand if the Premier brought forward a land-tax, and had to withdraw it, that he would be embarrassed; but on the present occasion all he wanted was money, and the Committee were prepared to give him more than he asked for. There might be some few alterations in the items as proposed by him, but there could be no embarrassment if he got £20,000 or £30,000 more than he expected. Spirits was a fair thing to tax; that would be admitted on all sides. But the duty on machinery would fall unduly upon the northern end of the colony. Machinery was made in the South—in Brisbane and Maryborough; it was not made in the northern part of the colony, and he could assure the Committee that the North used more machinery than the South, in proportion to the population. The tax on boots and shoes would also fall heavily on the North.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. PHILP: He was simply advancing reasons why the Premier might fairly give way and meet the Northern members. They were not asking very much. They had come a long way to support him; they had been returned to do so, but he (Mr. Philp) could not conscientiously go back to his constituents if he supported the tariff as it stood. He hoped the Premier would consider the matter and give way a little. It would save a good deal of discussion.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he could not accept the compromise offered by the hon. member, because it was a compromise of principle. He had stated many reasons why he could not accept an amendment that would take out of the Government proposals altogether the incidence of taxation, and leave it to others. The hon. gentleman talked about a compromise. Just let him state what he had indicated he would do, and see whether the compromise had not been, or ought not to have been, effected by that time. The hon. member asked that the duty on machinery should be reduced to 5 per cent., and he (the Colonial Treasurer) had, in a much better and more effectual way, reduced the tax on machinery, by putting into the free list a large number of machines which were not there before—centrifugals, triple effects, planing machines, gas engines, portable engines, traction engines, and a lot of other things—in fact, a great number of machines that were used in different industries, and that could not be made here with ordinary appliances. Of course, any machine in the world could be made here; it was simply a question of money. That was one compromise. Then sewing machines had been struck out and put on the free list. Then, with regard to bags and sacks, corn sacks, wool-packs, and sugar bags, the raw material had been put on the 5 per cent. list, the ordinary duty being paid on those articles themselves. That was a very considerable reduction, and a concession in the way of encouraging the industries

of the colony. On “fuse, dynamite, gelatine, lithofracteur” he had indicated that he was open to hear an expression of opinion. “Green fruit” had gone; “wheat” had gone; “steel rails”—that was a matter of no consideration; there was nothing in it. With the exception of four items he had given way upon everything the hon. gentleman had proposed, and then he asked for a compromise. He (the Colonial Treasurer) thought he had effected a compromise, and in a way to offer the best encouragement to the industries of the colony.

Question—That the “12s.” proposed to be omitted, stand part of the paragraph—put.

The Committee divided:—

AYES, 39.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Nelson, Morehead, Black, Macrossan, Donaldson, Pattison, O’Sullivan, O’Connell, Paul, Laya, Archer, Allan, Smith, Stevens, Gannon, Dalrymple, Goldring, Lissner, Powers, Little, Battersby, G. H. Jones, Corfield, Murray, Campbell, Hamilton, Perkins, Agnew, Plunkett, Adams, Watson, Crombie, Rees R. Jones, Lyons, Dunsmaure, Stevenson, Murphy, and Palmer.

NOES, 26.

Sir S. W. Griffiths, Messrs. Hodgkinson, Rutledge, Jordan, Glassey, Barlow, Drake, Sayers, Salkeld, Tozer, Morgan, Macfarlane, Cowley, Buckland, Smyth, Mellor, McMaster, Hunter, Hyne, Unmack, Foxton, Isambert, Wimble, Groom, Grimes, and Philp.

PAIR.

Mr. Annear for increased duties.

Mr. North against.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. UNMACK said that, with regard to case spirits, the Treasurer deserved great praise, and his proposition met with the approval of every honest business man. The object aimed at was that every purchaser should get the quantity he really bargained for. There was a very large quantity of case spirits imported into the colony only measuring a little over a gallon and a-half, while their reputed contents were two gallons. The consequence of the passing of that item would be that in future all case spirits would contain the quantity that they were reputed to contain. But he wished to point out to the hon. gentleman that he was in a measure defeating the object he had in view by giving such an extreme time before that change came into operation. The tariff had already been a month before the public, and as the new duty on case spirits was not to be collected before the 1st March, 1889, it would give an opportunity to persons to send home large orders, upon which the importers would make from 3s. to 4s. a case extra profit. Long before the 1st March tens of thousands of cases containing less than their reputed quantity could be landed in the colony. He threw it out as a friendly suggestion to the Treasurer that he should omit the word “March” and insert the word “January.” That would cover all spirits that were afloat at the time of the introduction of the tariff. It would give a space of four months, and there was no sailing vessel that would take a longer time on her voyage out than four months. No hardship would be inflicted on anyone, and the revenue would be the gainer.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had considered the subject well before he fixed on the 1st of March as the day when the new arrangement would take effect. The trade was established and the bottles were made, and it was only fair that time should be allowed, not only for the arrival of what was actually afloat, but to make bottles that would contain the reputed quantity. It was with that object that he had given a little more time. Everybody would understand that after the 1st March the duty would have to be paid on the reputed quantity. He did not think there was much

danger of the market being flooded in the way referred to by the hon. member. It was only fair to give those concerned time to get into the new trade, and to make a pint bottle which should actually contain a pint, and a quart bottle which should actually contain a quart. They ought not to disturb trade more than was necessary. He might add that there was a clerical error in the item as put. Instead of a full-stop after "1889," there should only have been a comma, and the word "namely," so as to make the two paragraphs into one sentence.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said he wished to ask a question. It might be owing to his ignorance of commercial matters. Did that apply to wine as well? There were twelve quart bottles in a case; were they to count as three gallons or as two gallons? Because ordinarily, twelve reputed quart bottles went to two gallons. The Colonial Treasurer had spoken of pint bottles containing a pint, and quart bottles a quart.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I do not know what you mean.

Paragraph put, and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved—

That there be raised, levied, collected, and paid upon—Wine—

Sparkling—per gallon, 10s.

Other kinds—per gallon, 6s.

Wine containing more than 25 per cent. of alcohol of a specific gravity of .825 at the temperature of 60 degrees Fahrenheit's thermometer—per gallon, 12s.

One hon. member had proposed to move that the duty on wine should be 20s. per gallon. He did not care what it was, as he did not attach any importance to it, except that he would like to get as much revenue from it as he possibly could. He thought that if he made it 20s. he would not get much revenue, as that duty would lead to sparkling wines being made in the colony.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: They have not got the gooseberries here to make them.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: You can make good champagne out of almost anything.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said he thought the Colonial Treasurer in courtesy might have answered his question.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had deferred answering it until they came to wines. The hon. gentleman had asked if the same rule applied to wines as to spirits. It did.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said he had asked whether a case holding twelve quart bottles made three gallons or two gallons?

The COLONIAL TREASURER said there were three gallons in twelve quart bottles. With regard to the other point as to whether the two clauses passed with regard to spirits also applied to wine, they did; although it was not put there, it was done by general custom at present.

Mr. UNMACK said he was somewhat acquainted with the trade he thought, and he desired to ask the Colonial Treasurer whether they were supposed to pay duty on 3 gallons for a case of spirits which contained 2 gallons, because a case of 12 reputed quart bottles, according to their idea, contained 2 gallons? The Colonial Treasurer had just told them that 12 reputed quart bottles made 3 gallons, and he had desired to know whether they were to pay duty on 3 gallons or on 2 gallons?

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he was wrong in what he had said. Twelve bottles were 2 gallons—Imperial quarts.

Mr. UNMACK said they were not Imperial quarts, but reputed quarts.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved—

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

Timber, logs, per 100 sup. ft., 1s. 6d.

Timber, undressed, per 100 sup. ft., 1s. 6d.

Timber, dressed, per 100 sup. ft., 2s.

The duty on timber to be estimated as of a thickness of one inch, and to be in proportion for any greater thickness. Any thickness under one inch to be reckoned as one inch.

In speaking in reply on the Financial Statement he had indicated that the first two items he would not alter, but that he was not averse to an increase on the third item—dressed timber. In consulting with a good many gentlemen connected with the trade he found that the term "undressed" was misleading, but he could now define it better. His object in including undressed timber as the item on which no increase should be made was that big scantlings should come into the Northern ports at the same duty as he had put down, so as not to handicap them against the South. He would therefore propose, having ascertained that the timber came in as scantling of 96 superficial inches, that it be put down as "balk timber of a scantling of 96 superficial inches" instead of as "timber undressed." That would give 1s. 6d. on that. On dressed timber he had no objection to an increase of 1s. He moved that the words "timber undressed" be omitted.

Mr. AGNEW said there was a slight misunderstanding. Most hon. members were aware that a little friendly chat, or meeting, had been held for the purpose of considering the timber tariff. He was not quite sure whether he was conforming exactly to the agreement they had entered into at that time. The items in the printed tariff at present were not exactly the same as at the time they came to that understanding. He had spoken strongly before upon the subject of these timber duties, and was sorry the Treasurer had not seen his way to further protect the timber industry. It was an industry that was not confined to any particular district, and deserved to be protected. The people in all the districts of the colony reaped the benefit, and at present the saw-milling industry was not in a very flourishing condition. He considered that the timber industry should receive an equivalent for the protection that had been extended to the farming and mining industries. The farmer was protected in some cases by duties reaching as high as 80 per cent., but those engaged in the timber industry would be satisfied with 25 per cent. It was worth while maintaining an industry for which so much valuable plant had been brought out to the colony, and in which so many people were profitably employed. He hoped the Treasurer would see his way to grant a small concession; but he would not weary the Committee with a speech, because they all knew how steadfastly the tariff had been adhered to, and that all the talking in the world would not make the Treasurer alter his intentions. Still he hoped the hon. gentleman would see his way to include beech, both undressed and dressed, and cedar, sawn and dressed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: They are included.

Mr. AGNEW said he would have liked to have seen the duty 4s. 6d., but as they could not get that, he supposed, as hon. members opposite had said, they must be thankful for small mercies.

Mr. HODGKINSON said he wished to know if timber, undressed, would include Oregon logs?

The COLONIAL TREASURER said it would.

Mr. STEVENS said, if he understood the position rightly, log timber and balk timber would be charged 1s. 6d. That was, timber undressed, not worked up.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that was put down as balk timber, and would be charged 1s. 6d.

Mr. STEVENS said balk timber was undressed timber; but all undressed timber was not balk timber.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he proposed to leave out the words "undressed timber" and put in "balk timber," of a scantling of over 96 superficial inches. Smaller timber would be charged 3s.

Mr. LUYA said it should read "timber and logs of a scantling equal to 96 superficial inches and upwards, 1s. 6d. per 100 superficial feet; and timber undressed, of less size than 96 inches, 3s. 6d."

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he would make the third line "timber sawn and dressed 3s."

Mr. LUYA said that when the Treasurer was making concessions he ought to make a concession to dressed timber, which would protect the whole colony from being inundated with New Zealand timber. In New Zealand there was a duty of 4s. per 100 feet upon timber, to protect those engaged in that industry there against American timber. They would only be acting logically if they made a distinction between timber dressed and undressed. They had a great deal to thank the Government for in cancelling those abominable regulations under which they had been working for so long a time. So far as he was concerned he thought they should pay as much as they had been paying in the past for the raw material; but what the sawmillers grumbled at was the abominable regulations under which the royalty was collected. Of course, when the time came, he should certainly advocate that the money collected on the timber should be spent in the conservation of their forests. Nobody knew so well as those engaged in the industry how easy it was to propagate the pines and cedars which grew in millions in their scrubs. He would ask the Treasurer to make the duty on dressed timber 4s. 6d. per 100 feet, which was just about the cost of dressing it. Planing mills could be established in the North as well as in the South, and the industry could be established simply by placing a heavier duty upon dressed timber. One of the easiest parts of sawmilling was the dressing of timber, as none of that heavy machinery was required which was necessary for the reduction of the raw material.

Mr. PHILP said he thought the Treasurer had been got at by the timber merchants. It was proposed that balk timber up to 96 inches should be allowed in at 1s. 6d. He did not believe any timber was imported up to 96 inches, he thought the largest timber imported was 12 x 12 inches.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: That would be 144 inches.

Mr. PHILP said a great deal of undressed timber came from America under 12 x 12, and a great deal of timber 6 x 1. If the timber was brought in dressed it would be liable to be damaged in the transit. They had some people who had only planing machines, and not saws, for cutting up the timber at all. There was a difficulty also in the fact that vessels of small bulk could carry large quantities of timber, dressed, but if they were confined to carrying balk timber, they could not carry nearly the quantity, and the result would be that they

would be playing into the hands of the sawmillers of Maryborough and Brisbane. He had received a letter sent him from a large timber merchant at Townsville who had no machinery, but simply imported timber from Maryborough, or wherever he could get it cheapest. That gentleman said:—

"If this proposed duty is carried it will entail a loss to our firm of £500 on cargoes we have already ordered. We would like to stop them, but it is too late. We cannot, as in other goods, add the duty to the selling price, as it would raise the cost above Maryborough prices, and we should find no buyers."

He further said:

"The duty Hyne proposes on timber will give the Maryborough people a monopoly at the expense of the North, and will reduce the revenue instead of increasing it, as at present prices it will completely shut out foreign timber."

He questioned that, because they could not get the long lengths in Queensland timber that they could in Oregon timber. The timber on which a duty of 3s. was proposed could be bought as low as 6s. in America, so that the proposed duty amounted to 50 per cent. Then look at the freight from America to the colony. That was in itself a sufficient protection. He knew that at one time Maryborough did the whole of the timber trade with the North, and the people of the North were quite satisfied to deal with Maryborough. The Maryborough people, however, began to take advantage of their position, and at a meeting of three or four sawmillers they put up the price of timber 4s., 5s., and 6s. per 100 feet. What were the people of the North to do? In self-defence they had to go outside. They made inquiries and found they could land timber in Townsville from America much cheaper, and they were justified in doing so. The freight from Maryborough to Normanton was 10s. per 100 feet, and was not that itself a sufficient protection? Nearly all the timber used in the North had to be imported at present, though he hoped it would not be always so. In Normanton and Croydon large quantities of timber were used, and the price was sometimes 40s. per 100 feet. If the increased duty was put on, it would all go into the pockets of the sawmillers, as there would be no competition with them from outside. They had plenty of forest timber in the colony, and why could they not cut up timber as cheaply here as in America, or in New South Wales? They were getting a great deal of timber from New South Wales, and at from 3s. to 4s. per 100 feet cheaper than they could get it in this colony, simply because there was greater competition.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: No; but because it is easier got.

Mr. PHILP said the sawmillers of the colony were few in number and were wealthy people, and the result of the proposed duty would be the establishment of three or four monopolies, and the people in the North would have to pay 50 per cent. more for timber than they were paying now.

Mr. LITTLE said he did not agree with the hon. member for Townsville on that question, and, on the contrary, he sincerely regretted that the Treasurer had not placed a heavier tax on imported timber. He would tell the Committee why. In the district he had the honour to represent, and in the district represented by the hon. member for Cairns, Mr. Wimble, they had forests of the best timber in Australia. During his election contest he saw, to his sorrow and regret, two vessels loaded with New Zealand timber at Port Douglas; and the hon. member for Cairns had seen many vessels loaded with New Zealand timber at Cairns. The action of the late Government in imposing the timber royalty of 2s. had

ruined the timber trade in the colony. He admitted they could not at present use the timber they had in the districts he had mentioned, owing to the want of means of transit, but as soon as the third section of the Cairns-Herberton railway was completed they would be able to supply not only the North but the whole colony. He knew the scrubs on the Mosman, Daintree, and Saltwater Creek thoroughly, and had lived out there many years ago with the present Minister for Mines and Works, and owing to the royalty the timber-getters could not touch the timber there, and some of their machinery was rusting there now. The timber-getters there were the frontiersmen and pioneers who kept back the blacks from the settlers, who, being protected by those men, cultivated their farms and improved their holdings, and made a living for themselves and their families. What were those men doing now? They were humping their swags through Woothakata, and their wives and children were destitute. If it had not been for the royalty imposed those settlers would be still flourishing, instead of going about the country asking for employment. The proposed increased duty on timber would work in two ways, as would be seen, and he regretted that even a higher duty had not been imposed on imported timber.

Mr. GROOM said he did not pretend to know much about that question, but he would say that the hon. member for Nundah was quite right in what he had said as to there having been a meeting to consider the duties on timber, but they also considered something else. He had no desire to provoke a discussion, but he wished to say that some hon. members were asked to support particular duties, and they were asked also to support other proposals coming from the other side of the Committee.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: "Log-rolling."

Mr. GROOM said he would not call it log-rolling.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Where timber is concerned it may fairly be called "log-rolling."

Mr. GROOM said he would say this: The promises on one side had not been carried out. Some hon. members had faithfully promised that when the items of agricultural produce came on for consideration they would give those who had proposed the increase the assistance of their votes. He regretted that that promise had not been carried out. He had himself given a promise then that he would support the increased duty to be proposed on timber, and, notwithstanding the fact that certain hon. members had broken faith with him, he would adhere to the promise he had given, and support the increased duty on timber.

Mr. WIMBLE said he had to congratulate the hon. member for Townsville on his constancy in one thing. The hon. member had, at all events, shown that he was a determined freetrader. When they took into consideration the amount of timber grown in Queensland, not only in the North, but in various parts of the colony, he did not think it behoved anyone to advocate that they should import timber from outside the colony. The industry was one which would provide a great amount of employment, and it deserved every meed of protection that could be given to it. With regard to the remark of the hon. member for Townsville as to the advantages of using American timber, and as to the imposition of an increased duty on timber leading to the establishment of a monopoly at Maryborough, he, as one of the Northern members, would observe that, should such a monopoly be established, it would

be readily broken down directly they got the Cairns railway open. The third section, as the hon. member for Woothakata had said, would open up a timber district which he (Mr. Wimble) did not hesitate to say could not be surpassed in value. There were vast quantities of valuable timber in the district, and, whatever they had been told about it, there had been nothing exaggerated. The supply of timber in that district was practically inexhaustible, and was capable of supplying, not only this colony, but all the other colonies, for the next half century. He would earnestly support the amendment, and trusted that the Premier would allow the extra duty on undressed timber to be carried as it had been advocated by the hon. member for South Brisbane. With respect to the remarks of the hon. member for Toowoomba, Mr. Groom, regarding an agreement that was made with the "hay and corn party," as they had been termed, he might state that he (Mr. Wimble) was one who agreed in part to some of those things, and the increased duty on timber was one of the articles in which they expected support from the hon. members referred to. They had now an opportunity of seeing whether they would keep their pledge and help the timber industry.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said there was no amendment before the Committee. He would move that the word "undressed" be omitted, with the view of inserting in lieu thereof the words "of scantling, 96 square inches and over."

Mr. HYNÉ said he could scarcely grasp the proposal of the hon. gentleman. Were they now dealing with the whole of those lines?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: With the middle line.

Mr. HYNÉ said, then he presumed the discussion just now would be on the two lines—"timber logs" and "timber of scantling, 96 square inches and over?"

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Yes.

Mr. HYNÉ said, in that case he would be able afterwards to move an amendment with reference to dressed timber. He would like to make a few remarks on the timber question. He thought it was pretty well known that, unfortunately for himself, he was connected with the timber trade. He wished it was otherwise. He looked upon the proposal to impose a duty of 1s. 6d. per 100 feet of "scantling 96 inches and over" as a concession to the timber industry, and was very glad it was made by the Treasurer. If he enumerated the difficulties which the timber industry had had to contend against during the last seven or eight years, he knew very well that people would say he was speaking from a selfish motive. He did speak with feeling on the matter, and, no doubt, when a man spoke with feeling, it was a selfish feeling, especially when it touched his purse, as his connection with the timber trade had touched his purse. However, he proposed to quote statistics showing the quantities of timber imported into the colony during the past three years, and the figures he would give were from the "Statistics of the Colony for 1887." Last year, 1887, the quantity of hardwood imported was: rough, 1,460,562 feet; dressed, 27,610 feet; pine, rough, 4,033,568 feet; dressed, 2,022,795 feet; total, 7,514,535 feet. In 1886 the hardwood imported into the colony was 451,802 feet in the rough, and 34,321 feet dressed; pine, rough, 6,567,897 feet, and dressed, 4,290,211 feet; total, 11,344,231 feet. A year further back, in 1885, there was imported of hardwood, rough, 687,844 feet, and pine, rough, 7,903,541 feet; total, 8,591,385 feet. The grand total of pine and hardwood for the three years was 27,480,151 feet. What he wanted to show

was that there was no necessity for one foot of that to be imported, as they had abundance of timber, abundance of labour, and abundance of machinery lying idle. Those figures showed what magnitude the trade would assume if it received the protection to which it was entitled. He would mention the number of saw-mills lying idle that had come under his own observation. In Maryborough there were four large mills idle; that was, there was as much machinery lying idle as there was at work. There were also mills lying idle at Ipswich, Toowoomba, Logan, Albert, Caboolture, Rockhampton, Gladstone, Bowen, Whitsunday Passage, Cairns, and Nerang. He would ask the Committee to reflect for one moment and consider whether there was not something radically wrong when all that machinery was lying idle. Why was it lying idle? It was not for want of material to cut, or for want of a sale, because there was plenty of demand for the timber if they could only keep out foreign timber. He knew very well that the argument would be used by those who were opposed to a timber tariff that by putting on those duties they would increase the cost of timber to the consumer. He disputed that, and maintained that nothing of the kind would be done. What he wished to show the Committee was the price of timber landed in Brisbane, and the rate it was sold for. His object in doing so was to show that the consumers did not get the benefit of the cheap imported timber. American timber was landed for 12s.—11s. for the timber and 1s. for duty—and the selling price was from 15s. 6d. to 17s. 6d. That was the same price as the colonial timber. Now, it did not give the consumer one iota of benefit to import timber. It simply caused the machinery to lie idle, because the market was glutted with the imported article. Then, again, others would say that if they got the extra duty timber would rise. He said nothing of the kind would take place, but that the competition caused by the starting of all that machinery would replace the price; and to strengthen his arguments he could refer to the statement of his hon. colleague, when he said that the protection given to candles had caused the lowering of the price of the imported article by 4d. or 5d. per lb. If that applied to candles it would to timber also. Then, again, the Premier used an argument that the Northerners would be entirely in the hands of the Maryborough people. Certainly they supplied the North almost entirely, but in a year or two he looked upon it as certain that Cairns would be the greatest exporting district of Kauri pine. He had seen there the finest scrubs he had ever seen, and it would not be many years before Cairns would be able to supply the whole of the North. Another argument he knew would be used by the freetraders, and that was, if the increase was granted it would increase the cost of the article. He spoke feelingly as a Maryborough man, and could assure hon. members that it would increase the demand; more machinery would be kept running to its full power, and instead of having timber lying in his yard for three years, as he had now, he would have quick returns. That would compensate the colony for the protective duty. He was very pleased with the concession that had been made, and when the time came, would move that 4s. 6d. per 100 be charged on dressed timber.

Mr. STEVENS said an hon. gentleman had said that the freight on American timber was very high indeed, but he could not have known what it was. The freight on American timber was 4s. 6d. per 100. A great deal of it was put on board at 4s., which brought the price to 8s. 6d.; and it was not retailed at a price that benefited the consumer, but was

charged as much for as colonial timber. The Treasurer had made a great concession in agreeing to a duty of 3s. on rough timber, but there was an actual difference of 1s. 6d. between undressed and dressed timber, and it would be hardly fair to admit dressed timber at the same rate as undressed timber. He must say that he could not help sympathising with the hon. member, Mr. Philp, when he found that so many of the Northern members were not with him in his proposed amendment. When the protectionists were fighting for what they wanted the hon. member wore a cruel smile, but that smile was absent now. The hon. member's amendments, of course, were deserving of consideration, not only from the Committee, but the country, but he could not view other amendments in the same light. He hoped the Premier would agree to the amendment that would be moved by the hon. member for Maryborough, that 4s. 6d. be charged on dressed timber, because that was the actual difference between dressed and undressed timber.

Mr. ALLAN said he could assure the Committee that in his district, around Killarney and Allora, they had large sawmills, but that the beech that was sent down here was charged 26s. 1d. per ton. That contained 300 feet, which amounted to a charge for carriage of 9s. per 100 feet. Therefore, he thought that any consideration they got would be well deserved. He trusted that the Colonial Treasurer would make a difference between dressed and undressed timber. It was very easy to dress the timber when once the machinery was on the ground, and it made a difference of 1s. 6d. per 100 feet.

Mr. PALMER said the hon. member for Maryborough had just told them that they had plenty of timber, machinery, and labour, and yet the mills were lying idle. How could the hon. gentleman explain the fact that the repairs to the Victoria Bridge had been stopped for the want of timber? If the timber they were so anxious to protect was so plentiful, and the labour so plentiful, how could such a thing occur. He had listened to the debate that had taken place and had not spoken at all, but if he had had any leanings towards protection he was sure the debate would have cured him. He found that they had to protect everybody against everybody else, and hon. members thought of nothing but their own districts. In the Gulf country there was not a single stick of timber grown, and the people had chiefly to live in galvanised iron houses, although the timber was so plentiful along the coast. There was a demand for any quantity of timber at 35s. a hundred, and yet people had to get their timber from New Zealand. If it were not for the timber they could get from that colony they would have to do without it altogether. The demand was the most extravagant one he had ever heard of. While they had enormous quantities of timber in the forests all over the South, yet those who were interested in sawmills were crying out for more protection upon timber. The hon. member for Cairns, Mr. Wimble, had said, "Just wait until the second section of our railway is finished and we will supply the North," but he (Mr. Palmer) was prepared to guarantee that when the second, third, or fourth section of that railway was finished that hon. member would be one of the first to cry out for more taxation on timber. Once the proposed tax was put on timber it would remain there; it would be a tax upon the North continually, and be aggravated as years went on. He was certain that even if the tax were put on, the people of the North would still get their timber outside Queensland, because he believed the timber-getters of the southern part of the colony had

laid themselves open to the charge brought against the farmers by the hon. member for Toowoomba, Mr. Groom, in a speech he made during the last election. The hon. member then said the farmers were protected quite enough, and that the evils they were suffering under arose from their own fault, from things over which they had control—that was, the want of a proper system amongst themselves in getting their produce into marketable shape. It was clear, from the confessions that had been made by hon. members, that those difficulties must arise from want of management. Perhaps it arose, as the hon. the leader of the Opposition had said, from invincible ignorance; but certain it was that, with all the conditions in their favour, yet they could not compete with far-away countries, such as North America and New Zealand, where they had to carry their timber a long way to port and then ship it here. He protested against any more of these continually-increasing burdens upon the already over-burdened timber industry of the colony.

Mr. WATSON said he had been dealing in timber for the last twenty years, and he should vote in favour of the amendment of the hon. member for Maryborough, Mr. Hyne, to put 4s. 6d. on dressed timber.

Mr. GRIMES said the discussion on the timber duty had certainly been a very one-sided one. They had heard the interests of the saw-millers advocated by four or five members, and only one had stood up on behalf of the consumers. He was pleased to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Carpentaria, Mr. Palmer, that those who used timber should be considered as well as those who cut and prepared it. The cheapness and abundance of timber in Queensland had not been an unmixed evil, because it had enabled numbers of persons to put up houses for themselves who would not have been able to do so otherwise. It had reduced the cost of a mechanic's cottage very considerably. Besides that, it had given employment to a large number of carpenters who would not have been able to obtain employment had timber kept at its previously high price. He did not approve of the high duty the Premier now proposed to put upon timber; still less did he approve of the exorbitant duty intended to be proposed by the hon. member for Maryborough.

Mr. COWLEY said, in dealing with that question, they should take into consideration the numbers of men who were now able to build houses, and the great amount of employment that was provided for carpenters. Round about Brisbane, Townsville, and other large towns, land was being cut up in all directions, and hundreds and thousands of men, who had grown tired of paying rent, were able to build houses for themselves through the low price of timber. A heavy protective duty on timber, would fall very heavily upon working men who desired to build houses for themselves to live in.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Timber will be cheaper.

Mr. COWLEY: Protection never made anything cheap. It created monopolies. When there was a demand in the North for timber, five years ago, the price in Maryborough rose 5s. and 6s. per 100, and the people had to send to New South Wales for timber. Hardwood that they had to pay 14s. and 15s. for in Maryborough, they could get from Sydney at 7s., 8s., and 9s.—timber equally good. Why should the people up North be compelled to go to Maryborough for their timber, and pay 5s. or 6s. per 100 more for it? He thought the Premier in consenting to undressed timber being put in with dressed timber had made a very great

mistake, and that it would prove a very great hardship. If he had allowed the tariff to stand as originally proposed, it would have been quite heavy enough without going any further. They wanted scantling of all sizes up North at the lowest possible rate. He did not claim protection for a single thing for the North. The North had not asked for protection. The bulk of the Northern members, during that debate, had advocated free trade, or as near to it as possible. The hon. members for Cairns and Woothakata had told them that they had thousands and millions of feet of timber in their districts; but it was inaccessible. No protective duty, however high, would bring that timber to the consumer, but as soon as the railway was made it would come down without protection; and then the hon. members for Maryborough, and others who supported the proposed high duty, would find, in all probability, to their cost, that they had made a great mistake, and that Cairns would flood the Maryborough market with timber. He trusted the Premier would withdraw from the concession he had made.

Mr. STEVENS said two hon. members had claimed that the numerous buildings erected about Brisbane had been built owing to the low price of timber; but, as a matter of fact, the consumers had not got their timber 1s. per hundred cheaper. The bulk of the timber had been bought at a low price and retailed at the usual high price. He happened to know that as a fact, because a case of the kind had come under his notice when travelling to Southport.

Mr. DALRYMPLE said that if the public did not receive the benefit from the duty it was certain that somebody else did. He rose chiefly to reply to a fallacy uttered the other evening by the hon. member for Maryborough, and repeated to-night by the hon. the junior member for Maryborough, to the effect that the price of candles had fallen in consequence of protection. That was a most ridiculous statement. The price of candles had fallen, not in consequence of protection, but because of a very great fall in the value of the raw material—tallow—of which they were made. If protection was going to result in a serious fall in the value of the manufactured article, he did not think so many hon. members would be in favour of it. He did not approve of a protective tariff; still less did he approve of the attempts made from the other side of the Committee to add to the burdens which fell upon the consumer.

Mr. LUYA said he wished to set the Committee right as to the price of sawn timber imported from America.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: They know all about it.

Mr. LUYA said the timber cost 3s. 9d. put on board the vessel at Puget Sound; freight and other charges brought it up to 9s. 2d.; and the difference between that and what it was sold for at Normanton or elsewhere was what went to the importer. His firm will be the first to pay the duty on American timber, as they will import the first shipload from Puget Sound under the new duty; but it made very little difference to them, and he should certainly vote in favour of an increased duty.

Mr. PHILP said that with regard to the remark of the hon. member for Logan that the price of timber was just the same now as it was before timber began to be imported, he might mention that the price of Maryborough timber at Townsville, four or five years ago, before timber was brought from America, was 30s. per 100. After the importation began they brought it as low as 14s. per 100.

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

The COLONIAL TREASURER said there had evidently been some misunderstanding about the way the question was put.

Mr. ARCHER said he thought the Chairman had put the question quite properly. There was no misunderstanding on his part. The question put was that the paragraph, as printed, stand part of the question, and the Chairman declared that the "ayes" had it.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the Committee misunderstood it; they thought he was putting in the words, that the other motion had been carried, and that the word "undressed" be left out. The question ought to have been put in another form. No doubt the hon. member for Rockhampton would not take advantage of a mistake having been made, and would allow the Chairman to put the question over again. The line simply altered the language; the 1s. 6d. per 100 remained exactly the same.

The CHAIRMAN said that after stating the proposed amendment, he put the question in this way: "That the word proposed to be omitted"—namely, "undressed"—"stand part of the paragraph."

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the question was put perfectly right, but from the expansive nature of the debate, and the wide ground it had travelled over, members did not understand it. But they could undo what they had done by admitting it was a mistake, and taking the sense of the Committee upon it.

The Hon. A. RUTLEDGE said he was quite satisfied there had been a misunderstanding on the part of the Committee. He was prepared to vote for the omission of the word in the second part of the paragraph, but there had been so much discussion that hon. members' minds were utterly confused as to what they were voting about. He did not understand, nor did many members of the Committee, he imagined, understand that they were voting to allow the paragraph to remain as it was now.

Mr. GRIMES said, the Chairman having decided the question by declaring for the "ayes," he doubted whether the question could be put again. He should like to have the Chairman's ruling on that point.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it was a pity the hon. member for Rockhampton had not been in his place earlier, as then he might have seen his way to deal with the matter in a different way. The question was very properly put by the Chairman, and properly dealt with by the Committee.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he would put it perfectly right by moving that after the word "undressed"—

Mr. GRIMES said he wanted the Chairman's ruling on the matter as to whether it could be re-put.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said there was no ruling wanted. He would let the word "undressed" stand part of the question, and move that after the word "undressed" there be inserted the words "of a scantling, 96 square inches and over."

Mr. HODGKINSON said he would like to ask the Colonial Treasurer whether he meant to define by that "balk timber," because "balk timber" was not "undressed timber," as it was squared.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: It is quite undressed.

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

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved that after the word "dressed," in the next line, there be inserted the words "and sawn, of a scantling under 96 square inches."

Mr. HYNE said he had already said that he would move an amendment on that item. He wished that the Colonial Treasurer would allow the duty to be 4s. instead of 3s., as that would encourage the millers. He was not going to make any comment, but would move that the duty on dressed timber be 4s., and on sawn, as the Colonial Treasurer proposed, 3s.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he was prepared to move that the words "two shillings" be "three shillings," as he had said, but he would take a division on the amendment as to taking sawn and dressed timber together. He thought sawmill people, and everyone connected with timber ought to be perfectly satisfied with his proposals.

Mr. STEVENS said it seemed an anomaly, as, although 2s. might be a protection on undressed timber, it would not be on the dressed timber. It would be a clear gain of 1s. 6d. to the timber imported over their own timber.

Mr. PHILP said 3s. on all dressed timber was quite sufficient, and he hoped the Colonial Treasurer would not give way any more. He would oppose any further additions to the timber tariff.

Mr. GOLDRING said he thought the timber people were making most preposterous propositions. They wanted to ruin the North altogether. Why should they not be allowed to import from America, New Zealand, and New South Wales if they could do so satisfactorily? The timber merchants said that the increased duty would not increase the prices, but he said it would. If they were prevented in the North from importing timber from America, New Zealand, and New South Wales, prices would be 50 or 100 per cent. more than they were now.

Mr. BATTERSBY said that, as one who represented a timber electorate, he should advise hon. members to accept the concession of the Colonial Treasurer if they wanted to get done with the tariff that week. If the Northern members wanted to get done before Christmas they would accept that concession and make fewer speeches; and he would advise the Southern members to sit quiet and let them get through the business.

Mr. STEVENS said he would like to ask the Colonial Treasurer to put those two items separately, so that they could vote upon them separately. If he did not, he would compel those interested to take a division, and he must say that he hardly liked to do that after the great concessions the Colonial Treasurer had made. It would seem ungenerous, but there was such a vast difference between dressed and undressed timber that he felt compelled to ask that. He hoped the Colonial Treasurer would put it in such a way that they could take a division.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the only way to decide that was to defeat the amendment he had proposed. He had put it in such a way that if he carried it there could not be any further amendment on it; and he did not see any other way to put it. He did not want another division, and he would vote against any additional duty at all.

Mr. STEVENS said he thought the Colonial Treasurer might see that he was putting them in a false position, and it appeared rather ungenerous to make them accept a thing they did not like. If he put it in the way he had suggested, the difficulty could be met.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: What the way you would suggest?

Mr. STEVENS said if the hon. member would move that the duty on sawn timber be 3s., and leave dressed timber as a separate item, it would meet the case.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he would not do that. The hon. gentleman failed to see the concession that had been granted, by allowing small sawn timber to come in at a duty of 3s.

Mr. HYNÉ said he moved an amendment, that dressed timber pay 4s.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the hon. member could not move any amendment of that kind, but he could vote against his (the Colonial Treasurer's) amendment.

Mr. HYNÉ said he should like to ask the Colonial Treasurer—Was he in order in moving that there be an export duty imposed on cypress pine?

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the hon. gentleman could not move that until he had got through the tariff, and he did not think it would be in order then; but at the same time if the hon. gentleman could find any means of bringing it before the Committee it might be done. He moved that "two shillings" be omitted with the view of inserting "three shillings."

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

Question—That the word (3s.) proposed to be inserted be so inserted—put.

Mr. HYNÉ said he would move as an amendment that the duty on dressed timber be 4s.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the hon. member could not move that amendment.

Mr. HYNÉ said he was so fogged about those amendments that he did not know what they were passing.

Mr. FOXTON said the amendment could be put. It was proposed to insert the word "3s.," and the hon. member wished to move as an amendment that the word "4s." be inserted instead of the word "3s."

Question put, and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 45.

Sir T. Mellwraith, Messrs. Morehead, Nelson, Black, Donaldson, Macrossan, Hamilton, O'Sullivan, Jordan, Hodgkinson, Paul, O'Connell, Laya, Archer, Rutledge, Allan, Palmer, Stevens, Gannon, Groom, Lissner, Powers, Hyné, Isambert, North, Grimes, Murray, G. H. Jones, Corfield, Wimble, Little, Perkins, McMaster, Battersby, Plunkett, Adams, Watson, Roes R. Jones, Lyons, Agnew, Crombie, Dunsmure, Pattison, Stevenson, and Murphy.

NOES, 11.

Messrs. Tozer, Glassey, Salkeld, Barlow, W. Stephens, Morgan, Macfarlane, Campbell, Smyth, Mellor, and Goldring.

PAIR.

For the increased duties, Mr. Annear.

Against the increased duties, Mr. R. H. Smith.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

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

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved—

That there be raised, levied, collected, and paid on—Boots and shoes, except indiarubber shoes (present English sizes to be the standard), viz.:—

Men's No. 6 and upwards—per dozen pairs, 22s.

Youths' Nos. 2-5—per dozen pairs, 14s.

Boys' Nos. 7-1—per dozen pairs, 12s.

Women's No. 3 and upwards, except lasting and stuff boots, including goloshed boots—per dozen pairs, 13s.

Girls' Nos. 11-2, except lasting and stuff boots, including goloshed boots—per dozen pairs, 11s.

Girls' No. 7-10, except lasting and stuff boots, including goloshed boots—per dozen pairs, 8s.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he wished to ask the Colonial Treasurer whether he meant to stand by the tariff proposed on boots and shoes.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: What do you mean by that?

Mr. MACFARLANE said there were some inconsistencies in the proposed tariff. It was perhaps right to exempt women's lasting and stuff boots, including goloshed boots, because they could not be made in the colony, and he supposed the intention was to allow them to come in at the *ad valorem* duty of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. That was right enough, but there were several inconsistencies in connection with men's boots. A great number of men's boots imported from England were 5s. a pair in England, and boots of another quality were 15s. in England. The one quality of boot was used by the working classes and the other by the better classes—clerks and so forth. The proposed duty on both of those classes of boots was to be 1s. 10d. per pair, and that was not right. It would be far better to put the low class boot on the *ad valorem* list at $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and the better class of boot on the *ad valorem* list at 15 per cent. If that were done it would bring in just as much to the Treasury and would cause much less confusion than the proposed tariff. If the proposed system was adopted importers of boots would require invoice clerks to do nothing else but keep a set of books for classifying the boots according to the tariff. He spoke with some experience in reference to the boot trade.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had had one invariable style of correspondence in regard to that item. The man who did nothing but import and sell boots was strongly against the tariff proposals, and the man who made boots wanted the duties specified as they were in the proposed tariff. He did not pretend to possess the knowledge of the hon. member for Ipswich at all as regarded the boot trade, but he had done the best thing he could do. He had enumerated the items exactly in the same way as they appeared in the last proposed tariff that failed in Victoria, except that the duty proposed in Victoria was much greater than he proposed. He thought that a good precedent, as they had had a great deal of experience in Victoria in that matter, and they found it far better to have a fixed duty on those articles. There was no doubt in his mind as to the effect of a fixed duty. It generally had the effect of improving the character of the article introduced, as a man did not care about importing a bad pair of boots when he had to pay the same duty on them as on a good pair. The tendency was to raise the character of the goods imported. That same tariff had been debated in South Australia within the last six months, and carried, item by item, as they were put down in the tariff he proposed, only the duty proposed there was about 40 per cent. more than he put on.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he did not object to the fixed duty, but to the unfairness of taxing boots worth 5s. at the same rate as boots worth 15s. It was all nonsense to say that those boots would be made in the colony, for they would not. Would it not be a fair thing to have two fixed duties—one, say, of 1s. 10d. a pair on boots worth under 10s. per pair, and a higher fixed duty upon boots worth above that price? If that were done a man who wanted a good boot would have to pay for it. The tariff as proposed would cause a great deal of dissatisfaction. Hon. members must see the unreasonableness of making boots at 5s. pay the same duty as boots at 15s. It was not good always to go to Victoria, and it might be a good thing to take an example from some of the other colonies, and they might find there was no necessity to adopt the Victorian system. There were bootmakers in Brisbane who supplied

ladies and gentlemen in Melbourne with boots when the *ad valorem* duty here was 5 per cent., simply because the boots could be got cheaper in Brisbane than in Melbourne.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Did they smuggle them into Victoria?

Mr. MACFARLANE said they did not smuggle them into the colony, but took them in as personal luggage.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that people who got their boots in that way got them made in Brisbane, because they could get them made better here than in Melbourne. He knew that when he was in England he got his boots made in Brisbane. The argument the hon. member used as to the poor man's boots having to pay as much duty as the rich man's was really of very little importance. He (the Treasurer) would advise the rich man to go to Stewart's, in George street, where he would get his boots made properly, and, at the same time, encourage local industry.

Mr. DRAKE said he agreed entirely with the proposals of the Government in regard to those items. He thought that *ad valorem* duties were no good at all in keeping out shoddy, which could be run into the colony at such a low price that it scarcely paid anything. He did not agree with the hon. member who stated that the proposed duty was unfair, because it would press heavily on that class of people who wore the common kind of boots, as he believed those boots could be made, and were made in the colony. The duties, therefore, would scarcely touch those people, but would very properly fall on those who wore the more expensive and highly finished boots. He would suggest to the Treasurer that the words "including goloshed boots" should be put in brackets, as had been done with similar phrases in other parts of the tariff, so as to prevent any possible confusion; he was uncertain whether they were included in the exceptions until he referred to the tariff of South Australia.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: All right. That does not require any amendment.

Mr. PHILP said he thought those duties were unfair, and that an *ad valorem* duty would be very much better. He therefore moved that the whole paragraph be omitted, with the view of inserting "all boots and shoes, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*."

Mr. GROOM said he could not support the amendment. Among all the items in the tariff that now proposed met with his hearty approval. If they wished to encourage the establishment of a large number of boot factories in the colony that was a step in the right direction. With regard to the cheap boots which had been spoken about, he believed that the proposed tariff would lead to all the cheap boots which were now being imported from New South Wales and Victoria being manufactured in the colony. He had some sympathy with the hon. member for Townsville in not being able to carry any of his amendments, because in that respect the hon. member was in the same position as himself; but as far as that particular portion of the tariff was concerned, it had his hearty approval, and he could not support the amendment of the hon. gentleman.

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

AYES, 36.

Sir. T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Nelson, Morehead, Macrossan, Black, Donaldson, Dunsmure, Groom, Lyons, Murphy, Pattison, Stevenson, Croubie, Rees R. Jones, Watson, Adams, Plunkett, W. Stephens, Agnew, Tozer, Perkins, Campbell, G. H. Jones, Murray, Battersby, North, Isambert, Wimble, Powers, Drake, Gannon, Paul, Allan, Hodgkinson, O'Connell, and Luya.

NOES, 23.

Messrs. Goldring, Barlow, Glassey, Philp, Dalrymple, Lissner, Sayers, Macfarlane, McMaster, Archer, Ilyne, Buckland, Cowley, Palmer, Corfield, Smyth, Hunter, Grimes, Unmack, Foxton, Hamilton, Mellor, and Smith.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved—

That there be raised, levied, collected and paid on—Jewellery, plate (gold and silver)—for every £100 of the value thereof, £25.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the next item would be the 5 per cent. list, as it appeared in the proposed tariff on page 4. From time to time he had given notice of putting certain articles, which he had classified as well as he could, on the 5 per cent. list. As he had intimated before, he proposed to do away with the 10 per cent. *ad valorem* duties altogether and substitute 5 per cent., increasing the number of articles that would be put on the 5 per cent. list. With the permission of the Committee, however, instead of moving the 10 per cent. list, as printed on page 4, he would move the printed amendment which had just been issued to members, which would save the necessity of moving a great number of amendments. He had intimated at various times as the tariff was going through that the material used in making up different articles that were likely to be manufactured here would be put under the 5 per cent. list, and he had increased the list very considerably, with the object of giving a fair opportunity to manufacturers here. Following on that, the free list would be increased, and was also framed on the principle of giving encouragement to different local industries. It had been arranged upon the best information he could get from those engaged in the different industries. He therefore moved that the following words be omitted from the tariff with the view of inserting the amended list:—

"Cotton piece goods—shirtings, and all calicoes, prints, muslins, sheetings, and cotton ticks; flannel, in the piece; linen piece goods—ducks, diapers, rough brown and dressed holland, tabling, sheeting, and damask ticks; moleskin, in the piece; paper (for paper-bag making); sewing machines—for every £100 of the value thereof, £10."

Question—That the paragraphs proposed to be omitted stand part of the tariff—put and negatived.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved that the following words be inserted:—

Cotton piece goods—shirtings, and all calicoes, prints, muslins, sheetings, and cotton ticks; union ticks, in the piece; flannel, in the piece; linen piece goods—ducks, diapers, rough brown and dressed holland, tabling, sheeting, and damask ticks; moleskin, in the piece; reversible and levantine silk mixtures, of not less than 44 inches in width; alpaca cloth, with border; zancella, cloth, with border; paper, except otherwise enumerated; ash timber, in plank; American oak, for staves; carriage shafts, spokes, felloes, naves, hubs, bent wheel rims; bagging and woolbagging; bunting, in the piece; cork, elastic, flock, linseed, castor oil seed; furniture springs—for every £100 of the value thereof, £5.

Mr. SMYTH asked if "bagging and woolbagging" would include corn sacks?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: It will include the material out of which they are made.

Mr. GROOM asked what was the meaning of "paper, except otherwise enumerated"?

The COLONIAL TREASURER said most paper would be in the free list.

Mr. COWLEY asked under what head bottles would come? They had no bottle manufacturers here, and he had received a telegram from a sauce manufacturer at Townsville, asking, not

for a protective duty on sauce, but that bottles should come in free. He thought they might make the concession of putting them in the 5 per cent. list, instead of under 15 per cent.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said sauce-makers were very well protected already, and 15 per cent. was not an unfair duty on bottles.

Mr. COWLEY said the sauce manufacturer he had mentioned did not ask for a protective duty on sauce, but merely that bottles should be allowed to come in free, so as to enable him to establish the industry. He thought 5 per cent. would be a fair thing.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he did not think there was a more successful industry in the colonies than bottle-making, and from the way it was going on it promised to be an increasing industry.

Mr. PHILP said he was glad to see the proposed amendment, which was the best introduced yet. Still there were a lot of goods that might be included in the 5 per cent. list, such as canvas, mosquito net, saddle serge, and collar serge. All those were made up in the colony. He was also informed that ordinary flannel came in at 10 per cent., and twill flannel came in as serge at 15 per cent., which seemed a great anomaly. He thought cornsacks and woolpacks might be allowed in at 5 per cent. They were not likely to be made in the colony. They could be imported almost as cheap as they could import the material.

Mr. ISAMBERT said he thought the Government should have power to decide to which class the various articles belonged, because disputes were sure to arise, and importers would fight tooth and nail to get the advantage of the Custom-house.

Mr. HAMILTON said that as the articles mentioned by the hon. member for Townsville would be made up in the colony, he hoped the Colonial Treasurer would see his way to include them in that list.

Mr. GOLDRING said a little consideration should be shown to the squatters as far as their woolpacks were concerned. They had had to contend against great difficulties during the last few years, and wool was not particularly high now. He did not see why woolpacks should carry a higher duty than they did before. He did not believe the packs could be made up in the colony at anything like the price they could be imported for, and they should, therefore, be excluded from the 5 per cent. list.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the arguments for increasing the list would be interminable. He could only say that he had gone through a mass of correspondence that would have frightened any man, and had picked out the reasonable things to put into the 5 per cent. list. The things mentioned by the hon. member for Townsville he did not think ought to be included in it. When they increased the duty on bagging, it was only fair to say that the material should come in at a much lower rate. He did not know whether woolpacks would be manufactured in the colony, but the bags used by farmers would, no doubt, be made by the women and children about the place. It was with that object that he placed the raw material on the 5 per cent. list, while the bags paid 15 per cent.

Mr. MURPHY said that as a squatter he was in favour of the proposition of the Treasurer. The hon. gentleman had made very fair concessions to them in allowing the bagging out of which their woolpacks were made to come in at 5 per cent., instead of 15 per cent. which the manufactured article had to pay. As a protectionist, that was quite on the lines of the policy he was

in favour of. It would give employment to persons in the colony to make up the packs. He did not think there was any squatter who would not support the proposition.

Mr. BARLOW said he would call the Treasurer's attention to what was at present a trifling item—only £31 11s. 6d. having been collected upon it last year—but which would in all probability in time assume very large proportions. He referred to dye-stuffs, and would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he should put it in the 5 per cent. list.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had no objection to put dye-stuffs in the 5 per cent. list.

Mr. GOLDRING said the hon. member for Barcoo spoke from a protectionist point of view, while he (Mr. Goldring) spoke as a freetrader; and he did not think that the duty of 5 per cent. would induce squatters to get their woolpacks made in the colony. They could not be made for the same price that they could be imported.

Mr. DALRYMPLE said he was of opinion that woolpacks, sugar bags, and flour bags should be introduced into the colony free. There seemed to be a disposition in the Committee to build up industries in Brisbane, Toowoomba, and a few other places at the expense of the consumers in the North and West. But the producing interests of the colony were deserving of encouragement, because it was upon them that the colony had mainly to depend, and the cheaper the producers could get their corn sacks, or woolpacks, or sugar bags, the better it would be for them, and ultimately for the colony as a whole. Hon. members seemed to be following the lines of the late Government when they brought steel sleepers for the Normanton railway past Normanton and all the way to Brisbane in order to give employment to the mechanics of the South, and without the slightest consideration to the people who wanted to use that railway, and to the fact that they were increasing its cost hundreds of pounds per mile. It was levying blackmail on the North for the benefit of the South; that was about the mildest term he could apply to it. Such articles ought to be brought in without charging the people who used them something extra for the benefit of the South.

Mr. UNMACK said there was one article to which he wished to direct the attention of the Colonial Treasurer, which he appeared to have inadvertently omitted—that was canvas, which was largely used in making sails, tarpaulins, and tents, and that was a large industry. He thought it should be in the 5 per cent. list.

The COLONIAL TREASURER asked where they were going to get the jute from?

Mr. UNMACK said that it was in the 15 per cent. list at present, and, as they were admitting bagging and woolpacks, canvas should also be included.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had considered the question, and he did not think it ought to be charged only 5 per cent.

Question—That the paragraph proposed to be inserted, stand part of the tariff—put and passed.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Adjourn!

The COLONIAL TREASURER asked why they should adjourn when they had arranged to get through the tariff to-morrow. There was plenty left for to-morrow, as they had the whole of the free list to discuss, and it was quite understood that they should go on. He would move—

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

Machinery and boilers being fixed on board and used in propelling any vessel into Queensland, such vessel to be used for trading, or carrying passengers within the

limits of any port in Queensland now or as may hereafter be defined by section 108 of the Navigation Act of 1876, shall be deemed to be goods imported into Queensland and shall be liable to duty—for every £100 of the value thereof, £15.

The HON. A. RUTLEDGE said it was a fair thing to adjourn. Machinery was the only item remaining upon which there was likely to be any discussion, and they would have all to-morrow to finish. Many of them had not taken up time by talking, and he thought it was a good evidence of their *bona fides* when they said they were anxious to let the tariff debate close to-morrow. He did not think there would be much bickering about the articles on the free list. There was no objection from his side of the Committee, so far as he knew, to the articles on that list, and if the Colonial Treasurer would allow machinery to remain till to-morrow when they would all be fresh, it would be only right.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he was quite sure the hon. member, if he considered the matter, would see that they had not done much work. That was the third week of the debate on the tariff, and he was quite prepared to go on with it, and hon. members generally were too. He had had nothing to complain of in the Opposition, and he had not the slightest intention of blaming them. Let them go on for some time longer that night and dispose of the tariff; and if they could not do it all, let them be able to finish it to-morrow. It had been understood that they were to finish to-morrow. The next item of 15 per cent. *ad valorem* would take a great deal of discussion—as much as anything; and he did not think there was a single hon. member present but wanted to vote on it. He did not think he was asking anything unfair in asking them to go on.

Mr. GROOM said the leader of the Opposition had expected that the Colonial Treasurer would only go as far as “sewing machines,” and then stop. He knew that hon. gentleman wanted to say something on the question of machinery, but he had had to go away.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Why did he not stop?

Mr. GROOM said the leader of the Opposition had certain strong reasons for going, and he was sure the Colonial Treasurer would believe him when he said the leader of the Opposition would not have gone if he had not had good reasons for doing so. Considering that the hon. gentleman had hardly spoken the whole evening, and was very anxious to take part in the debate on that matter, he thought the Colonial Treasurer might consent to adjourn, as there was no intention to obstruct to anything on the free list to-morrow, as they would all go by the run, so that there was really all to-morrow to finish.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he was sure that the leader of the Opposition, if he had had the least desire to stop at sewing machines, would have intimated his desire to him. All along they had arranged matters in the most amicable way, and there would not have been the slightest trouble in doing so again, so that he could not take what the hon. member had said unless he had a message from the leader of the Opposition. His opinion was that the leader of the Opposition would be very glad to rise in the morning and find that they had gone through with the tariff.

Mr. SAYERS said he might tell the Colonial Treasurer that the leader of the Opposition had paired with the hon. member for Mackay under the impression that they would stop at machinery. He believed the leader of the Opposition had asked several hon. members to pair, and the hon. member for Mackay consented to do so.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said surely they had nothing to do with private arrangements that had been made by the leader of the Opposition. He was very sorry that gentleman was not in his place, but with the Colonial Treasurer, he thought he would be very happy to-morrow morning to see that the whole of the tariff had been settled, because from what the hon. gentleman had let fall when talking with him (the Colonial Secretary) he was sick and tired of the debate that had gone on. He certainly had never said in the Committee that he wished the debate to stop there. As for the hon. member for Charters Towers, he had just come off circuit, and had been having a good time in more ways than one, so he ought to be fresh and ready to go on, and as he represented a mining constituency he ought to be quite prepared to go on.

Mr. DALRYMPLE said it devolved upon him to say that if he had agreed to pair with the leader of the Opposition, and then had remained in his place, he should have done something which he thought would have been very dishonourable and improper.

Mr. SAYERS: You only paired on the one subject.

Mr. DALRYMPLE said, as a matter of fact, the leader of the Opposition had asked him to pair with him, and he had suggested that he should pair with the Minister for Lands, or the hon. member for Charters Towers himself, and then he had gone away. He was afterwards asked by the hon. member for Charters Towers, Mr. Sayers, to pair with the leader of the Opposition, and he had agreed that he would pair with him on the timber question. If that were given as a reason why the debate should not continue, he would have the greatest pleasure in leaving the Committee, as there were plenty of others on his side without him.

Mr. SAYERS said that he had stated the hon. member for Mackay had paired with the leader of the Opposition on the timber question only.

Mr. DALRYMPLE said he wished to be perfectly clear on that point. When the leader of the Opposition had asked him to pair with him he had said “No”; but subsequently after the hon. gentleman had left, the hon. member for Charters Towers had asked him to do so on the timber tariff, and he had complied with that request.

Mr. SAYERS: That is correct.

Mr. PHILP said he would like the clause to be better defined. Would it apply to any steamer coming into the colony?

The COLONIAL TREASURER said it only applied to the machinery and boilers of small steamers trading at the different ports, which were described in the Navigation Act.

The HON. A. RUTLEDGE said he did not like to seem pertinacious, but, apart from the leader of the Opposition, there were several members absent who took great interest in the question of machinery, and who would have remained if they had thought that item would have been reached. The Colonial Treasurer had had every assistance from the Opposition in his tariff proposals, and they had all to-morrow to finish. If that night were the last night he would be quite prepared to stay there until 12 o'clock, but as they had another night, he hoped the Treasurer would consent to adjourn.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the hon. member was paying the leader of the Opposition a very poor compliment if he assumed that that gentleman would wish the business of the Committee to be stopped simply because he could not find it convenient to be present.

The Hon. A. RUTLEDGE: There are other members also.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said those other members ought to be present. There were exceptional reasons why they should work harder that week, as they were, to a certain extent, pledged to finish the tariff to-morrow.

Mr. SMYTH said it was all very well for the Colonial Treasurer to say they were pledged to finish the debate to-morrow, but the next item might take a day or two. When the hon. member for Barcoo was sitting on the other side of the Committee they had to listen to him stonewalling for a whole night, and they would profit by his example. He was determined that the matter should not be rushed through to please anybody, and he would sit up night after night until he ained his end, so the Colonial Treasurer need not expect to finish to-morrow.

Mr. MURPHY said he could assure the hon. member that the hon. member for Barcoo was quite as fit as ever to sit up night after night, and he was satisfied he would have as good a cause then as he ever had had.

The Hon. A. RUTLEDGE said they had had a very good understanding up to the present; but if the hon. Treasurer wished to push the discussion upon the question to a division, then that good feeling would be greatly disturbed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he could assure the hon. member that he was quite wrong. As he (the Colonial Treasurer) had intimated last night, he knew there were some recalcitrant members on either side of the Committee who would not acquiesce in the arrangement that they should finish to-morrow. They seemed to have aroused the ire of the hon. member for Gympie; but that hon. member had made exactly the same speech to him yesterday that he had just delivered, and he said it in the presence of several other hon. members also. Knowing that some hon. members were prepared to stonewall the subject of machinery, the sooner that stonewalling was finished the better.

Mr. DRAKE said he thought the Opposition had convinced the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government that they were as anxious as the Government were to get through the tariff, and he also thought that they would adhere to the compact to get through the business to-morrow night. If there was a chance of a long debate to-morrow they would be better employed at present in getting some rest. The Colonial Treasurer ought to be satisfied with the progress that had been made.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he liked to hear the hon. member pleading for rest. Ministers had to attend to their departments all day, and then sit and listen to long debates at night. He did not see why, because the hon. member wished to sneak away from work, he should ask the Government to do so as well. They were determined to go on with the work.

Mr. PHILP said he had no intention of stonewalling, but he would be glad to have one or two hours' debate upon machinery, and it was too late to start at once. He was quite prepared to conclude the debate to-morrow night.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said they had heard a speech from the hon. member for Enoggera asking them to go peacefully away to their beds, and they had heard a speech from the hon. member for Townsville asking that they should have the matter discussed, but not then; and they had heard a speech from the hon. member for Gympie, who cried "war, war!" and said he would keep them all there, and if nobody else would stonewall, he would. The remarks

made by that hon. member could bear no other construction. They found that the leader of the Opposition was absent, and he had made a distinct promise that the debate, so far as he could influence it, should finish to-morrow night. Hon. members said that that promise would be carried out; but the speech of the hon. member for Gympie did not tend at all in that direction, so that it would be as well if they went on with the matter at once. The remarks which were to be made by the hon. member for Townsville were, no doubt, very well digested, had been well thought over, and, no doubt, would be well delivered, and, no doubt, also, when delivered would be well reported. He had every reason to believe that that hon. member was the champion of those who were opposed to the tax, and that his speech would be taken in that light. It might as well be delivered at once, and there was no reason why a decision should not be arrived at at once, at any rate, no sufficient reason for not doing so had been advanced by any hon. member who had as yet addressed the Committee.

Mr. GROOM said he could assure the Colonial Treasurer that there had been no understanding come to on the Opposition side to stonewall.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Nobody said so. I said the hon. member for Gympie.

Mr. GROOM said the Colonial Secretary seemed to imply that from what had fallen from the hon. member for Gympie there was some sort of understanding on the Opposition side to obstruct.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Certainly not.

Mr. GROOM said he was glad to hear the hon. member say so, because there had been no understanding of the kind. The understanding was to have everything settled in accordance with the promise made by the leader of the Opposition, and he was sure that hon. gentleman would not leave the House to-morrow night until that was carried out. He had already stated that the hon. gentleman went away that evening under the impression that they would not get beyond the item "sewing machines," and other members had gone away under the same belief. He could assure the Colonial Treasurer there was no understanding, implied or otherwise, on the Opposition side, to obstruct, but they were determined to assist the hon. gentleman to get through with the tariff by to-morrow night.

Mr. SMYTH said he did not like to be abused, and he had not used the word "I" when speaking. He did not think himself such an important personage as to take upon himself the responsibility attributed to him by the Colonial Secretary. He did not think they had sufficient information about the machinery tax before them. He was not in the habit of coming to the House with a cut-and-dried speech, as the Colonial Secretary seemed to think. He had to get up and say what he had to say anyhow as he thought it. The Colonial Treasurer said the paragraph applied to machinery and boilers in vessels trading in certain ports; but what was the meaning of a "port"? Did the port of Townsville, for instance, include all within the breakwater? Then there were the Gulf ports, where some small vessels went out to meet steamers in the bay, and some went out side the heads altogether to meet sailing vessels and tow them in. There might not be much discussion on that item, but on the next item there would be a great deal of discussion. The item before them, he understood, applied to machinery upon vessels plying within ports, and

not to all machinery. For fear there should be any misunderstanding, he would like the Chairman to say to what the question referred.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is, that the paragraph commencing with the word machinery should stand part of the tariff.

Mr. HUNTER said that what they wanted to know was whether mining machinery came under the paragraph before the Committee.

Mr. SMYTH said he would like the Chairman to say whether the question before the Committee included mining machinery.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the question before the Committee dealt with machinery and boilers being fixed on board and used in propelling any vessels in Queensland, such vessel being used for trading within the limits of any port in the colony; it did not include mining machinery.

Mr. REES R. JONES said he did not like the item, as he could not approve of the limits of some of the ports as defined in the *Government Gazette*. For instance, the port of Rockhampton was defined as between Cape Keppel and Cape Manifold, a distance of ninety miles; and it included the whole of the Fitzroy River and its tributaries up to the town of Rockhampton. There were some very large vessels engaged in trading between the town of Rockhampton and the bay, and he did not think the machinery and boilers of those vessels should be taxed. He suggested that it would be better for the Colonial Treasurer to fix the limit. There was an industry on the Fitzroy River for preserving and refrigerating meat, which, if carried on, would be of great benefit indeed to the whole of the Central district, and especially to the pastoral occupants of that district. According to information supplied to him, those engaged in the industry were importing a steamer containing a large engine and refrigerating machinery, and would, if possible, secure two river hulks similarly fitted there to take the meat from the works down to Keppel Bay. All those things would come under the item proposed by the Premier, and it was a very large item to consider in connection with the establishment of a new industry.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that all machinery of that kind was exempt by the clause which he had quoted before. As to the hon. member's remarks about the limits of the port extending over ninety miles, and that big vessels traded there, he could only tell him that, if the Government were in a position to do it, they would tax the machinery and boilers of all vessels engaged in the Queensland trade. He had to draw the line somewhere, and he found he had to draw it at small steamers trading within the limits of the ports. All those vessels were made in Sydney and sent up here, and the makers of similar vessels in Brisbane and other ports of the colony were kept idle in consequence.

Mr. PHILP said he was not going to dispute that point as the item was a small one, but he might say that if the Colonial Treasurer carried out the principle he had stated no steamer would come here at all. They had tried that in America, and the result was that all the large ocean-going steamers trading with America were British steamers. They found the same thing in Victoria and New South Wales, and there was hardly a sea-going steamer made in the colonies.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved—

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

All goods imported into the colony not hereinbefore enumerated or hereinafter exempted from duty—for every £100 of the value thereof, £15.

Mr. SMYTH said they had done about a fair thing. If the Colonial Treasurer—

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that if the hon. member would allow him he would make a proposition, which he thought would satisfy the Committee. That was a big question, and he did not propose to go on with it that evening. There were, however, some amendments suggested by the hon. member for Toowong which he had examined and considered improvements. Those might very well be disposed of. The hon. member suggested that the duty on certain articles should be fixed, instead of *ad valorem*. The amendments had been circulated among hon. members, and he would therefore now move:—

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

Condensed milk, per lb., 2d.

Chicory, root kiln dried, per lb., 3d.

Bicarbonate of soda, per cwt., 1s.

Paper bags, not printed, per cwt., 5s.

Paper bags, printed, per cwt., 7s. 6d.

Caustic soda, per cwt., 1s. 6d.

Lead, pig, per cwt., 2s.

Lead, piping, per cwt., 2s.

Lead, sheet, per cwt., 2s.

Resin, per cwt., 1s.

Whiting, per ton, 7s. 6d.

Mr. HAMILTON said he thought the duties on caustic soda and bicarbonate of soda were too high. Bicarbonate of soda was largely used in making aerated waters.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: That is just what I want. I want to get at the teetotalers.

Mr. HAMILTON said they were increasing the duty on that article by 25 per cent. Caustic soda was used in the manufacture of soap, and he also considered the duty on that too high.

Mr. GROOM said that if the object of imposing a duty on printed paper bags was to give the work to the tradesmen of the colony. 7s. 6d. per cwt. was not sufficient, as that was not the price of printing the bags. The duty should be at least 10s. per cwt.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the hon. member would find that the whole of the bags would be printed in the colony after the duty of 7s. 6d. per cwt. was imposed.

Mr. ISAMBERT said he would like to add silicate of soda to that list, and make the duty on it 10s. per cwt. It was chiefly used for making cheap soaps, which he thought should be excluded from the market in favour of the more genuine soaps.

Mr. GLASSEY said he would propose a reduction in the duty on condensed milk. He knew of no article outside the actual necessities of life on which a duty would affect the working people more than a duty on condensed milk. Hon. members could sneer and jeer, but it was a fact. There were parts of the country where people could not get fresh milk, and he thought 1d. per lb. was quite sufficient duty. He therefore moved that the word "2d." be omitted with the view of inserting "1d."

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

Mr. ISAMBERT proposed that there be added to the list the words "silicate of soda—per cwt., 10s."

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he hoped the hon. member would not press his amendment, as he really had not the information to contest the matter at present, and the duty on silicate of soda would be doubled by the tariff, as it would be raised to 15 per cent.

Mr. ISAMBERT : The duty I propose is fully 100 per cent.

Mr. UNMACK said he did not think the hon. member need press his amendment, as silicate of soda was used in manufacturing a second-class soap, which was really almost out of the market. He would, however, suggest the addition of two or three other articles to the list, but was quite willing to leave the fixing of the duty on them to the Treasurer. One of those articles was "preserved potatoes" and the other "compressed vegetables," and both were used almost exclusively in the interior. Compressed vegetables, according to the present tariff, would pay an *ad valorem* duty of 15 per cent., which would mean £19 10s. per ton. He thought those vegetables were a necessity, and they were only used in districts where fresh vegetables could not be obtained. He therefore suggested the propriety of putting a moderate fixed duty on those articles, but would leave the amount to the Treasurer.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he did not think those articles should be placed on the fixed duty list. In too many instances the use of compressed vegetables was pure extravagance. He did not know any place in the interior of the country where they could not grow their own vegetables. He had had to complain very much of extravagance in that direction, and had felt it very much in his pocket. It was purely want of proper management on the part of managers of stations in outside districts that they did not grow their own vegetables.

Mr. UNMACK said he was not going to press the matter, but, at the same time, it seemed a very great hardship that such heavy duties should be imposed because certain station managers were bad managers. He did not care so much about the duty on preserved potatoes, but £19 10s. on compressed vegetables was very heavy.

Mr. HAMILTON said in the far North compressed vegetables and condensed milk were most necessary articles of consumption. Milk especially was most difficult to obtain on new diggings, and he recollected one field where several thousand men were congregated, and one goat supplied the milk to the whole place. As to vegetables, the only persons who grew them on the fields were Chinese, and, speaking for himself, he did not care to eat Chinese-grown vegetables, knowing as he did the way in which they were grown.

Mr. PHILP said in the North when diggers went prospecting they invariably took condensed milk, and the proposed duty would fall very heavily upon them.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had never heard of a prospecting digger going about with preserved milk in his swag. As a rule, he did not carry anything but flour, sugar, tea, and salt beef.

Mr. HAMILTON said he had known many diggers suffer scurvy through the want of milk.

Mr. HODGKINSON said the only miners that he knew of who carried condensed milk and vegetables were those who were supplied at the expense of the Government.

Question put and passed.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

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

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at twenty-three minutes past 11 o'clock.