

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 8 OCTOBER 1889

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, 8 October, 1889.

Petition—endowment to divisional boards.—Message from the Governor—Loan Estimates for 1889-90.—Brisbane Sanitary Contracts Committee—final report.—Motion for Adjournment—the sugar question.—Messages from the Legislative Council—Drew Pension Bill—Crown Lands Acts, 1884 to 1886, Amendment Bill—Rockhampton Gas Company Act Amendment Bill—Warwick Gas Company Bill.—Granville and Burnett Bridge's Bill—third reading.—Ann Street Presbyterian Church Bill—third reading.—Motion for Adjournment—publication of Loan Estimates.—Local Government Acts Amendment Bill—committee.—Adjournment.

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

PETITION.

ENDOWMENT TO DIVISIONAL BOARDS.

Mr. ARCHER presented a petition from seventy-four divisional boards praying for the continuance of the present endowment to divisional boards; and moved that it be read.

Question put and passed, and petition read by the Clerk.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR.

LOAN ESTIMATES FOR 1889-90.

The SPEAKER announced that he had received a message from His Excellency the Governor, forwarding to the House the Loan Estimates for 1889-90.

The COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. W. Pattison) moved that the paper be printed, and referred to Committee of Supply.

Question put and passed.

BRISBANE SANITARY CONTRACTS
COMMITTEE.

FINAL REPORT.

Mr. BARLOW presented the final report of the select committee appointed to inquire into and report on the sanitary contracts made with the municipal councils of North and South Brisbane; and moved that the paper be printed.

Question put and passed.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

THE SUGAR QUESTION.

Mr. GANNON said: Mr. Speaker,—I wish to draw the attention of the House and the country to certain reports going through certain newspapers with regard to the vote that was taken in this House the other night, and I shall conclude with a motion for adjournment. The newspaper I am going to specially mention this afternoon is one of which the proprietor is a member of this House. I refer to the *Toowoomba Chronicle*. As you, Sir, know, a vote was taken the other night with regard to a motion on the sugar industry, moved by the hon. member for Herbert, Mr. Cowley. You, Sir, and this House know what that motion meant, and I must say that I was rather astonished to find that this newspaper, the proprietor of which is, as I say, a member of this House, contained a report that the hon. member must have known was an incorrect one. It was inserted, I believe, with the view of injuring certain members of this House.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: They did themselves the injury.

Mr. GANNON: The paper I allude to, Mr. Speaker, is the *Toowoomba Chronicle and Darling Downs General Advertiser* of Saturday, October 5. The paragraph I take exception to is headed "The Black Labour Vote." I will show the country that it was not a black labour vote. Hon. members know very well that it was not a black labour vote, but I suppose there is an object in putting the matter before the country as a black labour vote. No doubt this sort of thing is done by certain members of the House on the Opposition side for a certain reason, but I think it is a great mistake; it is worse than being disingenuous, because it is putting before the country what is absolutely false. There is no question about it. Now I am not going to speak for other members; I am speaking for myself, and will put myself straight with this House and straight with the country. Hon. members seem to be very much inclined to laugh, but I have no doubt they will laugh on the other side of their mouths before I have finished. They, no doubt, think it is very jolly, because, by a little finessing and helped by newspapers which have published what is utterly false, they have carried their point. I am glad to see the hon. member for Toowoomba in his place to hear what I am saying in regard to his newspaper. If not the editor, the hon. member is the proprietor, and therefore knows, to a great extent, whatever may go into his paper, and no doubt a great deal of it is written by himself.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: He sent the telegram.

Mr. GANNON: I have no doubt he did send the telegram. I will read the end of the paragraph:—

"The division clearly shows who are in favour of inundating the colony with black labour, and shows the electors of this colony the members who on the hustings pledged their word against black labour but gave their votes in favour of it."

Then follows the division list. "Noes 25, against black labour." "Ayes 31, in favour of black labour." Amongst the latter names I find the name of M. B. Gannon. Now, in my place here, I say that the heading of this article and the heading of the division are downright deliberate falsehoods.

Mr. MURPHY: The man who wrote them is a liar!

Mr. GANNON: The proprietor of this newspaper knows that, with the exception of the five hon. members who voted for Mr. Cowley's motion, all the rest voted against the amendments and the motion, and proved by their votes that they were dead against black labour, and would have nothing to do with it.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS on the Opposition side: Oh, oh!

Mr. GANNON: Mr. Speaker,—I can assure you, and I have said it before in this House, that when the head of the Government said the Government would have nothing to do with black labour, and would not support the motion, that was quite enough.

Mr. HODGKINSON: What have words got to do with it?

Mr. GANNON: That, in my opinion, proved that they would have nothing to do with black labour. Once more I rise to deny that I am in favour of black labour. I have always been against it. I will never vote for it, and rather than vote for a Ministry who are in favour of black labour I would resign my seat, and get clear once more of this House. I have never yet broken a promise I have made to my constituents, and I shall certainly never do so on a vital question like this. I am sorry to delay the House over this matter, but I think it is perfectly right that such falsehoods having been published by the paper I have referred to and other newspapers, very often influenced by gentlemen who ought to know better, it is time we took up the cudgels and proved that we are not what we are represented to be. I do not think it is necessary for me to delay the House any longer, because there is a lot of work to do. I therefore move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. DRAKE said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. member has moved the adjournment of the House, in order to put himself straight, but I think it will take the hon. gentleman a long time to put himself straight. I understood the hon. gentleman to say this afternoon that he has never broken any promise he has given.

Mr. GANNON: Hear, hear!

Mr. DRAKE: The hon. member may remember about six weeks ago, a division was taken in this House, the question being whether the sugar debate should be adjourned until the following Thursday, or whether it should be adjourned for a month. On that occasion the hon. member for Toombul voted for adjourning it for a month, when it seemed very probable that the matter could never come on again, as it appeared the session was likely to close. Some little remark was made about the hon. member giving such a vote on that occasion, after the speeches he had made on the subject.

Mr. GANNON said: Mr. Speaker,—I rise to a point of order.

Mr. DRAKE: Is this a point of order, Mr. Speaker?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS on the Opposition side: Gag! gag!

Mr. HODGKINSON: The gag again.

Mr. GLASSEY : It is time we knew if this gag is going to continue. If it is, someone will answer for it, and no mistake.

Mr. MURPHY : Oh, keep your hair on !

Mr. DRAKE : The hon. member said on that occasion :—

“What I have said I stand by, and intend to stand by, and when the time comes to vote for the hon. gentleman's amendment, he will find me on his side.”

HONOURABLE MEMBERS on the Opposition side : Hear, hear !

The SPEAKER : I must call the hon. member's attention to the 85th Standing Order. I feel bound to do that, because the hon. member who moved the motion for adjournment just now avoided reading any report of what has taken place in this House. He read the heading of some article in a newspaper, and the division. I was prepared to interrupt the hon. member if he had attempted to read any report from a newspaper on a subject referring to a debate which had taken place during the session. The 86th Standing Order deals with that; but the 85th Standing Order says :—

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

I scarcely think the hon. member is justified in quoting from a debate on a subject which is not now before the House.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said : Mr. Speaker,—I submit that that ruling has never been insisted upon when a reference to a previous debate is necessary to elucidate the subject that is before the House. The hon. member for Toombul having spoken, other hon. members may surely answer him. That is ordinary common sense, and it is impossible to answer him except by referring to the whole matter. He has referred to a particular incident of a debate. Surely it is allowable for other hon. members to correct any errors he may have made by referring to other incidents in the same debate. That is a matter of ordinary fair play, and, if I am not mistaken, it is expressly laid down in the authorities.

Mr. MURPHY said : Mr. Speaker,—Speaking to the point of order, I remember an instance in which I was called to order by the late Speaker, Mr. Groom, when a dispute occurred between myself and the late Hon. Mr. Miles in regard to an interview I had with him in reference to a certain railway. He made a statement which was contradictory to the statement I had made, and I attempted to refer to *Hansard* to prove my statement. I was thereupon interrupted by the hon. the Speaker, who pointed out exactly the same Standing Order that you, Sir, have referred to—that a member may not refer to a debate that has taken place during the same session. If at one time it is ruled that we are not to infringe that Standing Order, I do not see why we should not be consistent and adhere to it at all times.

Mr. ARCHER said : Mr. Speaker,—What fell from the hon. and learned member for North Brisbane is not at all to the point. He says that the rule has not been enforced in the House.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH : I did not say so.

Mr. ARCHER : He said members have been allowed to refer to debates on other occasions.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH : What I said was this : That when one hon. member has referred to one incident of a previous debate, it must surely be according to all rules of fair play to allow other hon. members who desire to answer him to refer to other incidents of the same debate.

Mr. ARCHER : Just so ; and I am pointing out that in this case that does not occur. The rule is that no report of the debate shall be read. If the hon. member for Enoggera had refreshed his memory by looking at *Hansard* before he came into the House, he could have quoted from memory the words he has read to the House.

Mr. DRAKE : I might have misquoted them.

Mr. ARCHER : That does not matter ; the hon. member would then have kept within the rules of the House. I never heard an hon. member called to task for quoting words that had fallen from another hon. member so long as he did not read them from a report of a previous debate. The hon. member for North Brisbane must know that.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH : The rule is against “referring” to a previous debate, not against “quoting” from a report of it.

Mr. ARCHER : It is against quoting from a printed document. The debates that have been referred to have been adjourned from week to week, and month to month ; and I am perfectly certain of this, without referring to the authorities, that there is no such absurd rule as that you may not quote a word from the report of a debate in any way at all. How could you answer a man if that was so.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH : Exactly ! Hear, hear !

Mr. ARCHER : Just so ; but you must make the quotation from memory, and must not get up and read it. I understand that is the rule.

Mr. DRAKE : It is rather unfortunate that these points of order should be continually raised in order to prevent hon. members making remarks strictly upon the subject that is brought before the House. I should not have spoken upon the subject at all if the hon. member for Toombul had not gone out of his way to move the adjournment of the House in order to bring the matter under our notice. He went out of his way to put himself straight.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN : He did not go out of his way to do it.

Mr. DRAKE : Nobody asked him to move the adjournment of the debate. I did not ; and I take it he went out of his way to move the adjournment of the House. The hon. member said he wished to put himself straight, and surely by reminding the hon. gentleman that on a former occasion recently he stated that when the amendment of the leader of the Opposition came to the vote he would be on that hon. gentleman's side, I was giving the hon. member an opportunity of putting himself straight in respect of that occasion. I believe there are other instances in which the hon. member has informed the House from time to time that he would vote in a certain way, and when the division bell rang, he found that somehow or other he had got on the wrong side ; and he occasionally requires to explain how that came about. Though I may have been technically wrong in quoting the exact words from *Hansard*, I submit it is very much more satisfactory that an hon. member should quote the exact words he wishes to bring before the attention of the House, rather than trust to memory, when by doing so he might not be quite accurate in his quotation.

The SPEAKER : I do not know whether the hon. member is speaking upon the point of order, or continuing his speech on the motion for the adjournment.

Mr. DRAKE : I am continuing my speech.

The SPEAKER : I may say that I felt bound to call the attention of the hon. member and the House to the rule, because, after what followed

the other night, I thought it desirable that the Standing Orders should be followed as closely as possible; and I therefore called the attention of the House to the Standing Order bearing upon this point.

Mr. DRAKE: Of course, Mr. Speaker, I accept your ruling. But leaving that subject now, I wish to refer to another matter as the adjournment of the House has been moved, and that is a matter which came under the notice of the House on last Friday night, with regard to certain circumstances that transpired on Thursday. About the tea hour on that occasion you will remember that there was considerable difference of opinion as to whether the hon. member for Bundanba had a right to speak or not—whether he had forfeited his right to speak or not in addressing you after the question was put and the voices taken. I refer you to the evidence of a witness that may be taken to be impartial, and that is a newspaper called the *Capricornian*, which is published in Rockhampton, and which is strongly inclined to the other side in politics. That newspaper publishes a report—

Mr. MURPHY: From the *Courier* office.

Mr. DRAKE: I do not know from what office it got it, but I know the paper is dated Saturday, October 5th, and it could not have been published later than Friday; and the telegram I am going to refer to as appearing in it might have reached that paper shortly after the circumstances which took place in this House on Thursday afternoon, but it certainly reached it long before what occurred on Friday night took place, and before any gentleman on the Government side of the House or anywhere else thought fit to question the decision of the Speaker that the hon. member for Bundanba had a right to speak. You, Sir, decided that that hon. member had the right to speak, and the matter which I am about to quote from the *Capricornian* must have been published before it occurred to anyone to question your ruling. I beg now to call your attention to the view taken by the *Capricornian*, which represents the politics of the other side of the House:—

“Mr. Cowley’s speech on the sugar question lasted until five minutes to 6, after which Mr. Powers made a personal explanation. A division was then taken on Sir S. W. Griffith’s amendment, and the votes were not counted until ten minutes past 6. Mr. Glassey then rose to address the House, but the Government supporters cried, ‘Divide, divide!’ The Oppositionists objected to a division on the original motion, urging Mr. Glassey to continue, and stating the debate could be continued after tea. The Premier then said the Government business (Supply) would take precedence after tea. Mr. Glassey continued his remarks, and the chairman adjourned until 7 o’clock.”

That is a statement of the case by a gentleman representing a paper holding the views represented by gentlemen on the other side, and he may be considered an important witness, if not opposed to the hon. member for Bundanba.

Mr. O’SULLIVAN said: Mr. Speaker,—Referring to this matter, I will get rid of it in a very few sentences. I have not a single doubt in my mind that your decision was right. I assert that your decision was right. I do not care to go over the circumstances in connection with that night’s debate. All I know is that I walked out of the House and put on my hat and went home. I did not like it. Now, with regard to this black labour vote. It appears from the report that was sent by someone here to the *Queensland Times*, in Ipswich, I am bound to be a black labour supporter, after about thirty years’ trying to get black labour out of the colony. Well, that sort of game won’t wash. I am not the slightest bit

afraid of that sort of electioneering dodge. All I have to say is that I was not sent into the House to vote for amendments proposed by Sir Samuel Griffith. I am not on his side of the House. I can tell that hon. gentleman that when the time comes that I shall sit on his side, and it is within the bounds of possibility that I may do so if I live long enough, I shall be as loyal a supporter of his as I have ever been of the party with whom I am now connected. I am not going to change my ideas to meet the views of the leader of either side of the House. I can claim to have some ideas of my own, and I shall not be a slavish follower of either Ministry or Opposition. A motion came before this House, moved by the hon. member for Herbert, and was ably and exhaustively debated by the whole House, but particularly by the hon. member for Herbert himself. I think it cannot be denied that the hon. gentleman handled his motion as ably as any motion has ever been handled in this House. He gained what little sympathy I could give him for his ability; but no amount of sympathy would ever induce me to become a supporter of black labour. I acknowledge that I am willing to do anything that would induce the sugar growers in this colony to go on, otherwise than by giving them black labour. Two amendments were proposed upon the resolution. I understood thoroughly that, as a party, we were bound to vote against black labour; but, by a political dodge, the leader of the Opposition introduced an amendment, by which it would appear that if we opposed it we should pose as the supporters of black labour. Now, I say that this side of the House intended not only to oppose both amendments, but to oppose the original motion also, and yet I am the next morning put by an hon. member of this House into a newspaper, in the district in which I live, as a supporter of black labour. I say that whatever ruffian wrote that article he is not game to put his name to it. If he had, I should kick him.

Mr. HAMILTON said: Mr. Speaker,—I really do not see what it matters to us what the opinion of the telegraphic correspondent of the *Capricornian* is in the matter. We have our own opinions in this House, and I suppose we are just as capable of judging as that correspondent is. We all know what the arrangement was that night. The members on this side of the House voted against the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, but we also intended to vote against the motion of the hon. member for Herbert as well. The reason we voted against the amendment of the leader of the Opposition was because he moved it directly after the leader of the Government had distinctly stated that the Government had not the slightest intention of extending the operations of the Pacific Islanders Act, and we regarded the action of the leader of the Opposition as an insult to the Government. It was our intention to vote against the motion of the hon. member for Herbert, but we knew that if the hon. member for Bundanba were allowed to speak after tea, it was the intention of the Opposition to talk the motion out that night and prevent it going to a division. Members on the other side were overheard by an hon. member on this side making arrangements to that effect. Their idea was to convey a wrong impression to the country—to convey the impression that we intended to vote for the original motion—and that therefore we were supporters of black labour. It was a political dodge, but we did record our votes in spite of that dodge, and showed the country that although we opposed the amendment of the leader of the Opposition we were just as strongly opposed to the motion of the hon. member for Herbert, and that we are as strongly opposed to black labour as the leader of

the Opposition is. I recollect the time when the hon. member for Stanley introduced a motion to impose a poll-tax upon kanakas, and the leader of the Opposition, who was in opposition at the time, supported the hon. member for Stanley. When the hon. gentleman came into power I introduced a motion in exactly the same words, and then when the hon. gentleman had a majority to support him in carrying it, he opposed the motion. Had the leader of the Opposition supported me on that occasion the matter would not have been deferred for several years, as it has been, and black labour would now be a thing of the past.

Mr. HUNTER said: Mr. Speaker,—I rise to express my surprise at the hon. member for Toombul rising to move the adjournment of the House to put himself straight with the House, or with his constituents. Surely when the hon. member talks of putting himself straight, it is an admission that he must have gone crooked. There is something peculiar about the matter. I wish to refer to these points of order which have been raised. When the hon. member for Mackay, Mr. Dalrymple, who is one of the strongest advocates of black labour in the House, sat down without finishing his speech on the sugar question, the hon. member for Oxley, who had risen immediately, gave way to the hon. gentleman again, and the whole of the Opposition supported him in doing so, and the hon. member for Mackay was allowed to go on. Then, again, the Minister for Lands forfeited his right to speak upon the question by making a small speech in moving the adjournment of the debate, but we unanimously, on this side, said, "Let the hon. member speak; we are all in favour of freedom of speech." These facts cannot be got over. Then, again, the hon. member for Burrum kept us here till 12 o'clock—far beyond the ordinary hour at which we usually adjourn, to listen to the eloquent speech which he delivered on this subject, and not a soul in the House called for an adjournment. We find three Ministers speaking on this subject. The hon. member for Burrum strongly supported black labour, the Minister for Lands spoke strongly in favour of black labour, and the Minister for Mines and Works spoke strongly in favour of Italian labour, which is far worse than black labour. Yet the hon. member for Toombul says that he would not support any Government in any way in favour of black labour; and because a certain statement is made in a newspaper to the effect that he was in favour of black labour, he gets up now and moves the adjournment of the House to set himself straight. With the exception of the Minister for Railways, the whole of the Ministers have spoken in favour of black or Italian labour—which is worse.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS on the Government side: No!

Mr. HUNTER: On every occasion when hon. members opposite have been called to order, we have said, "No, give them fair play," and we expect the same from our enemies. It is strange that all these points of order have been raised during the debate on the coloured labour question—a thing which should not be stifled. Several Standing Orders have not been observed in this House. How is it that you, Sir, do not call attention to the practice of hon. members in reading newspapers in the House? That is a breach of a Standing Order, and if that rule is not carried out, why is it allowed to remain in force? I beg to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that hon. members in this House are now reading newspapers.

Mr. SALKELD said: Mr. Speaker,—I have no objection to those hon. gentlemen who have spoken putting themselves straight with the House and with the country; but I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Toombul pride himself upon sticking to every pledge he has made. I remember on one occasion the hon. member said he would vote for the retention of the beer duty. That was on the 2nd of October. On the 12th October, ten days afterwards, when the vote was taken, the hon. member, though his name is given as having been present in the House, was absent from the division. What is the use of his coming here and priding himself on keeping his promises? What is the good of his trying to make the people outside believe that if he gave a wrong vote he gave it thinking he was right—that if he voted against the imposition of a safeguard against coloured labour he was still opposed to coloured labour? Why did any hon. member vote against the proposed safeguard if he is really opposed to coloured labour? It has been tried to be made out that the debate on the sugar question was exhausted, and that hon. members on this side had plenty of opportunity for speaking, but refrained from doing so, and that for that reason the gag was applied. But I would point out that, as soon as the amendment of the leader of the Opposition was negatived, the question assumed a different position altogether. Many hon. members on this side would no doubt have voted for the motion of the hon. member for Herbert with that safeguard. We who are opposed to coloured labour, and who are determined that Queensland shall not be turned into a hybrid country, are always told by our opponents that we are opposed to the sugar industry. But in order to do anything for the sugar industry it is necessary to impose safeguards against coloured labour. Hon. members on this side are quite willing, and desirous, and anxious to do anything in reason to encourage the sugar industry, or any other industry, but they draw the line at coloured labour. When that safeguard was negatived by a solid party vote, it became necessary that something more should be done, and the hon. member for Bundamba was quite right in getting up to speak. He had an amendment to move, and some views to give expression to, and several other hon. members on this side wanted to speak on the question. If the motion had been passed with the safeguard contained in the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, the country would have been satisfied, and hon. members on this side, if they had not been inclined to vote for it, would not have opposed it. When things came to this pass, the Minister for Mines and Works wanted to put the whole Government party right.

The Hon. P. PERKINS: Who are the Government party?

Mr. SALKELD: I suppose all the hon. members who sit on that side are the Government party.

The Hon. P. PERKINS: No.

Mr. SALKELD: Then if the hon. member does not belong to the Government party he had better take the chair at the end of the table, where there is just room for one. The action of the Minister for Mines and Works was intended to mislead public opinion in regard to that vote. There is no doubt about that. The Minister for Mines and Works took that point, and it was a wrong point in every way. It was affirming what was not true, and it has damaged the Government and everyone who voted for it. They may try to whitewash themselves as much as they like, but it will be useless. Public opinion will remove the whitewash as fast as they put it on, and the black colour will remain,

The best thing they can do is, instead of trying to put themselves right with the House, to say nothing at all about it.

Mr. MURPHY said: Mr. Speaker,—As far as I am concerned, I have no personal feeling on this matter at all, because I approved of Sir S. W. Griffith's amendment—

Mr. HUNTER said: Mr. Speaker,—I rise to a point of order. Certain hon. members are reading newspapers in the House. This is the second time I have called your attention to it.

The SPEAKER: It is contrary to the Standing Orders to read newspapers in the House.

Mr. MURPHY: As I was saying, I have no personal feeling in this matter, because I thoroughly approved of Sir S. W. Griffith's amendment; and therefore—

Mr. HUNTER said: Mr. Speaker,—I again rise to a point of order, as the Minister for Mines and Works continues reading a newspaper, and should like your ruling on the point. That hon. gentleman raised a similar point with regard to me on one occasion, and I think that what is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander.

The SPEAKER: According to the Standing Orders of the House, any member who reads a newspaper when the House is sitting is out of order. That is the strict rule, but up to the present time it has never been enforced. If the House wishes the rule to be enforced it would help the Speaker by giving him some definite expression of opinion on the subject. It is impossible for any Speaker to enforce a rule which the House persistently disregards.

Mr. HUNTER: Was there any special instruction given with regard to the points of order raised during the debate the other evening?

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS (Hon. J. M. Macrossan) said: Mr. Speaker,—If the junior member for Burke had only kept his temper properly he would have seen that I am reading a private letter, and not a newspaper at all.

Mr. MURPHY: As I was saying, when the hon. member for Burke interposed with his point of order, I have no personal interest in this squabble between the two sides of the House, as to whether they voted for or against black labour, because I thoroughly approved of Sir S. W. Griffith's amendment, as I said when speaking on the question. But not wishing to give a vote that would be an imputation practically upon the Government, I walked out of the House and did not vote on the hon. gentleman's amendment at all. Therefore, I think I can speak on the subject dispassionately. I think that if hon. members of this House sent such telegrams as I have seen in the newspapers, those at Toowoomba and Ipswich more especially, those hon. members would have been guilty of conduct unbecoming a member of this House, as they have wired deliberate and actual falsehoods to those papers. The proprietors of newspapers in this House who allowed their papers to publish such reports, knew that they were lending themselves to a deliberate lie, Mr. Speaker. There can be no question about that. There is not one hon. member on the other side of the House who does not know that the hon. member for Stanley is against black labour. There is not a member on that side, and there is not a man in my constituency, I am happy to say, who does not know that I am against black labour.

Mr. HUNTER: That is no excuse for voting for it.

Mr. MURPHY: There is not an hon. member on that side of the House who does not know that hon. members on this side in voting against the amendment of the hon. the leader of the Opposition were not voting for black labour. They know that perfectly well; and I say, Sir, that this has been the most mean, contemptible way ever tried by one party to put another party in a false position. I have never before seen anything of the kind in my political life.

Mr. HUNTER: What about the gag?

Mr. MURPHY: I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that I shall never see such an attempt made again by any party whilst I have the honour of a seat in this House. There is no use hon. members opposite trying to mislead the country on this question. They, no doubt, think that the party on this side is about to terminate, that it has nearly reached the end of its tether.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS on the Opposition side. Hear, hear! So it has.

Mr. MURPHY: I can assure those hon. members that they make a very great mistake. This party will live long enough to show that these newspaper reports are lies, and that the men who sent them are liars. It will live long enough to refute those lies, and to prove that the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury seats will have nothing to do with black labour.

The HON. P. PERKINS: How long is it since you left the other side?

Mr. MURPHY: I cannot hear what the hon. member says, nor do I very much care. I only repeat that this party will exist long enough to prove to the country that what I have branded as lies are lies, and that the men I have described as liars are liars—that my words are perfectly correct.

Mr. LUYA said: Mr. Speaker,—Hon. members on the other side seem to be very much put out because I am going to say a word or two. I am not going to defend anything I have done; not at all. They need not labour under that mistake. I took good care to explain the way I voted.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Oh! yes.

Mr. LUYA: I would not trust hon. members opposite the snap of my fingers. If they had their way kanaka labour would be effectually stopped, and we should be inundated with cheap European labour—cheap Italians. We have not forgotten that, and I hope we shall not forget the cheap labour Immigration Act of 1884 introduced by the hon. the leader of the Opposition. That is why I voted against the hon. gentleman's amendment.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: Oh! no.

Mr. LUYA: I say yes; and the hon. gentleman will know it yet. He will not live many years before he will rue what he has been doing during the last few weeks. The hon. members on the other side who circulated those infamous lies all over the country know that I am opposed to black labour. They, at all events, heard my reasons for the vote I gave, and they know it is impossible that I could be a living lie such as they attempt to make out. My constituents know it is an impossibility that I could do such a thing; and hon. members opposite know it very well also. I wish those hon. members could carry into their political life a little bit of common decent honesty. I must confess that I feel rather ashamed of them.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: We are very glad of it.

Mr. LUYA : Whatever good opinion of them I had is gone. We all know the disreputable manner in which they tried to handle this question. We have not forgotten it, and I hope we shall not. We should always look upon their manoeuvres with a great amount of suspicion. I always try to look beneath the surface to see what they mean, but it is very hard to get to the bottom of some of the wild ideas they have in their heads. They have talked about the hon. member for Toombul, one of the straightest and most honest men in the House, speaking one way and voting another. If there was any hon. member on the opposite side of the House as straight as the hon. member for Toombul, he would be a very happy man. At all events, there is no more honourable or straight-going man in this House than that hon. gentleman ; no member's word would be taken before his.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER : No one doubts it.

Mr. LUYA : They tried to throw a slur on it in the usual manner in which they try to gloss over those things. They cannot go honestly and straightforwardly to work. Once they get into this kind of slanging politics all honour seems to leave them. I have had my say, at all events, and I am speaking conscientiously, as I have always done, whether in this House or out of it. I say the hon. gentlemen who voted against the amendment of the hon. the leader of the Opposition are more opposed to black labour than he is himself.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS of the Opposition : Oh, oh !

Mr. LUYA : I say they are not only more opposed to black labour than he is himself, but they are more opposed to what is ten times worse than black labour, that is the cheap European labour which he tried to force upon the country. If I had to choose between the two, I should not hesitate to say that I would take kanaka labour rather than the other.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS of the Opposition : Hear, hear !

Mr. LUYA : I know what cheap European labour would do for the hon. gentleman. Those people would become qualified to vote the same as other citizens, and would be useful at elections. That is a kind of labour I shall most distinctly vote against. Those are my reasons for voting against the hon. gentleman's amendment. Holding the views I do, it would be incompatible on my part to do otherwise than I did. After listening to the speeches of the hon. member for Herbert, Mr. Cowley, and the hon. member for Mackay, Mr. Dalrymple, in which they stated that the only remedy for the existing state of affairs was the introduction of kanaka labour, I could not vote for the motion of the hon. member for Herbert, as some hon. members opposite said they would. I leave those hon. members to speak for themselves.

Mr. SMYTH said : Mr. Speaker,—This black labour question has not originated on this side of the House. It originated from a supporter of the Government, who represents a black labour constituency. If it had not been for the motion of the hon. member for Herbert, we should have heard nothing about the black labour question this session ; and by introducing it he has led hon. members opposite into a trap. Of course they had to do what they were told.

Mr. HAMILTON : They were told nothing.

Mr. SMYTH : Hon. members opposite during the elections said they would not vote for black labour ; and some of them said that they would vote for the amendment of the hon. the leader

of the Opposition. The black labour question was a question the Government determined to make a stand on, and those hon. members could not give an unbiased independent vote. Let those hon. members go to their constituents during the recess, and see what they think of their action. I should prefer kanaka labour to the cheap Italians whom it has been suggested should be introduced. Would not these Italians be put on the electoral rolls, and be at the service of a certain party in this colony ? I believe they would. They would bear the ear-mark that has been referred to on previous occasions, and be made tools of by a certain party. There is one matter to which I wish to draw attention. I have been a few years in the House, and I have made inquiries from various persons, but I have never seen or heard of such a thing being done as was done the other evening when the leader of the House went against your ruling, Sir, and moved that it be dissented from. If that party in the House does not agree with your ruling it is time that you tendered your resignation. You gave your ruling fair and square, and decided that the hon. member for Bundanba, Mr. Glassey, had a right to speak. *Hansard* is a truthful production, and it reported that that was your decision, and the point of order which was raised the next day was an afterthought. The gag was then put on. I do not think that in the annals of Australian Parliaments anything has been done like that which the leader of the Government did in dissenting from the Speaker's ruling, and I think that any gentleman holding the position you do should send in his resignation and let them get someone else whom they can gag.

Mr. BARLOW said : Mr. Speaker,—I was very much startled with a remark that fell from the hon. member for Cook, to the effect that we ought to have known which way the Government was going to vote on the motion of the hon. member for Herbert, Mr. Cowley. I think that of all the conundrums ever propounded to reasonable men, that of how the Government were going to vote on that question was one of the most difficult. The Ministry includes the hon. member for Mackay, who is entirely wrapped up with coloured labour, and it includes the latest accession to the Government, who is also an advocate of black labour. I am precluded by the Standing Orders from quoting from *Hansard*, but speaking from memory I can say that the hon. member for Burrum, in the concluding part of his speech, stated that if he has a mission, it is to set the public right on the subject. That is the opinion of the latest accession to the Ministry. Both the hon. gentlemen to whom I have alluded are supporters of black labour, and yet the conundrum proposed to us was that we should have known which way the Government were going to vote. This motion was not a Government measure, but was introduced by the hon. member for Herbert. It has been constantly tried to be proved that the reason why some members have been making buckets of whitewash this afternoon, and why they voted against the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, was that they were afraid of insulting the Government who had declared their pledges against black labour. The Government incidentally stated that they were opposed to black labour, but there is a very remarkable document which was once quoted by Mr. James R. Dickson, and bearing the signature of Mr. J. M. Macrossan. I grant that this is very ancient history, and it is perhaps hardly fair to quote it, but still it is a matter bearing on the question. I do not see how it was possible then for any member on this side of the House to know how the Government were going to vote on the question. I should have thought—of course this is merely

my individual opinion on the subject—that if the Government really wanted to knock the black labour question on the head they would have voted for the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, and then have conciliated or pleased their Northern supporters representing sugar districts by voting for the amended motion. That, it seems to me would have been the straightforward course for them to have taken. I can sympathise with the hon. member for Herbert, Mr. Cowley, and the hon. member for Mackay, Mr. Dalrymple, that after the exertions they put forward in this matter they should have met with so poor a return of gratitude. I thought at the time I stood behind the bar and saw the hon. member for Herbert supported by the member for Mackay, Mr. Dalrymple, and the members for Bundaberg and Burnett sitting alone during the division, that they received a very poor return for their exertions, and the faithful support they have given the Government. It has been stated that lies have been disseminated with regard to this matter. I am not aware that any lies have been disseminated, but I know that a deliberate attempt was made to burke discussion, and to gag members on this side of this House. Those things which have been stated to be lies are absolute facts. A piece of gratuitous impudence was perpetrated in this House by the Government in their attempt to gag members on this side of the House, and prevent them expressing their opinions on the main question at issue. I had addressed the House at some length, but I had only dealt with the question of black labour. There are many other ways of encouraging the sugar industry besides granting the planters black labour, and we had not an opportunity of debating those methods. We were absolutely shut out from debating this question, by what I do not hesitate to say was a deliberate insult to yourself, Sir. Although I did not take a part in putting you in the chair, still during the time you have been there I have endeavoured to show you that deference and respect which are due to your official position. I have never uttered one word of disrespect to you, but have always bowed to your ruling, and treated you as the Speaker of this House should be treated. But the very first opportunity, when it will serve a party purpose, those who put you in the chair have dissented from your ruling. I would just remind three hon. members—the member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. Watson, the member for South Brisbane, Mr. Luya, and the member for Toombul—that on the 30th of August the question of an adjournment of the debate on the sugar question arose. We were anxious to go to a division on the question; but the hon. members to whom I have referred deliberately voted for the postponement of the debate to a day when it was almost morally impossible for a vote to be taken. I wonder what the country would think of us if, because we are in a comparatively small minority, we should submit to these things without resenting them. For my part, I recognise with pleasure the good work that is done by the Press, and I do not feel hurt if the Press says wrong things of me. It can speak of me as it likes. I am not judged by the Press, but by my constituents. We had a washing day here the other day, when the senior member for North Brisbane, Hon. Sir T. McLlwraith, had a little bit of dirty linen washing with his late colleagues. Now, it appears that other hon. members want to set themselves right with the country. The place to set themselves right is not in this House, but on the hustings and at the ballot-box; and I think they will find a great deal of difficulty in doing that.

Mr. HAMILTON: Look after your own constituency.

Mr. BARLOW: I will look after the hon. member's too. The hon. member the other night said something about the Ipswich debating society. I can tell him there is a Cooktown debating society, and it is highly probable that he will have to reckon with that society. I know perhaps more about the hon. member's constituency than about any Northern constituency, and have received more gratuitous insults from that hon. member than from any other member.

Mr. HAMILTON: You deserved them all.

Mr. BARLOW: I have never been so treated by any hon. member as by the hon. member for Cook, and I should advise him to keep himself quiet.

Mr. HAMILTON: You deserved it all.

Mr. BARLOW: That is the opinion of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HAMILTON: And of others.

Mr. BARLOW: Now, Mr. Speaker, misrepresentations have been circulated with respect to the mission of Mr. Pietzcker to Germany. The leader of the Opposition has been charged with sending Mr. Pietzcker to enslave Germans, but I contend that he sent that gentleman home to prevent them being enslaved by the planters. The planters wanted to make bargains with these people which were not compatible with the state of affairs in this country—with the rate of wages, the class of accommodation, the food and other things, and that was prevented. With regard to cheap labour, I deprecate it in any shape.

Mr. LISSNER: Pietzcker could not get the Germans out, at any rate.

Mr. BARLOW: I repeat it again, that Mr. Pietzcker was sent home to prevent the sugar planters from enslaving the Germans, and documentary evidence exists in the "Votes and Proceedings" to show that hon. members have persistently tried to humbug the public on this question, and make it out that Sir S. W. Griffith sent Mr. Pietzcker to bring out cheap labour. He did nothing of the sort. The only fault I found with the leader of the Opposition, and I said so at the time, although I had not the—I will not say honour of a seat in this House, as it is at present constituted, at that time—the only fault I found with him was that he mixed himself up with the question at all. He should have said to the sugar planters, "It is your business to find labour for yourselves, and you may get what you think fit, but you shall not have black labour"; but the leader of the Opposition, with that sense of justice and fair play which he has always shown, and with a desire to do good for the country which he was appointed to govern, went out of his way to serve the sugar planters.

Mr. GANNON: To get cheap labour.

Mr. BARLOW: And, as he always does when he goes out of his way to serve that class, he got abuse, misrepresentation, and vilification. Much of the great delusion which at the late general elections returned the present party to power—a party which has already shown signs of disintegration—I say the advent of that party to power was mainly due to two questions—cheap Germans and the "Hopeful" case—much of that delusion is being swept away. On both those questions the most foul, wretched hireling scribes—men who have no right to live—were employed. Those scoundrels have since been rewarded with public pay and place. Those rascals disseminated every sort of foul literature against my hon. friend, and endeavoured to blacken his character. I keep in my political album a copy of "Facts to Know" in a prominent place, and whenever

I want to refresh my memory about them, I know where to go. I will reserve them for the next general election.

Mr. MURPHY: What did you do with "Facts to Know"?

Mr. BARLOW: I trampled "Facts to Know" under my feet on the platform of the School of Arts at Ipswich. Now, it has been charged indirectly that hon. members have sent messages and telegrams from this House. I can only say, on my part, that I have never but once sent a telegram from this House on a political subject.

Mr. MURPHY: I did not charge you.

Mr. BARLOW: I know that, but I must set myself right. It has been said that hon. members have sent lying telegrams to the papers. I never but once sent a political telegram from this House, and that was some considerable time ago; but I have never sent one telegram away from this House during this present crisis.

The Hon. P. PERKINS: What crisis?

Mr. BARLOW: If I had done so I should have had a perfect right to do so. Every member of this House has a perfect right to send any telegram he likes, so long as he pays for it. As to the courtesy of journalism I do not suppose it is all on one side. Newspapers are supposed to be commercial speculations, and they have to take sides. They have to soften down things for their friends, and paint their enemies as black as they can. That is the principle of every one of them. I never find fault with a newspaper that finds fault with me.

Mr. NORTH: The *Queensland Times*.

Mr. BARLOW: The hon. gentleman says the *Queensland Times*. He also said the other day that he was not responsible for anything written in the *Queensland Times* by the member for Ipswich, or any other blackguard. Now, in the *Queensland Times* of last Saturday there appears a statement by the editor that the hon. members for Ipswich had nothing whatever to do with the report in question, and that they are not the writers of any of the matter which appears in that paper on questions concerning Lockyer or Stanley. The *Brisbane Courier*—and I take this opportunity of correcting the remark in that paper when referring to this pleasing episode which the hon. member for Lockyer compels me to refer to—said that the statements which I quoted on that occasion were quoted from a letter signed "Observer." That is not a fact. They were quoted from a one column report of the proceedings of a meeting held at Laidley, and that report was from a *bonâ fide* correspondent of the *Queensland Times* in that township.

Mr. NORTH: You cannot give his name.

Mr. BARLOW: How do I know his name?

Mr. NORTH: How do you know he is a *bonâ fide* correspondent.

Mr. BARLOW: I have the word of the editor.

The Hon. P. PERKINS: He must be a nice journalist.

Mr. BARLOW: The hon. member for Lockyer must have a very small opinion of me.

Mr. NORTH: Very small.

Mr. BARLOW: Well, not smaller than I have of him; but he must have a small opinion of me if he thinks I would vamp up a fictitious report of a meeting held in his electorate. However, that is enough on that subject. I will not submit, while I sit in this House as a representative of a large and important constituency—I will not submit to be gagged, and if ever there was an instance in which a party by brute force and power of a majority checked and stifled

discussion, and stifled it upon the most flagrant misrepresentation, that occurrence took place the other night.

Mr. CROMBIE said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. member says he will not submit to be gagged while he is in this House, but his leader the other night attempted to gag the whole House. I will tell you how the attempt was made. It was by the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition, and that was meant to gag the whole House for this session, to prevent any discussion on the black labour question. I voted against the amendment for that very reason, as I would not be a party to a gag of that kind. With regard to the vote, I promised my constituents that I would vote against black labour, and I did so when the motion of the hon. member for Herbert was put to a division. About this crisis we hear of; I do not know that any crisis has taken place. I came here to support Sir Thomas McLlwraith, and that hon. gentleman handed over the leadership of the party to the present leader of the Government. I have followed the latter loyally, because Sir Thomas McLlwraith appointed him my leader. I can say that the present leader is loyally supported by all on this side of the House, and it is my intention, at all events, to follow him as far as I can.

The Hon. Sir S. W. GRIFFITH said: Mr. Speaker,—I wish to say a word before the debate closes. I have been very much amused at seeing hon. gentlemen opposite get up one after the other and take their position upon the stool of repentance and endeavour to explain to their constituents—

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: They have nothing at all to explain.

The Hon. Sir S. W. GRIFFITH: Endeavour to explain to their constituents why they voted against their pledges. I may tell those hon. gentlemen, though some of them have been in the House longer than I have, that they will find out that in public life, as in private life, honesty is the best policy. They will find out that it will pay them better—I put it on that low ground—it will pay them better to vote according to their pledges than to vote some other way, and then try to explain it. It will pay them much better. I have been reminded during the past few days of the play of "The Taming of the Shrew." Some hon. members may have forgotten that play. The argument of it is that a certain Petruchio got a wife who was a great shrew, and he was determined to tame her. It appears to me that the Government are in the position of Petruchio, and their party, these liberal-minded anti-black labour men, are in the position of the shrew Katherine, who had married Petruchio. They said, "We have said that we will not vote for black labour, and we will not vote for it." The Government say, "You will not vote for black labour? You shall vote for it;" and then they say, "Very well, if you say so, certainly. If you say we must, we will." Several of them solemnly pledged themselves to vote for the amendment I moved on the motion of the hon. member for Herbert; they promised their constituents to give their votes on every occasion against the continuance of black labour. The Government say, "You must not do that. You must not keep such promises," and they say "No," and humbly bow down to Petruchio and submit. They now come up to-day, having swallowed all this quantity of dirt, and try to make the public believe that they like it; but the manner in which they make the explanation shows how very nauseous it was to them, although they swallowed it.

Mr. BARLOW: It has made them sick,

THE HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: The position they were in was a simple, plain, and straightforward one. The hon. member for Herbert proposed a resolution that it was desirable some encouragement should be given to the sugar industry. Nobody knew what the Government were going to do.

MR. COWLEY: I did

THE HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: I did not, at any rate, and I came into the House prepared to move an amendment which I had ready written, and that was the amendment upon which a division was taken on Thursday last—affirming that it was desirable to do something to encourage the sugar industry, but that it was not desirable to re-open the black labour question. I was aware that there was a large majority of the House pledged to support a proposition of that kind, affirming that they would not re-open the black labour question, and I believed also that there was a majority in favour of assisting the sugar industry. I have yet to learn that it is not competent for a member on this side of the House to move an amendment upon a motion proposed by a private member without its being taken as an attack upon the Government. How have these gentlemen been led away? What paltry excuse have they put forward for their action? That they were bound to vote against the leader of the Opposition. That is what it all comes to. Upon an amendment moved by a private member upon the motion of the hon. member for Herbert, every member of the House was surely free to give an opinion. The members on that side spoke upon the subject from different points of view, and members on this side, I believe, have different opinions to some extent on the question. Have I not the right as a private member to move an amendment upon a motion by a private member? When I moved the amendment upon it a large majority pledged themselves to give their votes in favour of it, and yet they were persuaded not to vote for it because the leader of the Opposition moved it, and they must not vote for anything he proposes. I have been in Parliament a good many years now, and I have never before seen public business carried on in that way. Hon. members opposite come into this House to support the Government and not to oppose the leader of the Opposition. It is no concern of theirs what I do. If I put forward a plain proposition, I surely have the right to expect the vote of every member who is pledged to support that proposition. Because the Government choose to say it is an attack upon them, hon. members opposite bow down to their task-master, Petruccio, and swallow their words, because he said, "I will make you do it." They came here to-day with a great many explanations; but it will take a great many more than we have had to-day to make their conduct appear other than what it is. They had not the courage of their convictions, but they voted as they were told, and have said to-day that they rather like being dragged through the mud. We have had almost enough of what was done last week. We know the utterly—I was going to use a strong word, Mr. Speaker.

MR. O'SULLIVAN: You cannot say anything stronger than you have said already.

THE HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: "Foolish" is the word I will use. After those utterly foolish tactics of Thursday evening last, in persuading a party to go in the face of their pledges, simply for the purpose of giving the leader of the Opposition a slap in the face—after those utterly foolish tactics they endeavoured to cover them up by tactics infinitely more foolish. They actually induced the House to affirm by a majority, and in contradic-

tion of their own expressed opinions, that your ruling, Mr. Speaker, was untrue, and that what you stated was not a fact. They did not ask the House to affirm that you were mistaken in your construction of the Standing Orders, that your ruling was erroneous, or that you had made a mistake in a matter of practice, but they made the House, by a majority, affirm that when you said the hon. member for Bundamba was entitled to speak because he was on his feet before you had finished putting the question, you said that which was not true. I very naturally asked the leader of the Government when he proposed such a motion whether he was mad. Nothing short of taking leave of his senses could justify a man in moving a motion of that kind. Still, that was done, and hon. gentlemen opposite had not the courage of their opinions. Like Katherine again, when Petruccio proposed that motion, they at first actually got up and said the Premier was wrong, and he had no right to make such a motion; but the Premier said, "You shall vote for it, madam," and the hon. gentlemen on the other side came up at the lash and voted for it; and voted for what they knew and had admitted to be false. I think the hon. member for Toombul would have done much better to have let this alone. The best thing for him to do is to let the people forget it, if they can. It will be a long time before they will forget it. As I said before, honesty is the best policy; go straight and vote straight. If the hon. gentleman will take my advice, he will vote according to his convictions in future, and if he has no convictions, let him give his vote according to his pledges. I will say just a word with reference to what the junior member for South Brisbane said about Mr. Pietzcker. I ask the hon. gentleman if he actually believes what he said?

MR. LUYA: Yes.

THE HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: Then I ask the hon. gentleman to take the trouble to turn up the "Votes and Proceedings" for 1886, volume ii., page 907, where he will find the actual instructions given to Mr. Pietzcker, which show that he was sent for the purpose of preventing any people from the Continent being inveigled here by falsehood and misrepresentation.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. gentleman must have been rehearsing a dream he had a long time ago. He has been telling us exactly what he did with his party when he was in power. He has been doing the whole thing over again, and is not satisfied until he has rehearsed the whole performance. The Government did not ask the members on this side of the House to vote in any particular way. I myself stated when I spoke on the question how I intended voting, and gave my reasons for the vote I was going to give, and I suppose hon. members on this side believed in what I said, and voted accordingly. I am very sorry that the hon. gentleman should have made some misstatements. I do not like to take any hon. member to task for making misstatements, but he has certainly done so. The hon. gentleman said that he did not know what the intentions of the Government were upon the motion of the hon. member for Herbert.

THE HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: Hear, hear!

THE MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: The hon. gentleman did know, because the leader of the Government gave a decided answer before the hon. gentleman moved his amendment.

THE HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: That is so.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: And therefore the hon. gentleman did know the intention of the Government. It was upon that account, and upon that account alone, that I said I would vote against the hon. gentleman's amendment.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to say a word in explanation? I said that when I came into the House that afternoon I had the amendment ready in writing, and that at that time I did not know what the Government were going to do.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: At any rate the hon. gentleman knew perfectly well before he moved his amendment.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: That is correct.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: The hon. member for Herbert himself knew what the Government intended to do upon his motion, because he was told distinctly that the Government would not grant an extension of black labour. There can be no disputing that. I do not care what the newspapers say about me, so far as black labour is concerned. My opinions are too well known in the colony upon the question of black or Chinese labour, for me to fear what newspapers say about me. I know they have said a great deal about me lately, but then it is said by hon. members of the Opposition, who are correspondents, editors, and proprietors of newspapers. I have not to go very far to find them out. I know them. They make speeches in this House, and then they repeat their speeches in the columns of the newspapers afterwards. I do not say whether it is right or wrong, but it is perfectly true. I suppose it is their trade.

Mr. HODGKINSON: What is the hon. gentleman's trade?

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: The hon. member for Enoggera made a strange statement for a gentleman who has had a legal education. He also is the proprietor or correspondent, or something, of a newspaper, and yet he got up and quoted from a paper called the *Capricornian* as to the truth or otherwise of what took place here last Thursday evening; but he may be the correspondent himself, for all I know. I know it is not uncommon for gentlemen in this House to rise and quote what they have written themselves in support of the truth of their statements. It has been done even lately. They are known to hon. members of this House. The hon. member for Enoggera asserted that it had never occurred to any person until the following day that the hon. member for Bundamba had forfeited his right to speak. Now, I can produce proof that I mentioned the matter immediately after the Speaker had said that the hon. member for Bundamba had a right to speak. I mentioned it to two or three of my colleagues, and pointed out the Standing Order.

Mr. HAMILTON: You showed it to me.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: So that the statement made that it never occurred to anyone at the time is untrue. I know that it occurred to one or two private members as well as to myself. The leader of the Opposition said that members on this side voted against their convictions when they disagreed with the Speaker's ruling. I deny that.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: Their expressed convictions.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: I, for one, did not vote against my convictions, and I know several other hon.

members who stated to me previously that they believed thoroughly that my statement as to the hon. member for Bundamba having forfeited his right was perfectly true, because they had seen the same thing themselves. Now the man who says that and believes that, could not be voting against his convictions.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: I did not say all of them.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: I do not know to whom the hon. gentleman alluded, but I certainly voted according to my convictions, and I hope that upon an important question like this I shall never vote otherwise even for party purposes. The whole of this question is merely a party one. There is really no principle in the whole thing. It is simply a party effort on the one side to try and blacken the other. So far as I am concerned, I do not care, as I made no pledge to my constituents. I was not asked to make a pledge upon the black labour question. They knew me too well to ask it.

Mr. HODGKINSON: They knew that you supported it.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: The hon. gentleman knows nothing about it.

Mr. HODGKINSON: I can quote day and date.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: We will leave it so—my constituents know better. The hon. member for Ipswich referred to something which I explained in this House before, as to a statement made by the Hon. J. R. Dickson. I shall just repeat the explanation I made once before: When I came down to the House in 1874, there were certain grievances which the North suffered under then, and suffers under still, to a very large extent. The leader of the Northern party at that time—or the nominal leader, as there was only a very small party then—was Mr. Fitzgerald, the hon. member for Mackay. One of the members of the party was Mr. Hodgkinson, the present member for Burke, and myself, and another, who was a member of the Ministry, also belonged to the party. Now, after the Palmer Ministry was put out of office, I went to Sydney, and stayed there during the recess and until Parliament met again. Before I went Mr. Fitzgerald asked me if I were agreeable to sign a manifesto of Northern grievances, and I said, "Yes, I was quite willing," and gave him *carte blanche* to sign for me, never thinking for a single moment that he was going to put in black labour as one of the Northern grievances. The manifesto was drawn out, written, and signed during my absence in Sydney, and when I came back I remonstrated with Mr. Fitzgerald for having done what he did, and he said, "Oh, it is nothing. It is a Northern grievance, if it is not one of yours." That is the history of that incident. The statement made by Mr. Dickson is perfectly true. There is no doubt that it appeared with my name to it; but I say I have never since supported black labour.

Mr. HODGKINSON: April and May, 1888, Townsville.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: I certainly did support a motion for the introduction of coolies under certain regulations.

Mr. HODGKINSON: You said, "I am in favour of coloured labour."

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: I say that is the only time I ever supported anything of the sort, and then only under the strictest regulations.

The HON. P. PERKINS: You ran away from it.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: I have never said anything in this House which I have not said, or would not say, outside it. My constituents are opposed to black labour.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: No.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: There are a certain number of the electors of Townsville in favour of black labour, but the majority are strongly opposed to it. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that the whole of the finishing up of the debate on the encouragement of the sugar industry has degenerated into a mere party squabble.

Mr. BARLOW: Who started it?

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: The debate was started by the hon. member for Herbert, but he did not start the party squabble. Had the motion been advocated on its merits it would have been carried without a division. Almost every hon. member on both sides is agreed that black labour should be kept out, but that the sugar industry should be encouraged and supported as much as possible. But the hon. member for Herbert made the mistake—he believes in it, of course—of strongly advocating that the only means by which the sugar industry could be encouraged was the introduction of black labour. We are all in favour of encouraging any industry, whether it be sugar, mining, squatting, or any other. But there is a certain condition surrounding the encouragement of the sugar industry, and that condition is that the Act passed five years ago cannot be extended, repealed, or altered. There are members of this House who were opposed to black labour before nine members out of every ten came into the House. The hon. member for Stanley and the hon. member for Toowoomba are the two oldest members of the House, and I know the hon. member for Stanley has been opposed to black labour all his life.

The HON. P. PERKINS: He is not now.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: He says he is, and I have no reason to doubt his word. I hope this discussion will terminate, so that we can get to business. We have a good deal of business to do before the session ends.

The HON. P. PERKINS: Then why do you go on talking?

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: It would be as well if hon. members on both sides were to drop the question, as I think it has been agitated enough inside the House and outside to satisfy all parties.

Mr. STEVENS said: Mr. Speaker,—I cannot agree with the leader of the Opposition when he condemned the hon. member for Toombul for proceeding to put himself right. When a man finds himself in a false position, be he member of Parliament or not, he should take the very first opportunity of putting himself right. There is not the slightest doubt that many hon. members have put themselves in a false position on this question. I was not in the House when the division on the amendment of the leader of the Opposition was taken, but when I returned to the House afterwards I could hardly believe my ears when I found that a large majority had voted against it, including the names of hon. members whom I know to be thoroughly opposed to black labour; and when I was told afterwards the reason why they had voted against the amendment I could not see the force of it. The conundrum put by the hon. member for Nundah is nothing compared with the extraordinary

conundrum that has been put before the country during the last few weeks. The hon. member for Herbert introduced a motion with which every hon. member was fully in accord—namely, that it was advisable to do something in the way of legislation to encourage the sugar industry. I do not think any hon. member could possibly vote against that. Then an amendment was proposed by the leader of the Opposition precluding the introduction of black labour. I believe a large majority of members of the House are firmly pledged against black labour. At the hustings they spoke strongly against it, and gave individual pledges to vote against it. Yet, for the sake of some party arrangement, they apparently deliberately break their pledges when the question comes before the House. I know that many hon. members who voted against that amendment are thoroughly in accord with it, and it could only have been party exigencies that caused them to vote in the way they did. However, it will be a very grave lesson to some hon. members. If it does not “adorn a tale” it will serve to “point a moral,” that members should never break their electioneering pledges, even at the call of party exigencies.

Mr. McMASTER said: Mr. Speaker,—As this appears to be washing-up day with us, I think it will be better to go on with the washing-up a little longer. I should not have got up but for the statement of the Minister for Mines and Works that the Government did not in any way ask their supporters to vote last Thursday evening. If that is the case, there are other hon. members on that side of the House who will have to put themselves right with their constituents, as well as the hon. member for Toombul. My colleague, for instance, pledged himself to his constituents that he would not support black labour, and that he would oppose it in every shape and form; and, to my surprise, I found him voting for what I consider, and what his constituents consider, the support of black labour. And there are other hon. members on that side who will have to put themselves right with their constituents as well as my colleague. The most honest and straightforward speech we have had from that side this afternoon has come from the hon. member for the Logan. He says the amendment of the leader of the Opposition was defeated for party purposes, and that those who voted against it had placed themselves in a false position. That is perfectly true. It was an open secret all through the discussion on the black labour question, that the Government did not want to go to a division on it this session. That was freely spoken about outside. I do not say the Government said so, but I have heard it said repeatedly that they were determined to discuss the question till the end of the session, without coming to a division. To one gentleman who made that remark to me, I said the session would last a very long time, and that probably the Estimates would not get through at all. However, the Government seem to have found that the Estimates were not getting through as fast as they liked, and they decided to go to a division. There are members on that side who have declared they would vote for the amendment of the leader of the Opposition; but pressure—Government pressure—must have been brought to bear upon them—I do not know whether they used the gag or the screw; I suppose it was the screw—and they were told—as I have heard—that they would have to vote against the amendment, as it was to be made a party question.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Nonsense!

Mr. McMASTER: There is no nonsense about it; and it was not kind of the Government to place their supporters, such as my

colleague, in such a false position that they would have to go before their constituents and explain to them the reason why they had broken their pledges in voting against that amendment. They may try to wash out the stain as much as they can, but, depend upon it, they cannot wash out the ballot-box. They will have to put themselves square with the ballot-box as well as with the House, and I think it is best to have all the washing completed this afternoon.

The HON. P. PERKINS said: Mr. Speaker,—I am not going to talk to my constituents. I do not care for them. I am not a coward; I am not going to be bawling and roaring here and mentioning my constituents. I am not afraid of them in any way whatever. If my constituents do not like me; if they do not think I am a worthy representative, I can find some other constituency to return me. I think so, and if I don't find that constituency I can seek fresh fields and pastures new. Let them go. It is an unfortunate thing that so many hon. members stand up here and instead of telling the truth, which some of them seem incapable of doing—

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order in speaking in that way of members of the House.

The HON. P. PERKINS: I withdraw the remark. But I do think it a despicable position for a man who is returned to this House—instead of transacting the business of the country—to be continually getting up and referring to his constituents, trying to curry favour with them and courting popularity. That is only becoming the hon. the leader of the Opposition or the hon. member for Charters Towers, who are continually working up business in a certain way which I will not allude to. I will let them be. However, it is just as well that we should understand one another. When are we to shut up shop? I would like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, what time the shutters are going to be put up. If this sort of thing is to go on, we shall not be able to shut up for a month. I think, Mr. Speaker, you have been very quick in calling attention to me. I reminded you the other day about Mr. Speaker Lenthalle, when Charles the Second came down to the House. Whenever I stand up, you are in the habit of putting me down. You do not put those hon. members on the other side down. You let them go on, give them license—

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Order, order!

The SPEAKER: If the hon. member has any fault to find with my decisions, or any action of mine in this House, he should call attention to it at the time. No hon. member will have any cause of complaint, if he calls my attention to anything of that sort at the time it occurs.

The HON. P. PERKINS: Very well, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to obstruct business. It is the Government who are obstructing business. The hon. the Minister for Mines and Works, with those long speeches he makes, is to blame for a good deal of it. I hope we shall now proceed with business.

Mr. WATSON said: Mr. Speaker,—I do not intend to say much on this question. I never was in favour of black labour in my life.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS of the Opposition: Oh, oh!

Mr. WATSON: It is to my constituents that I intend to render an account of what I have done in this House, and it will be for them to say whether I have faithfully or otherwise performed the contract that was put into my hands as their representative. I am prepared to

stand or fall by their decision. As for my hon. colleague, the member for Fortitude Valley, I must state that it would be better for him to mind his own business and not mind mine. He need not go to my father-in-law in the Valley—

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. WATSON: I do not go to his constituents to blacken him. On the contrary I keep a calm head, and go about in a proper manner, and whatever I think is right I act accordingly. I never say behind a man's back what I won't say before his face.

Mr. McMASTER: I told him to put you square.

Mr. WATSON: I'm square enough. I know that two and two make four, that three threes are nine, and four nines are thirty-six. I can always work out problems of that kind. Any explanation I have to make I will make to my constituents and not to the Opposition. Had the hon. the leader of the Opposition put this amendment in a straightforward manner, and not in the roundabout way he did, what would have been the result? When the first caucus was held on this side we were all distinctly pledged to oppose black labour. If it had not been so, I would never have sat on this side of the House.

Mr. FOXTON: What about the second caucus?

Mr. WATSON: I will tell the hon. member for Carnarvon that he is a black labour man. When Dr. Mullen and myself were passing his place we saw two beautiful South Sea Islanders working in his garden. No one ever saw that in my garden.

Mr. FOXTON: What about the second caucus?

Mr. WATSON: What I am about to tell you now, Mr. Speaker, will prove whether I am in favour of black labour. I lost one of the most affectionate brothers a man ever had through the sugar industry. My brother lost his wife after she and her baby had been at sea for six days in a tank. Therefore I say that if anybody ever had reason to curse kanakas, and to curse the sugar industry, I have. And more than that, Sir, when in Frisco, in 1854, I saw the hoodlums with ropes round the necks of Chinamen, dragging them along through the mud, it convinced me that no country under the universal sun will ever prosper if it introduces people of an entirely different race and colour. No country that brings in people who are not of the same grade, the same nature, and the same colour as themselves, can ever prosper; and that is why I am deadly opposed, and always have been, to the introduction of black labour. If my constituents tell me when I go before them, as I intend to do as soon as the session is over, that they are not satisfied to return me again, I can say: Thank God, I have done my duty, and can afford to stay at home.

Mr. LITTLE said: Mr. Speaker,—The remark made by the junior member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. McMaster, that members on this side of the House were coerced by the Government, is not fair or correct.

Mr. McMASTER: I did not say so.

Mr. LITTLE: I beg to differ from the hon. member. The hon. member repeated exactly what was said by the leader of the Opposition. I can say, speaking for myself, that I am not coerced by the Government. I am here pledged to the men who returned me, and have been true and faithful to my pledges. I am not afraid of hon. members opposite; I am here to protect the men who returned me and the party with

whom I am identified in the House. I know I have been told that I am not overwhelmed with intelligence, but I cannot sit here and allow the junior member for Fortitude Valley to tell me that I have to bow and bend to the Government.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: But you have, you know.

Mr. LITTLE: If I cannot make a speech, I can hear and understand what is said; and I have as much right here as any member in the House, and I shall protect myself and my position in the House, and do it as ably and honourably as I possibly can. On the occasion when the vote was taken I was misled. I was told that the vote would not be taken on Thursday evening. I was here immediately after tea, and would have stayed to any hour to support the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition had I known that a vote would be taken then. The hon. gentleman had the impertinence to tell me when I was having a wash that I would not have voted on the question. I would have been here if I had known that the vote was to be taken. I would not lose the confidence of the class to which I belong, and if I am not a very able or very eloquent man, I am a straightforward, honest man. The leader of the Opposition told me that I would not have voted for the amendment if I had been here, and that I made two speeches, one on one side of the question and one on the other. I am only a common miner, but I can tell the hon. gentleman that he cannot interpret common English when it is spoken to him. I told the hon. gentleman that I regretted being absent, and that if I had known that the vote was to be taken that evening I should have been present, but the hon. member for Herbert, Mr. Cowley, told me that the vote would be taken on Friday evening. When the vote was taken on the amendment I was away at a cock fight. I do not deny that. I happened to make that slip, and I stand by it. But I cannot tolerate the junior member for Fortitude Valley hurling across the floor of the House the charge that members on this side are coerced by the Government. I am not, and I should have voted against them on this question. I sincerely regret that I was not present, and I hope that no vote will be taken on the subject until early next session. It is all very well for politicians to talk as they have been doing in this House, but if hon. members read the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Herbert, Mr. Cowley, they will see that it is simply to the effect that the Government should take some steps early next session to assist the sugar industry. That is the purport of this resolution, and I say that outside coloured labour it is the bounden duty of every member of this House to support the hon. member for Herbert and ask the gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches to assist the sugar industry.

Mr. COWLEY said: Mr. Speaker,—I should not have spoken on this question had it not been for something which fell from the leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman distinctly stated that no one in this House knew what the Government were going to do.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: I said I did not.

Mr. COWLEY: I said I did, and then the hon. gentleman corrected himself. I think it is only fair that I should state that I understood what the Government were going to do. I saw the Premier and asked him if he would assist to have the Polynesian Labour Act extended. The hon. gentleman distinctly said, "No." I then called a caucus of those members interested in the sugar industry, told them that

I had seen the Premier on the question, and that he had emphatically stated that he would not extend the Polynesian Act. One member wished me to draw up the resolution in favour of the extension of the Act, but I stated distinctly to them that it was no use to do that, for the Government would not sanction it. That is what took place, and it is only fair that I should mention those facts to the House. The hon. member for Fortitude Valley has said that the Government would not allow the matter to go to a division.

Mr. McMASTER: I did not say the Government.

Mr. COWLEY: The hon. member stated that it was an open secret that the Government would not allow the matter to go to a division.

Mr. McMASTER: I did not say the Government. I said the members on the Government side of the House.

Mr. COWLEY: We—the members representing sugar constituencies—were so annoyed at the action of the Government, that we determined to carry the thing all through the session and not let it go to a division, and we did it against the wishes and in defiance of the Government. But after that we relented. I did so. I saw we were blocking business and I did not wish to obstruct it, and therefore postponed the motion to a certain day, which enabled private business to come on. After that we had another meeting of the sugar members and we determined we would come to a division, because we heard that unless we did there was every probability of the business of the country being blocked. We therefore determined to come to a division when members had spoken. So far as wishing to gag or stifle debate, all I can say is that the hon. member for Bundamba moved the adjournment of the debate a month or six weeks ago, and when he had the opportunity of speaking he gave way to the hon. member for South Brisbane. Therefore he had an opportunity of speaking, and I should have been only too delighted to hear members speak. The more they spoke on the motion the better they would have pleased me. Now, the hon. member for Ipswich said he deeply sympathised with myself and the sugar members, and that I should have been rewarded for my support of the Government. I do not wish the sympathy of the hon. member at all, and especially if that is the way he gives it. Whilst I have been in this House, I have consistently voted as my conscience dictated, and I believe I have been the most independent member on this side, having voted more often against the Government than any other member. I did not expect to be rewarded for any support which I have given to the Government, and I do not expect it now. I simply wished my motion to be discussed on its merits, and if the Government could advocate it, for them to do so. Many hon. members who this afternoon have been so anxious to set themselves right with their constituents will, I venture to say, in a few years be sorry for it. The country will rise up and demand black labour. The country will see what is best for the interests of the North, and a change of public opinion will take place on this, as on other great public questions. Public opinion will be in favour of giving the North, at any rate, that labour which is absolutely necessary to develop its resources. The hon. member for Ipswich has done the sugar planters a great service. We laboured under the stigma that the planters had sent home an agent to prevent the Germans coming here, but now we are decidedly told by the hon. gentleman that it was the leader of the Opposition who sent home an agent to prevent them coming.

Mr. SAYERS: Except by fair means.

Mr. COWLEY: There was nothing about "fair means." The hon. member for Ipswich said distinctly that the leader of the Opposition sent home Mr. Pietzcker to see that these men did not come out here at a low rate. Now I say that the object of passing the Act, enabling the planters to indent European labour, was to enable them to get it at a cheaper rate than then prevailed in the colony. If the labour had been abundant here at the rate which the planters could afford to pay, then they would have accepted those men, but as they could not get them in this country the Act was passed to enable them to get cheap Continental labour. I say then that the hon. member has relieved the planters of the stigma which was attached to them of stopping those men from coming here, because now it appears it was done by the leader of the Opposition.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: You know that is not a fact.

Mr. COWLEY: That is what the hon. member for Ipswich has distinctly stated. Now it has been said that the way in which I advocated coloured labour has prevented my friends from voting with me, but I advocated the extension of the Act for five years simply because I could see no other means of encouraging the industry, and no hon. member has proposed any other remedy. I am not wedded to an extension of the Act. If any member can propose some legitimate means that the House can adopt for the preservation of the sugar industry I shall only be too happy to accept it, and the planters will do the same. I advocated a reciprocal treaty, and the idea was scouted. The hon. member for Rosewood advocated a bounty. He was, in fact, the only member who spoke up and gave a suggestion, but his ideas were pooh-poohed. Now, if any hon. member on either side will suggest any means by which the sugar industry can be preserved, I am sure the planters will gladly adopt it. The reason why I dwell so long on that particular branch of the subject was because I saw it was the only means that the House could sanction for the furtherance of the industry. A great deal has been said about cheap European labour, and I agree with those hon. members who say it would be better to extend the Pacific Islanders Act than allow us to bring in these men. We have an Act which will enable the planters to indent labourers, and the Government to bring them. I suppose that the leader of the Opposition, who passed that Act, will allow that he intended it to be made use of. But if that labour is brought into the country, I feel sure that the evils arising from it will be far greater in twelve months than if the Pacific Islanders Act were extended for twenty years. I believe every right thinking man in the country knows that. Now what position are we in? The reciprocity idea is scouted until we get federation; and from the tone of hon. members we will never see federation. We know the country will not give us a bonus on sugar produced. Therefore, the planters must accept the inevitable, and introduce cheap European labour; but let us thoroughly understand that it is not the planters who will be responsible for the evils that may result from cheap European labour. If this cheap labour comes in in hundreds and thousands, and if riots take place or other evils arise in connection with the introduction of that labour, the responsibility must not be put upon the shoulders of the planters. I wish the country and this House to thoroughly understand that.

Mr. HODGKINSON: That is a nice argument.

Mr. SAYERS said: Mr. Speaker,—I was sorry to hear the hon. member for Herbert make use of an argument drawn from what the

hon. member for Ipswich has said, knowing well that even if the hon. member for Ipswich did say what the hon. member attributes to him, it is not a fact. The hon. member seems to have taken advantage of a slip made by the member for Ipswich. Now, the hon. member for Stanley the other night, when speaking of what was done on the other side of the House, said he would walk out of the House if he did not believe in it. I give him all credit for that, and hope he will continue to do the same. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is very peculiar that all the explanations this afternoon have come from the other side. Hon. members on this side seem to be perfectly satisfied with their conduct on Friday night last, but hon. gentlemen on the Government side have had to get up and explain. On the 30th August the hon. member for Toombul, in speaking in this House, said, "I rise to say that I intend to support the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition." That was the amendment on Mr. Cowley's motion, and he said that a great many other hon. members would support it. The hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. Watson, speaking on a former occasion in explanation of a vote he had given against an amendment on the question proposed by the leader of the Opposition, stated distinctly that he had voted unknowingly, and if the hon. gentleman had explained the matter more thoroughly he would have voted with him, and against the Government. There is not a doubt in my mind that the vote on Thursday last was a surprise to every member of the Opposition, and to hon. gentlemen on the Government side who were not present, as some of them have already told me. As to the Government not knowing how hon. members on their side were going to vote, I distinctly say that they did know, because I saw the names of hon. members who were to vote against the amendment being taken down.

Mr. HAMILTON: They were not directed to vote.

Mr. SAYERS: One hon. member was asked how he was going to vote, and he said distinctly he was going to vote for the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. That was about fifteen minutes before the division took place, and in a very few minutes that gentleman had changed his opinion and voted with the Government against the amendment. I shall not mention any name, but the hon. member I refer to cannot deny it. The hon. member for Cook was taking the names down then to know how hon. members would vote, and he was perfectly satisfied that the Government were going to defeat the amendment. After that amendment was defeated hon. gentlemen on this side who were quite prepared to assist the sugar industry in any way that did not involve a continuance of black labour, found themselves in a false position.

Mr. HAMILTON: We know why you went out.

Mr. SAYERS: If the hon. member wants to know why we went out, I can tell him, as the hon. member for Stanley has already told him. It was simply because the gag was put on, and the hon. member for Bundamba was not allowed to speak, and we were not going to vote without letting the people know how we were voting. The motion of the hon. member for Herbert would have been carried I believe with a slight amendment; but we wanted it distinctly laid down, that whatever support this side of the House was prepared to give the sugar industry, it would not be the support of black labour. That was the only objection we had to the hon. member's motion. If the hon. gentlemen and those who supported his

motion had not held up the kanaka or black labour question in the way they did before the House, he might, and I believe would, have got a large measure of support from this side. The motion at first seemed very harmless, but after the speech of the mover, and those members especially interested in the sugar industry, we could not vote for his motion without some explanation. We did not wish to say we would do nothing whatever to assist the sugar industry, but that was the position we were placed in by the tactics of the Government in defeating the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. No doubt by adopting those tactics they have placed themselves in a false position before the country, and the tactics they adopted on the following Friday places them in a position more false if possible. I am certain no honest minded man outside the House, no matter what side he takes in politics, would support such tactics. I believe the conscience of the hon. member for Toombul must have pricked him after the statement he has made, and which, according to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I am not allowed to read to the House, and the same remark applies to the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. Watson. The hon. member for Toombul distinctly stated that he would vote for the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, and after voting against it, his conscience has, no doubt, pricked him, and he has felt it necessary to make some explanation. I am very sorry he has placed himself in that awkward position, but I suppose that being a new member, like many more of us, he allowed himself to be put in a false position, and is now trying to get out of it. When he goes before his constituents he will have to explain it again, and I hope he will be able to explain to them why he altered his opinion as expressed on the 30th August, and voted as he did.

Mr. BARLOW said: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to make a personal explanation in reply to the hon. member for Herbert. I did not charge the hon. member with having given a servile or dishonest support to the Government; but on several occasions, on the contrary, I have noticed that the hon. gentleman has voted independently. I said, that as a member of the party, and as one who had rendered them considerable service in the North, I considered he had received a poor return. As to my statement with regard to Mr. Pietzcker—

The SPEAKER: The hon. member will not be in order in going beyond a personal explanation.

Mr. BARLOW: I wish to say in explanation of my statements in regard to Mr. Pietzcker that in the second volume of "Votes and Proceedings" for 1886, at page 907, a distinct explanation as to the reasons why Mr. Pietzcker was sent home is given.

Mr. HAMILTON: I rise to a point of order. This is not a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member, I understand, is making a personal explanation, and is explaining his own words with regard to Mr. Pietzcker having been sent home.

Mr. BARLOW: I am endeavouring to explain, as I understand I am not permitted to read the document to the House, that Mr. Pietzcker was sent home not for the purpose of promoting German emigration, but for the purpose of witnessing agreements and of explaining to the German emigrants that they might have at first to submit to a lower rate of wages than was ruling in the colony, and also of explaining to them all about the land laws of the colony.

Mr. COWLEY: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member may now be saying what he intended to say, but it is not what he really did say, and I think he is going beyond a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: I understand the hon. member is explaining his own words with regard to Mr. Pietzcker having been sent home, which had been misunderstood by the hon. member for Herbert. The hon. member, perhaps, a little exceeded the bounds of a personal explanation, but scarcely sufficient to justify me in checking him.

Mr. COWLEY: I call your attention, Sir, to the fact that he has made a perfectly different statement to the one he made before.

Mr. BARLOW: Mr. Speaker,—I have said all I want to say.

Mr. JORDAN said: Mr. Speaker,—I must say something in reply to the remarks of the hon. member for Herbert, as they have great weight, because of the calm and deliberate way in which the hon. member speaks, and the fact that he confines himself strictly to what he believes to be true on all occasions. We are now coming to the end of this discussion, and I hope the question of black labour will never be raised in the colony again as long as it is a colony. I am quite satisfied with the result of this question, which has shown that the members of the Government and their numerous supporters are now entirely opposed to black labour. To my mind that is a most satisfactory result after all the years we have been contending on this subject, and especially after the stand I took against coloured labour nearly thirty years ago. I have always been a consistent opponent of black labour both in the House and out of it; and I am not much disposed to cavil as to the manner in which this question has been finally determined. I do not much care whether hon. members on the Government side of the House voted for the amendment of the leader of the Opposition or not. When the vote on that amendment was taken, and there was a majority of four or five against the amendment, I was in terror, as I did not know how the Government side were going to vote. Although the Government had said previously that they were now opposed to black labour, and had no intention of extending the period of its existence in the colony, I really did not know after the action of their supporters, and seeing the apparent sympathy there was on the part of the Government with the hon. member for Herbert, how they intended voting. After they voted against the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, I was in terror lest the vote on the original motion might be an adverse one, and in favour of the motion of the hon. member for Herbert. It appeared as if the desires of the sugar planters would be fulfilled, and had black labour been granted for another five years it would have meant its perpetuation; but seeing that the Government voted against the motion of the hon. member for Herbert and took their followers with them, I am supremely satisfied, and am not disposed to say what some hon. members on this side have said because they voted against the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. I would not say that because they voted against the amendment they were in favour of black labour. I do not think that is quite fair. I think it is only fair, after the expression of the intention of the Government by the Premier and the Minister for Mines and Works, that the Government did not intend to continue black labour any longer, that the supporters of the Government should be allowed to take their own course with regard to the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. If they had voted for the amendment of the leader

of the Opposition, it would have seemed to them casting a reflection upon the veracity of the Government, and on that account I do not think it quite fair that the papers or hon. members should say that those who voted against the amendment of the leader of the Opposition broke their pledges. I am satisfied with the fact that they afterwards voted against the motion of the hon. member for Herbert, and decided that black labour should be abolished in the colony. After having lived so many years in the colony—ever since the colony came into existence—and having opposed black labour strongly both in the House and out of it, I am rejoiced to see black labour done away with for ever in Queensland; but I should not like to allow the last statement of the hon. member for Herbert to be the last thing said in regard to this question. The Immigration Bill which was introduced by the leader of the Opposition in 1884, was introduced for the purpose of amending the Immigration Act of 1882, which gave facilities for the introduction of people from Germany under engagements. The hon. member for Herbert reiterated the remark which has been made in the House several times, and which I have once or twice contradicted, that the amending Bill was a Bill for introducing cheap German labour. That has been charged against us, and especially against the leader of the Opposition, over and over again, at the hustings, in the papers, and in this House. It has no foundation of truth in it. Nothing was said by the leader of the Opposition, when he introduced the Bill, about cheap European labour. The object of the Bill was to create greater facilities for the carrying out of the provisions of the Act of 1882, for the introduction of labour from Germany. That Act did not provide sufficient facilities for bringing out families, and the leader of the Opposition made an alteration in the schedule, which made it cheaper to introduce families than under the Act of 1882. While the Bill was being discussed, hon. members who then sat on this side, and who now support the Government, said repeatedly that this would be cheap European labour, German coolie labour as it was termed by some, and they interjected expressions of that kind several times during the debate. When I spoke on the question, I directed attention to the fact that the leader of the Opposition had said nothing about cheap labour, excepting in reply to some of those interjections. Then the members who occupied the Opposition benches stated that the effect of the Bill would be to bring down the price of labour. The leader of the Opposition said that was not the object of the Bill, but that if it tended in that direction even that would be better than inundating the colony with black labour. When I spoke on the question I said I believed that black labour was not cheap labour. I felt satisfied, from the experience I had had for six years in managing the emigration from Great Britain, that we could get a sufficient number of farm labourers—almost any number we wanted—who would be only too glad to come here under engagements for one or two years at a fair rate of wages, such as were generally given to new-comers in the colony, which I stated to be about £40 a year, with rations consisting of 8 lb. or 12 lb. of beef, 7 lb. of flour, 3 lb. of sugar, and a quarter of a pound of tea, with proper house accommodation. I said that from what I knew of emigration from England, I was quite sure that if the Agent-General was instructed he could get a sufficient number of farm labourers to supply the demands for labour on the sugar plantations of the North on those terms. I added that I should be prepared to further induce those people to come by engaging to give them a £20 land order after they had fulfilled the

terms of their agreement at the end of one or two years. That was the substance of what was said on the question, and it does not at all justify the statement that the Bill was introduced to bring down the price of labour by introducing a system of cheap German coolie labour. I acquit the hon. member for Herbert of any intention to convey a wrong impression, because I believe he is incapable of doing so; but he did not know the facts of the case. He was not here when the Immigration Bill of 1884 was brought before the House, and he did not hear the speech then made by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, or what I said on that occasion. I am sorry that my hon. colleague, the member for South Brisbane, has repeated similar statements; I think it is not right that they should be repeated, because it conveys quite a wrong impression. I think it would be well if this black labour question was set at rest, and I am pleased to see that hon. members on the Government side are now opposed to it. Of course, the Liberal side has always been opposed to black labour. It has been one of the fundamental principles of the party, and until recently the Conservative party, those who now support the Government, were in favour of black labour. They maintained and defended it at all times, until it answered their political purpose to change their views; at all events, they did change their views. Owing chiefly to the efforts of the hon. the leader of the Opposition, the state of feeling brought about on this question was such that it was absolutely necessary for anyone who wished to get into the House during the election of 1883 to state that he was unfavourable to black labour. We know that during the last election Sir T. McIlwraith pledged himself before the whole country against black labour, and it now appears that hon. gentlemen opposite are converted to our views. They now appear passionately desirous of convincing the country that they are the determined opponents of black labour, but if so, I think they should have supported the amendment of the hon. the leader of the Opposition. At any rate, it would have been more consistent if the Government had voted for it. If, as they say, they do not intend to encourage black labour, what better opportunity could they have had of putting their views practically before the country than by supporting that amendment? If the hon. members who brought forward the question this session and so ably advocated it had been satisfied with affirming in the terms of the resolution that something should be done next session to encourage the sugar industry in this colony, the whole House would have voted with them; but they were not satisfied with that. They insisted that the only means of doing that was by continuing black labour for a further period of five years, and there, I think, they made a great mistake. The hon. member for Herbert said the only remedy, the only help for the sugar industry, was coloured labour. He was followed in the same strain by the hon. the junior member for Mackay, Mr. Dalrymple, and the hon. member for Burrum, who also strongly advocated black labour. The hon. the leader of the Opposition said he was desirous of assisting the sugar industry; but he only wanted some safeguard, so that we should not go back to the old system of coloured labour. That was the reason why he proposed his amendment, and the Government might very well have voted for it, because from their remarks we did not know how they would vote on the main question.

Mr. ISAMBERT said: Mr. Speaker,—When the hon. member for Herbert brought forward his motion affirming the desirability of adopting some means next session to encourage the sugar industry, one could understand that it might either mean the introduction of Indian coolies, as

was once proposed by the party now in power, or it might mean the introduction of African negroes, or the continuation of the introduction of kanakas. But if there was any doubt at all as to the meaning of that resolution, it was dispelled by the speeches of the five hon. members who voted for it—Messrs. Adams, Jones, O'Connell, Cowley, and Smith; and also by several members of the Government, notwithstanding that they said they would not re-open the black labour question again. But the Liberal party were in earnest that something should be done for the encouragement of that most important industry, not only to the North, but to the whole colony. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the time to try and play with the best interests of the colony; when we know that a state of depression prevails; when people are complaining that they cannot get employment, and when we have not only a decreasing revenue, but increasing expenditure. But what has been done? The hon. member for Logan says that all hon. members on the other side were in favour of something being done to encourage the sugar industry. If that is so, then those hon. members have been false to their intention, because they voted straight away against the motion that something should be done to help that industry. We on this side were anxious that something should be done for that industry; that it should not be allowed to die out, but we were anxious that there should be no mistake as to the means to be adopted to attain that end. How on earth the Government could construe the amendment of the hon. the leader of the Opposition—not to re-open the black labour question—into a vote of want of confidence passes my understanding. On the contrary, the Government tried to put this side of the House into a false position before the country, because if the motion had been carried on the voices, without the amendment that it should not include the reopening of the black labour question, it would appear as though we were committed to their views. I do not know by what perversity of spirit the Government or their supporters could construe the amendment of the leader of the Opposition into a vote of want of confidence, unless it was out of spite, so to say, against that hon. gentleman, and for party purposes. This is too bad. It is very much like thimble-rigging. The Government voted against the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, so that they might say to the North that they were not regardless of the importance of the sugar industry. The hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. Watson, stated that he gave his vote in a straightforward manner; but if the assertion of the hon. member for Logan is correct, I cannot see that there was any straightforwardness in his action. We on this side of the House value the sugar industry far too much to make it a play for party purposes, as the Government have done. The Government have been in collusion, either with the black labour men or the separationists. They tried to drive us on to the horns of a dilemma, and compel us to vote against black labour, so that they should give some classes in the North an excuse for agitating for the separation of the North. They wished to make it appear that we were determined to ruin the industry by not granting black labour. But we have seen that black labour will not do. The most sensible speech made on the opposite side of the House was that made by the hon. member for Barcoo, who stated in a straightforward way that it was not the want of black labour that had ruined the sugar industry, as they had had plenty of black labour. If the motion had been amended as proposed by the leader of the Oppo-

sition, and then passed, the Government, or any party that might be in power, would be entitled to bring forward some measure to encourage the industry. I can see no means of encouraging the sugar industry but that of giving a bonus on sugar produced by white labour, and there would not be the slightest difficulty in raising revenue for that purpose. A tax on the consumption of grog—wines, spirits, and beer—would be quite capable of yielding sufficient additional revenue to grant a bonus of £2 or £3 a ton on all exported sugar grown by white labour. That would encourage the production of sugar by white farmers, especially if the planters would divide their plantations into small farms, as it would be to their benefit to do, and give inducements to white people to settle on the land and cultivate cane. There are plenty of young men in the agricultural districts of Rosewood and Fassifern, who are anxious to settle in the North and grow sugar, and would do so if sufficient inducements were offered. A tax on grog, for the purpose I have suggested, would yield a large enough revenue to pay a bonus on exported sugar, and would bless both him who gave and him who received. Not only is the sugar industry to be maintained, but also the integrity and unity of the whole colony, and we can afford to make some sacrifice in order to maintain the unity of the colony. If we taxed ourselves for the purpose of encouraging and maintaining the sugar industry, we should be amply benefited in return. I very much deprecate the way the Government have managed this important vote; they have clearly shown their thimble-rigging propensities. It is not the first time they have attempted to injure an interest of the colony. How much the colony has been injured by the adverse vote of the Government, which in effect means that nothing shall be done for the sugar industry, it is difficult to say. When the same party advocated that injurious scheme, the land-grant railway, they stopped at no means to try and force it on the colony. They even went so far as to defame the credit of the colony by saying that our credit was exhausted, so that we might be forced to adopt that suicidal measure, the transcontinental railway swindle. Now they are trying to ruin the sugar industry, so that the people of the North may have no alternative but separation. They would have people believe, if they could only get separation that they would get black labour, grab what lands are still left, and once more carry out their pet schemes, but the Liberal party is still too strong for them to accomplish their designs. As I said on a previous occasion, there is a better genius watching over the destinies of this colony. These injurious schemes have been broken down before, and any such schemes which may now be devised will not have much chance of succeeding. The North knows that the Liberal party is willing and anxious that something should be done for the sugar industry, and the North also knows that the majority of the Government party is opposed to them, and have decided that nothing should be done to assist the sugar industry. That is what their vote means, and it will have a very injurious effect upon the colony.

Mr. DALRYMPLE said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. member who has just sat down, has told us that the House was in favour of some support being given to the sugar industry; but in the same breath he also told us that the majority of the House is against it. I must say that I cannot reconcile these two statements. A great deal of this debate has been taken up by hon. members on the other side of the House charging the members on this side with inconsistency in consequence of a vote which they have lately given. It is one thing to oppose a motion on this

merits, and another to oppose a motion which members of the party generally think should not have been introduced. The reason why many members on this side voted against the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, was simply, as has been said before, because a statement had already been made by the Government that there was no intention to reopen the coloured labour question. The motion itself is a perfectly harmless motion, and to ask the House to vote on a subject which was not in dispute seems to me to be an absurdity. There was no necessity for it, therefore they declined to vote for the amendment, which, in their opinion, there was no necessity for introducing. That was the reason why hon. members voted against the amendment. In the face also of the statement that the public had pronounced against coloured labour, and that members had pronounced against it, it seemed as though the leader of the Opposition was desirous, at a time when there was no necessity for it, of calling attention to the fact that he was going to be the saviour of the country on the black labour question, when the country was not in the least danger. Hon. members on the other side, when they charge this side with inconsistency, do not analyse what they themselves have done. For instance, they almost all expressed a general desire to do something for the sugar industry. One hon. member, in fact, to-night has proposed what I venture to think is a very reasonable thing, a bonus on sugar exported, but he is the only member on either side who has proposed anything which would be of any practical effect whatever, except the extension of the Polynesian Act. Well, these hon. members professed to desire to do something to assist the sugar industry, and when the matter came to the vote what did those hon. gentlemen do? The leader of the Opposition talks about members having the courage of their opinions. Well, I would rather stand in this House and vote on either side than sneak out when an important question came to a division, as those hon. gentlemen opposite did.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: After the gag had been put on.

Mr. DALRYMPLE: Hon. members, at a time when they might have, and when I hoped they would have put themselves right, having said repeatedly that they were in favour of the original motion, when that motion came on what did they do? They did not vote either one way or the other, but in a most ignoble fashion they got up and walked out of the House. When, therefore, they talk about inconsistency they should consider their own conduct, which I venture to say is quite as inconsistent.

Mr. SMYTH: You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

Mr. DALRYMPLE: I know it may be justified in some manner. It is a matter of party tactics, and no member knows better than the leader of the Opposition how large a part, party tactics play in the affairs of this House. It seems to me that on a good many occasions party is first and the country last, and something of that sort may be said in regard to the sugar debate, and the way it ended.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: Speak for yourself.

Mr. DALRYMPLE: During that debate there was one whole afternoon when I hoped anxiously that some hon. members on the other side would have given us their opinions, but not one word did they speak. They sat there that day, and the only member who spoke was the ex-Minister for Lands, Mr. Jordan. He was the only hon. member who took advantage of the opportunity at all, and members on this side

waited anxiously to hear what the Opposition would say. Now, at some particular interval of the debate, they complain of the gag having been put on. It has been made a general complaint on both sides of the House, certainly by hon. members of the Opposition, and as I know full well by the Ministry, that too much time was taken up in the debate, and I may venture to give additional testimony to the truth of what was said by the hon. member for Herbert—namely, that the Government were, I think I may say, annoyed, because certain members here who have an interest to represent, chose to take up so much time. It has been the complaint on all sides that too much time has been taken up in the debate, but when the opportunity of terminating the debate legitimately was offered, hon. members would not take it. They have complained of the gag. Now is there ever going to be any finality to any debate in this House? I believe that the whole of this present debate is out of order. The Standing Orders say that no debate of the same session shall be referred to, and there is good reason for such a rule, because if a debate is to be continued in this way there will be no opportunity to transact other business. It is desirable that it should be dealt with at the proper time, and that it should be terminated; but hon. members refused to take advantage of the time which was given to them. They coolly make a great hubbub in consequence of something that transpired the other day, and say the gag was put on. I do not think there is reasonable ground for saying that sufficient time has not been given to hon. members to debate the question. The hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Barlow, was good enough to express his sympathy for certain members on this side, because apparently the Government had not rewarded them for doing their duty—because, in fact, they do not make a trade of and barter their convictions.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS on the Opposition side: Oh! oh!

Mr. DALRYMPLE: I can quite understand that a sentiment like that should be unpalatable to those hon. members. They do not understand our feelings when we come to this House. We do not come here to make any bargains whatever, either with the leader of the Opposition or the head of the Government. I came here to do my duty towards my constituents and the country, and whether I am rewarded or punished, I intend to do my duty. The hon. member, therefore, need not sympathise with us for doing our duty and not getting a reward. I do not expect to be paid for doing my duty.

The HON. P. PERKINS: Why not?

Mr. DALRYMPLE: Because it is not the custom in this House. It is quite sufficient that we conscientiously endeavour to do our duty, and we can well do without the sympathy of the hon. member for Ipswich.

Mr. BARLOW: I would have voted for your motion if it had not been for the gag.

Mr. GANNON said: Mr. Speaker,—I very much regret that the motion I moved this afternoon should have taken up such a vast amount of time. Hon. members seem to have gone over their old fights. I regret the loss of time, and I feel as if I ought to apologise to the Government for having occasioned it. What I did, I think, was perfectly right; and whilst in one way I regret it, in another way I do not. Now, what happened on Friday night puts me in mind of when I was in the bush. I had charge of a sheep station, and frequently had to count out the sheep. The leader of the Opposition on Friday night, filing out with his supporters, reminded me very much of the time

when I had to count sheep. At that time I had an old ewe which led the way for the other sheep, who did not know it, and the hon. gentleman put me in mind of the old ewe who put the other sheep upon the track. Hon. members of the Opposition do not like to be touched, but there is no doubt that the gag was applied to them the other night, and they could not call their souls their own when they were walked outside the bar, as the little boy said of the sheep, "carrying their tails behind them." That was highly amusing to members on this side, and it reminded me strongly of my experience amongst sheep. In saying what I have said, of course I do not mean to infer that the leader of the Opposition is like an old ewe. With regard to a certain speech, quoted by the hon. member for Enoggera against me, I certainly did use the words which the hon. member quoted, and I intended, at the time, to vote for the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. But certain things came to my knowledge afterwards which showed me that if I voted for the amendment of the leader of the Opposition I should be making a very great mistake, because I should be putting myself into his hands to serve his party purposes. I am not going to be caught like that, and, though I happen to be a new member, if that hon. gentleman catches me napping very often he may tell me so, as he has tried to do to-night. We have had enough of this debate upon the sugar question, and I am heartily sick and tired of the whole subject. When the Government stated that they would have nothing whatever to do with coolie labour, or kanaka labour, or anything of that kind, that should have been quite sufficient for hon. members opposite, and they should have taken that declaration, which was made in good faith by the Premier. The hon. member for Herbert knew it was made in good faith, and all of us knew it, and on that occasion many hon. members on this side did not speak upon the original motion because they knew what the Government were going to do. I have done all that I wanted to do with regard to myself and my constituents, and I am not afraid to go before my constituents. I only hope that members on the opposite side have got constituents who think as much of them as mine think of me.

Mr. HODGKINSON: Go to the country and try it.

Mr. GANNON: I am very sorry to have to speak in this manner about myself, but the manner in which members of the Opposition have spoken makes a man speak about himself, or they would have all the say their own way. I cannot help taking exception to the manner in which the junior member for Fortitude Valley turned round upon his colleague this afternoon. That was about the meanest exhibition I ever saw in all my life, not only in a House of Parliament, but in any assembly where men are admitted. I do not think anything could have been in worse form than the way in which that hon. gentleman turned against his colleague, the senior member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. Watson. I have also, during this debate, heard members repeating what they heard within the precincts of the House, and that is also very bad form. I do not think there should be any eavesdroppers about this House. Another matter I will mention is that referred to by the hon. member for Fassifern, who mentioned my having spoken against the removal of the excise upon beer, and not having been here to vote against that removal. I stopped about the House at great inconvenience to myself on that occasion, because I was going up country by the 7 o'clock

train. I waited and waited for that vote to come on, and I could not wait any longer. I have been perfectly outspoken on that subject, and I would have voted against the removal of the excise on beer, if I had been here. It seems that this sugar debate has aroused all the ill-feeling possible to arouse in members on the opposite side. Hon. members of the Opposition have something to do with certain newspapers, and they put lying paragraphs in those papers.

Mr. HODGKINSON said: Mr. Speaker,—I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is either committing a breach of order, or he is making a most unmanly insinuation. Let him name and make a distinct charge against some hon. member.

The SPEAKER: If the hon. member was referring to hon. members of this House in his remarks about writing lying paragraphs to papers, he is out of order. No hon. member has a right to make insinuations of that kind against another hon. member of the House.

Mr. GANNON said: Mr. Speaker,—I will submit to your ruling; but I will say that there are persons who are correspondents of newspapers, whether they are members of this House or not, who seem to have access to this House, and have sent, as I say, lying telegrams and lying paragraphs relating to matters which take place in this House, and which they are cognisant of. There is no doubt about that. I intended to have referred to another newspaper, but I think it is beneath contempt; it is a so-called society and radical newspaper, and is principally taken up with noting the doings of certain so-called high persons in society. You may read in it that Lady So-and-so went out and got a cup of tea and then came in again, and other important matters like that. It is beneath the notice of hon. members, I think; at all events, it is beneath mine, and I shall leave it. Once more, I say I regret having delayed the business of the House by bringing forward this motion. I thought it would not take up more than half an hour, but hon. members on the Opposition side seem to have trotted out all sorts of speeches upon it. I have, before I sit down, to congratulate the late Minister for Lands upon the temperate speech which he made, and if all other hon. members made speeches like his, we should not take up much of the time of the House in debates such as we have had this evening.

Mr. ANNEAR said: Mr. Speaker,—Before the motion is withdrawn, I may say the hon. member for Toombul commenced his speech in reply by regretting that so much time was wasted by his having moved the adjournment of the House. No doubt there has been a waste of time, and what it has all been about I can scarcely comprehend. It seems to me that the House has drifted into a state of utter disorganisation.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: On your side.

Mr. ANNEAR: No, not on our side. I firmly believe we are the elected of a large majority of the people of this colony, and we were never so united before as we are at this time. I am a very young member of this House, and I have not been here more than about four years. I do not pretend to be an old member, and I always give way to older members in this House, to men who I believe possess greater parliamentary experience and greater ability than I do. I am not going to give way to the hon. member for Toombul, who likened hon. members sitting on this side of the House to sheep following the old ewe. Now, I shall call your attention, Mr. Speaker, as you are conversant with what I am going to refer to, to the time when the leader of

the Opposition moved a resolution in this House to the effect that it was desirable to levy a land tax to contribute to the revenue of the colony, in order to relieve the working classes. With such a tax they would not be so oppressed as they are now by the heavy tariff they have to bear; but when that question came to a vote what did the hon. gentlemen opposite do? They walked out like sheep without having any reason for doing so. Every one of them walked outside the bar, and did not vote on that occasion.

The HON. P. PERKINS: I did not.

Mr. ANNEAR: I do not think the hon. member for Cambooya was here at that time. I do not think he could find a constituency which would elect him to a seat in this House. When the present leader of the Opposition tabled that resolution to compel those who had had £13,000,000 expended in the construction of railways through their properties to contribute a share of the enhanced value of their lands in the shape of a land tax, hon. gentlemen opposite did not vote upon the question. I very much regret that we were not able to vote for the motion of the hon. member for Herbert. I consider it was a fair and reasonable motion, and one which the country is pledged to. So long as I have a seat in the House, I shall give my vote to do all I can to relieve the sugar industry. Why did we walk out of the House? The reason must be patent to everyone.

We saw hon. members sitting on the other side of the House get up a few moments before and say they considered the Premier was wrong in moving that your ruling, Sir, be disagreed to; but when it came to a vote they stopped where they were and voted with the Premier. I can refer to the records of this House on many occasions to show that I have had the courage of my convictions. When I sat on the other side supporting the late Government, I crossed the floor and voted against the Government many times when I believed they were doing what was not right. Now, the hon. member for Toombul speaks about our constituents, and says that we are talking to our constituents. If this state of affairs is going to continue for a day or two longer, the best thing we can do in the interests of the country—not in the interests of one or two men—is to go to our constituents. Then there will be a stampede among hon. members opposite. Many hon. members sitting on those benches now will see their present seats no more. The voice of the country will almost annihilate them. If the present Government have a majority at their back, and I believe they have a majority which will support them through thick and thin, and who will bury all the promises they made to their constituents, and go back on all their pledges—

Mr. WATSON: No fear.

Mr. ANNEAR: That hon. member has done so already. I say, Mr. Speaker, if the Government have a majority, let the majority rule, and let us go on with the business of the country. That is what I want to do. I have no doubt the country will in a little while express itself on the conduct of hon. members, as it has done heretofore. To-day newspapers have been referred to, and one newspaper in particular seems to be a very bad paper at the present time. I maintain that that paper is a great power in this colony, and that it did more than any other paper to put the present Government in power. The paper I refer to is the *Brisbane Courier*.

Mr. HAMILTON: No names have been mentioned to-night.

Mr. ANNEAR: I think I am correct in saying that when an hon. member on this side referred to a certain paper, the hon. member for

Barcoo interjected in a derisive way "Oh, the *Brisbane Courier*?" Now, Sir, the *Courier* is a great power in the colony, and hon. members opposite are deeply indebted to the *Courier* for the position they occupy. Why, Sir, at one time it was almost a crime in this House to read the *Telegraph*, but let hon. members look at what was seen yesterday afternoon, and has been seen again this afternoon. That paper was almost a treasure in the hands of hon. members opposite. Perhaps I may be going a little outside the question, but I would ask hon. members whether the gentlemen sitting opposite were not returned to power pledged to support a certain able man. Hon. members opposite know whether they have treated that hon. gentleman properly or not. When the time comes, we shall see how many of those hon. members will stick to the pledges they made when returned to this House. It was their cry all over the colony, "Send me to Parliament as a supporter of Sir Thomas McIlwraith." Almost every hon. member sitting opposite was returned on that cry.

Mr. LITTLE: Not me.

Mr. ANNEAR: The hon. member for Woothakata says "Not me;" but he has altered his mind about other things. I have heard that hon. member say in this House that he was pledged to his constituents to vote against black labour in every shape and form.

Mr. LITTLE: So I am.

Mr. ANNEAR: The hon. member does not do it, then. I am sure the hon. member for Toombul, after he has been a little longer in this House, will not designate his equals as sheep. I should be sorry to apply such a designation to the hon. gentleman, for whom I entertain the highest respect. I believe him to be a thoroughly honourable man in all his transactions. It is no use twitting hon. members on this side of the House with being afraid. Put us to the test. Let the present Government dissolve Parliament to-morrow—I wish they would—and then we shall see who would occupy the Treasury benches, which are now occupied, with one or two exceptions, by altogether different parties to those who were returned last year, and differing in policy from that which was enunciated to the people of the colony, and on which they were all returned as staunch supporters of the Hon. Sir Thomas McIlwraith. I trust that this debate has come to an end, although I hope the sugar industry will not come to an end, as it has done a great deal for Queensland in the past. It would be a sad blow to the colony should that industry come to an end. I have seen in other countries, probably more favoured than the planters are in Queensland—I referred to some of them in England last night—cases where sugar refineries have been shut up by freetrade and by the buoying up of that industry by bounties in France and Germany. I will do everything in my power to induce Parliament to assist those who have had such great difficulties against them as the planters here have had up to the present time. I hope this question will now be allowed to rest, and that we shall go into recess in two or three weeks' time, and if we are spared to return here next year we shall find that we have learned a little more on the subject than we know now. But many things are expected to develop during the next three or four weeks. We are told we are to have a new Government. The country will want to know who the Government are going to be. That will not take long to tell us. I hope that when this debate comes to an end we shall proceed with the business of the House, and bring it to a close as quickly as possible.

The HON. P. PERKINS said: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman having already spoken on the subject cannot speak again. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion be withdrawn?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion withdrawn accordingly.

MESSAGES FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

DREW PENSION BILL.

The SPEAKER announced that he had received a message from the Legislative Council returning the Drew Pension Bill without amendment.

CROWN LANDS ACTS, 1884 TO 1886, AMENDMENT BILL.

The SPEAKER announced that he had received a message from the Legislative Council returning the Crown Lands Acts, 1884 to 1886, Amendment Bill with amendments.

On the motion of the MINISTER FOR LANDS, the consideration of the Legislative Council's amendments was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

ROCKHAMPTON GAS COMPANY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The SPEAKER announced that he had received a message from the Legislative Council returning the Rockhampton Gas Company Act Amendment Bill with amendments.

On the motion of Mr. MURRAY, the consideration of the Legislative Council's amendments was made an Order of the Day for Friday

WARWICK GAS COMPANY BILL.

The SPEAKER announced that he had also received a message from the Legislative Council, returning the Warwick Gas Company Bill with amendments.

On the motion of Mr. MORGAN, the consideration of the Legislative Council's amendments was made an Order of the Day for Friday.

GRANVILLE AND BURNETT BRIDGES BILL.

THIRD READING.

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

ANN STREET PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH BILL.

THIRD READING.

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

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

PUBLICATION ON LOAN ESTIMATES.

Mr. HODGKINSON said: Mr. Speaker,—I rise to say that I should like to have an explanation of a very extraordinary occurrence in connection with this House, that is to say, that the financial policy of the Government was published in the *Telegraph* newspaper and hawked about the streets of this city before members of the House were in possession of the information. I do not think it is necessary for me to dilate on the subject. I simply wish for information on

the matter. I should like to know on what around this extraordinary departure from the ordinary practice of the House has taken place. I move the adjournment of the House.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said: Mr. Speaker,—I am not aware that what the hon. gentleman has stated is substantially correct. After the message from His Excellency the Governor forwarding the Loan Estimates was delivered by His Excellency's messenger, I believe copies of the paper referred to were circulated. I saw papers put into the hands of hon. members, and I was informed by the sub-editor of the *Telegraph* that he had sent instructions down to the offices that the paper was not to be put into circulation until the statement was laid before the House. Therefore, it is not exactly correct to say that the paper was hawked about the streets before hon. members had the information. How the statement got into the hands of the *Telegraph* is disclosed on the face of it—that it was obtained by the courtesy of the Premier. I took good care that no one outside the Cabinet had seen the Loan Estimates until they were laid before the House. In fact, they could not be said to be correct until very late in the day; certainly it was after lunch time before they could be considered as having left the Cabinet. I do not think I need say any more on the subject.

Mr. GROOM said: Mr. Speaker,—I must say that I got a copy of the *Telegraph* at the house where I reside at five minutes past 3 o'clock. It was brought to me, and I was told that it contained the Loan Estimates. I said, "No; surely that cannot be true." However I read them, and on coming to the House I met the two hon. members for Gympie, and the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. McMaster. I said, "Have you seen the second edition of the *Telegraph* containing the Loan Estimates?" They said, "The Loan Estimates, surely not!" I told them it was so; that I had read them. Evidently there is something very unusual in this. I never heard of such a thing before. Hon. members have not got copies of the Loan Estimates yet, and will not until their parliamentary papers are sent round in the morning. Yet we find that a paper that twelve months ago was a despised organ by hon. gentlemen opposite, has been able to get from the Government the full financial policy of the Government with regard to the Loan Estimates. I should very much like to know if the same courtesy has been extended to the other evening paper. There are two evening papers in town, and if the object was to supply the information to the public, apart from any party bias, certainly the same privilege should in all fairness have been extended to the *Observer* as well as the *Telegraph*.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said: Mr. Speaker,—In answer to the hon. member I have to say that the statement supplied to the *Telegraph* is not a full statement. I explained that to the hon. gentleman in the library.

Mr. TOZER said: Mr. Speaker,—I am very glad the hon. member for Burke has drawn the attention of the House to this matter. From the action of the Government it would appear that it is their duty to supply their own supporters and the public with this information, and to leave hon. members on this side of the House the last in the colony to know a word about it. This paper distinctly states that these Loan Estimates were considered by a caucus of Ministerial supporters; and long before the House met, I read them in a copy of the newspaper referred to which was being supplied in town. This is not the first time this has happened, and I think the hon. member for Burke has a

perfect right to draw attention to it. If it is the intention of the Government to snub hon. members on this side of the House let them do so, but do not let them do it in this way.

Mr. BARLOW said: Mr. Speaker,—When I was addressing the House before, I was prevented from quoting the instructions issued by the hon. the leader of the Opposition to Mr. A. R. H. Pietzcker in connection with the proposed German immigration. I will therefore take this opportunity of reading the instructions issued by Sir S. W. Griffith to the Agent-General on the 11th March, 1885:—

“They (the Government) do not, however, propose to institute a system of immigration agencies on the Continent, as has been done in Great Britain and Ireland, even if such a scheme would be practicable or permitted; but they desire that all facilities that can be afforded by the Government to intending employers should be given. For this purpose Mr. Pietzcker has been appointed to act for Northern Europe. He will act entirely under your direction, and his functions will be to superintend all matters of business connected with the shipment of indentured emigrants, to see that the persons proposed for passengers are of a suitable class; to explain to them the circumstances of the colony, the conditions under which they will have to work, the current rate of wages in the colony, the reasons why they—being unfamiliar with the language and circumstances of the colony—may reasonably expect at first a lower rate of wages than that usually paid, the advantages to be derived from emigration under the constitution and land laws of the colony, and generally to see that the emigrants fully understand the nature of the agreements into which they enter. If the terms of any agreement shall appear to him to be unreasonable, he should point out the fact both to the agent of the employer and to the labourer, so that if the latter should still desire to enter into the agreement he may do so with full knowledge. He will also attest the agreements, as provided in the Immigration Act, and perform such other duties as you may direct. He may, with your approval, make such appointments of sub-agents, exercising similar functions, as experience may prove desirable.”

Those were the instructions issued by Sir S. W. Griffith, then Colonial Secretary, in connection with the so-called cheap German immigration.

The HON. P. PERKINS said: Mr. Speaker,—You might as well have accommodated me half-an-hour ago, but I will take this opportunity of saying what I wanted to say to the hon. member for Maryborough, Mr. Annear, and somebody else, who appears to have gone away. We were talking about the sugar industry; I believe, Mr. Speaker, we can talk about any subject under a motion for adjournment. I am one of those who are ready and willing to vote for any sort of labour that will encourage the sugar industry. I do not come here talking and roaring about my constituents. My constituents are rather an intelligent lot of men. They differ from most other constituencies that other hon. members represent, and they have shown their taste by the member they have elected. However, I have expressed my opinion that I am willing to take any sort of labour that will continue the sugar industry.

Mr. BUCKLAND: Coolies?

The HON. P. PERKINS: Yes; coolies, Chinamen, half-breeds, yellow, blackfellows, or any kind of labour. Does anyone tell me that sugar can be cultivated profitably with any other sort of labour? We know what our own countrymen do at the time when we want them most—that is at the crushing season. It is at such times that they strike for more pay or shorter hours. I am only one of two members in the House who are in favour of any kind of labour for the sugar industry, the other member being the hon. member for Stanley, Mr. O'Sullivan. I do not know what sort of an account he is going to give his constituents, but I am quite ready to square myself with mine. I am quite that the leader of the Opposition with all his ability

and legal training is ready and willing to surrender the opinions he holds in order to set himself right with the people who have elected him to a seat in this House. I venture to say that the hon. gentleman does not really entertain the opinions he has expressed. The hon. gentleman has ruined the sugar industry by the speeches he has made on black labour, by his continual harping on the subject, and by the black labour regulations he has introduced. He has traded on this question, and by his action has destroyed confidence in the industry both in Sydney and Melbourne, and not only in those places, but also in South Australia and the old country. It is a shame and scandal the way he has destroyed confidence in the colony, and it will take all his ability for four or five years to come, to get those people who would have invested their money in the colony, to invest their capital here. And what else has the hon. gentleman done? When the transcontinental railway proposal was introduced he went to London to ruin the hon. member for North Brisbane, Sir Thomas McIlwraith. The hon. gentleman tried to make this House believe that Sir Thomas McIlwraith was going to make a million or so out of the transaction. If the transcontinental railway had been passed we would have had £16,000,000 spent in this colony; we would have had the land because the company could not have carted it away; we would have had the railway, and we would have had 200,000 or 300,000 people introduced here at no cost to the colony. The transaction might have been a bad one for the company, but as far as the colony was concerned, a better speculation it had never entered into. If the people who made the railway lost the money they spent they could have gone back to London or Paris, or wherever they got the money from, and we should have had the railway to travel on. Who is to blame for that proposal being defeated? Why the leader of the Opposition. I ask the hon. gentleman is he not ashamed of himself? I think he ought to stand up and make an apology to this House for what he has done. He has shown that he is narrow-minded and short-sighted, that notwithstanding his law and ability he is not a far-seeing man. The hon. gentleman and his voting machines have nothing to talk about but black labour. That is their capital or stock-in-trade, although, as I believe, the thing is dead and buried. I am one of those who are willing to continue the sugar industry, by black labour, yellow labour, coolies, or half-breeds, and I believe that my friend, the hon. member for Stanley, holds similar views.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said: Mr. Speaker,—I do not know what the hon. member has been talking about, but I took notice of one phrase he made use of. He said he might never have the opportunity of speaking again on the transcontinental line. I suppose it is the ardent wish of every member of the House that he never will. If ever these old lines of Burns were applicable, they are applicable now:—

“Oh, wad some power the giftie gie us
To see oursels as ithers see us.”

The hon. member has been talking this small talk for the past week or two. If he takes my advice he will say as little as he possibly can. That is the only way he can make himself thoroughly agreeable to the House and his friends. Possibly these remarks of mine the hon. member may consider a little rough. They may be, but I can proclaim myself to be as good a friend as the hon. member has got, and I think either side will not disagree with me when I pray that the hon. member may be silent in the future.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said: Mr. Speaker,—I rise to say a word on the question raised by the hon. member for Burke—the

publication of the Loan Estimates before they were presented to Parliament. The paper purports to have been printed at 3 o'clock, and the Estimates were brought down to members of this House at a later hour. Possibly hon. members are not aware of the fact—the members of the Government being somewhat new to office may not know—that it is an invariable rule of parliamentary etiquette that no matter is ever published in the Press until it has been communicated to Parliament. No communication that ought to be made to Parliament is ever made public through the Press until Parliament is made aware of it. Of course we know perfectly well that arrangements are sometimes made for their immediate publication afterwards, as in the case of the Governor's speech. It is very often handed to the Press in advance, so that it may be published as soon as it comes out in the *Gazette*, but it would be an unheard of thing if it was published in the morning paper and delivered by the Governor at 12 o'clock. What the Government have done appears to be somewhat similar. Very likely it has been done through inadvertence, but I think it is an important matter that communications of that sort should be made first to Parliament. I have often been abused for sticking fast to that rule. I never would violate it, and would not yield to pressure. Sometimes something analogous to this case has happened in England by the betrayal of some officer of the Government; but there has always been the greatest indignation expressed, and the officer, if discovered, has been dismissed. I know that once or twice there has been a great disturbance over such a matter. I can only attribute this to the inexperience in office of some members of the Government.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS said: Mr. Speaker,—I quite agree with all that the hon. gentleman has said, and I must confess complete ignorance on the subject. I have not even read the paper yet, and I certainly was under the impression, which is borne out from what the Postmaster-General informs me, that if any publication of the kind took place, it must have been a distinct breach of faith. The Postmaster-General informs me that whatever was given to the Press, was given after a solemn promise that nothing would be divulged until the matter had been placed before Parliament. I can say no more on the subject. I know the rule of Parliament on such subjects, but I know myself that it has been broken by inadvertence sometimes. I am not saying it has been broken here, but I know it has been broken in other colonies and countries. I remember a case of a Governor's speech appearing in the Press before it was delivered, but such things are done by inadvertence. I have only to express regret on the part of the Government that such a thing has occurred.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Hon. J. Donaldson) said: Mr. Speaker,—I regret that the Premier is not here to make a personal explanation, but he assured me that the information was not to be published until after the meeting of the House, and I think hon. members sitting on this side of the House were asked to treat it as confidential until after the House met. Now I saw Mr. Lewis, of the *Telegraph*, this afternoon at 4 o'clock, and he told me that hon. gentlemen sitting on the other side had mentioned to him that the Loan Estimates were published before the House met. He assured me that the *Telegraph* was not circulated until half-past 3 o'clock.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: I was told of it in the library before the House met.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: I am merely stating exactly what I was told. I have not seen the paper yet; but Mr. Lewis gave me that assurance, and said I was at liberty, if the question arose in the House, to mention that the paper was not circulated until half-past 3 o'clock. I am informed by the leader of the Government that he gave the information to the *Telegraph* on the distinct understanding that it was not to be published until Parliament met. If it has been circulated before, of course that is a breach of faith; but Mr. Lewis assured me that it was not. I do not doubt what hon. gentlemen say; but I am merely giving the assurance that I have received in the matter.

Mr. McMASTER said: Mr. Speaker,—I can bear testimony to what the hon. member for Toowoomba has said. I was walking down to the House with the two members for Gympie, when we were overtaken by the hon. member near the Government Printing Office. He asked us if we had seen the extraordinary statement in the *Telegraph* this afternoon. I said, "No; what is it?" He said, "The Loan Estimates are published before they are laid on the table of the House. They may have been published yesterday, but I never saw them." I said, "They were not among my papers this morning." We were here before the House opened, at about twenty minutes past 3 o'clock, and that was where the hon. member picked us up. He evidently knew all about it before he came here. There is not the slightest doubt that the paper was sold in Queen street before the House assembled.

Mr. MELLOR said: Mr. Speaker,—I can bear out what the hon. member for Toowoomba has said. I was very much surprised at the statement, and could scarcely believe that such a breach of etiquette could take place. It was not a wise thing for the Government to treat the Opposition in the way they have done. The matter appeared in the second edition of the *Telegraph*, and that edition was not brought into the library. Hon. members opposite no doubt had the knowledge, and it was circulated through the country no doubt by the second edition of the *Telegraph*; but the only chance I had of seeing it was by sending for a copy of that paper. It is not proper treatment for the Opposition that they should have been kept in the dark in that way when everybody else was given the information.

Mr. HODGKINSON, in reply, said: Mr. Speaker,—The object I had in moving this motion has been fully attained. I had no intention of accusing the Ministry of any indiscreet action, but simply to point out that when communications are made to the Press they should be made with perfect impartiality.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: They will please themselves about their impartiality.

Mr. HODGKINSON: If not as a matter of propriety, then as a matter of policy the present Government should be peculiarly careful about their impartiality in this respect, because the journal that is their organ to-day is their enemy to-morrow; and the journal that slated them yesterday, favours them to-day. We have had practical proof of that. I may say that in addition to the evidence given by members who purchased copies of the *Telegraph* before the House met, it was said—on whose authority I do not know and do not care to know—the question of the Loan Estimates was discussed at a caucus meeting this morning. It is evident that the *Telegraph* had a very great prevision of what was going to happen, because in their first

edition they caution their readers to "Look out for the second edition," and they have this paragraph on the subject:—

"The rumours about impending changes in the Ministry quietened considerably this morning, but we are in a position to state that some excitement may be expected within the next thirty-six hours.

"In our second edition we shall be able to indicate some of the circumstances which may bring it about, as we are in possession of some information of considerable importance."

Having carried out the intention I had in proposing the motion, I beg now, with the leave of the House, to withdraw it.

Motion for adjournment, by leave, withdrawn.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

COMMITTEE.

On the motion of the HON. C. POWERS, the Speaker left the chair, and the House went into committee to consider this Bill in detail.

Clause 1—"Short title"—passed as printed.

On clause 2, as follows:—

"Sections two hundred and twenty-one and so much of section two hundred and twenty-three of the Local Government Act of 1878 as is not already repealed, and the twelfth schedule thereto, are hereby repealed, and the following enactment is substituted therefore:—

"When any such demand as is mentioned in the two hundred and twentieth section of the said Act has been made a poll shall be taken of the ratepayers on a day to be fixed by the chairman of the municipality, not being less than twenty-one nor more than twenty-five clear days after the delivery of such demand, notice of which poll shall be published at least twice in some newspaper circulating in the municipality.

"The poll shall be taken in the manner prescribed for holding elections of councillors, so far as the same can be applied thereto and is consistent herewith.

"The ballot papers to be used at the taking of such poll shall be in the form in the schedule hereto.

"Immediately after the close of the poll the number of votes recorded thereat shall be ascertained in the manner hereinbefore prescribed for ascertaining the number of votes at elections, and the returning officer shall, as soon as conveniently may be on or after the day of the poll, give public notice of the number of votes recorded.

"If the number of votes given against the loan is greater than the number of votes given in favour of the loan, the council shall be forbidden to proceed further with the loan."

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said he understood that the hon. gentleman intended to amend that clause, to correct the mistakes in it which were pointed out on the second reading of the Bill.

The HON. C. POWERS said that some suggestions for an alteration of the clause were made, and if any amendments were proposed that did not alter the principle of the clause, and would tend to give effect to its intentions, they would be accepted. The clause was intended to repeal certain sections of the Local Government Act respecting the manner of recording a vote against a loan, and to substitute other provisions for them. He thought the clause carried out the intention, and it had already been passed by the Legislative Council. It repealed section 221 and part of section 223 of the Local Government Act, and provided for the mode in which the new ballot should be taken for and against a loan. If the leader of the Opposition had any amendment to make which would make the clause clearer it would be accepted.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said he took the trouble, on the second reading of the Bill, to point out a very important defect in the clause, and now he found that the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill seemed to have forgotten all

about it. He really did not think it was his business to propose the amendment; the hon. member should do it himself. He proposed that in the 5th line of the 2nd page of the Bill the following words be added:—

"The presiding officer shall, at the request of any person whose name is on the roll, deliver to such person as many papers as the number of votes to which such person appears by the roll to be entitled."

He had understood the Government intended to move that amendment.

Mr. TOZER said that before that he had a previous amendment to suggest. In the 15th and 16th lines the time was limited to "not less than twenty-one nor more than twenty-five clear days." He considered twenty-eight days should be the limit. The time in the clause might prove unworkable, as it had done at the Gympie poll. If the twenty-first day came on Good Friday, there was nothing but holidays upon which to take the poll. Then it had happened in the case of Gympie that the poll had to be taken at the time of the general election, and they calculated they had only two days, because as Sunday was one of the days they were unable to choose a separate day for the general election. The consequence was that the two elections had to be held on the Saturday, or on the Monday or Tuesday. He moved that the word "five" in the 16th line be omitted with the view of inserting the word "eight."

The HON. C. POWERS said he had no objection to the amendment. They had only mentioned twenty-five days as a reasonable time, as they had to fix some time; but he had no objection to the amendment.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said he would withdraw his amendment, to make way for that moved by the hon. member for Wide Bay.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment—That the word "five" be omitted with the view of inserting the word "eight"—agreed to.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH moved that at the end of the 5th line, in the 2nd page, the following words be added:—

"The presiding officer shall, at the request of any person whose name is on the roll, deliver to such person as many of such papers as are equal to the number of votes it appears by the roll such person is entitled to."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. TOZER said he had drawn the attention of the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill to what had arisen in connection with the voting which took place at Gympie when the poll which had necessitated the introduction of the Bill had been taken. The hon. member for Stanley had also mentioned it. There was a difficulty in ascertaining whether the vote should be taken from the voters' roll or from the ratepayers' roll. There was a very grave doubt as to which of those rolls should be used, and whether the voters' roll applied to any other elections than those for the election of aldermen. The Gympie Municipal Council and himself had taken a great deal of trouble, and he had come to the conclusion that the voters' roll should be used in taking a poll. He wished to remove any doubt which existed, and to say whether a poll should be taken on the basis of the last voters' roll, or from the list of ratepayers. The voters' roll was made out at a certain time, and only included those who had paid their rates by that date. It was quite right that in voting for aldermen only those on the voters' roll should be allowed to vote; but a poll might be taken upon a question affecting the district for forty years, and it might be advisable to allow all ratepayers to vote upon a question of that sort. Though they might be disqualified

from voting for aldermen, for not having paid their rates, still when it was a question as to whether they should borrow £40,000 or £50,000, which would be an absolute charge upon their properties for a long time, they should all be allowed to vote. As they were amending the law, it might be as well to decide the point.

The HON. C. POWERS said the hon. gentleman had not moved any amendment. He considered that in any voting at all they should stick to the voters' roll. If it were proposed to allow all ratepayers to vote, it would be necessary to prepare ratepayers' rolls, as at present the only roll was the voters' roll. Under the existing Act the voting was taken according to the voters' roll, and at any ballot only those persons whose names were on the voters' roll for the current year would be entitled to vote.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said he quite agreed that the voters' roll was the proper roll, but in practice it was never thoroughly carried out. As he had stated on the second reading, in a vote of that importance every freeholder or householder should have a vote, whether he had paid his rates on the 1st November or not, for the reason that at any time the rate-collector chose, he could enforce payment. Of course, the answer to that would be, that a man should pay up his rates on the 1st November and have done with it. But there were plenty of foolish people who would not. At Ipswich the practice had been to appoint a certain class of people as rate-collectors who went to their own people and insisted on their paying the rates on or before the 1st November, so that their names might be put on the roll—those who had the proper ear-mark. To those who had not the proper ear-mark they would not go until after the roll was made up. But a week after the 1st November they went to them and made them pay. Consequently one-half of the ratepayers were not on the roll. He had seen with his own eyes the rate-collector pass the door of a ratepayer without the proper ear-mark before the 1st November, but during the next week if the rate was not paid there was a summons for him. He had had great trouble to get his own tenants and his own people to pay their rates in time; in fact he had had to pay their rates for them to get their names on the roll. That system had been carried on in his town for years, and he defied anyone to contradict it.

Mr. McMASTER said that although the practice alluded to by the hon. member might prevail at Ipswich, he was certain it did not prevail at Brisbane. It was simply a matter of courtesy that the rate-collector went round to collect the rates at all. The Act distinctly provided that the ratepayers should pay their rates at the head office. What was there to prevent those people the hon. member spoke of going to the office and paying their rates?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Simply because they do not know the importance of a vote.

Mr. McMASTER said that if those persons wanted a vote they should not be such fools as to leave their rates unpaid. He could hardly credit their being so far behind in Ipswich as not to know the value of a vote. Every ratepayer's name was in the ratebook, and if the rate was not paid on the 1st November a red line was marked through the name, signifying that the person was not entitled to be put on the voters' roll for the following year. He felt curious to see the ear-mark that the hon. member talked so much about; he wanted to know what it was like, so that he might ascertain if there were any such people in Brisbane. He thought the hon. member was mistaken.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he had lived in the same town as the hon. member for Stanley for twenty-seven years, and he had never before heard the complaint of the hon. member with reference to any particular class of the community being kept purposely off the voters' roll. He had frequently heard of people losing their votes, because they had not paid their rates; indeed, such a thing happened to himself once, but only once. That would happen to anyone, whether ear-marked or not. If the practice complained of existed in Ipswich, it was unknown to him, and he was certain it was not general.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said he supposed the hon. member was too innocent to know that the rate-collector at Ipswich had got the ear-mark too; he had a certain standing and a certain ear-mark. The hon. member accused him, or rather thanked him, for having come down from Stanley to help him to vote for a bridge. He did not call him the member for Stanley, but said he (Mr. O'Sullivan) had come down from Stanley to help him to get a bridge for Ipswich, as if Ipswich belonged to the hon. member. Why he (Mr. O'Sullivan) owned about one-twentieth of Ipswich. He could tell the hon. member that he was the founder and author of the school of arts at Ipswich, of the hospital at Ipswich, and the railway workshops at Ipswich. Those works would never have been established there if it had not been for him. When Coote's tramway was first started by the company, he (Mr. O'Sullivan) said he thought they were too young in the world to think of beginning to make a railway alongside a navigable river, and therefore railway works should be started in Ipswich. That was how the railway works came to be placed there, and the very resolution he carried on that occasion was the ruin of the tramway company, which became insolvent, and the Government had to buy the tramway; and then afterwards carry out the Act with fifty-eight of his amendments to it. Perhaps the next time the hon. member got up, he would again say he was very thankful that he came down from the mountains of Stanley to help him with that bridge. The hon. gentleman certainly said it in a very nice way, and he did not think there was anything in it. But there was nothing more true than that the rate-collector had, from year to year, gone through Ipswich, and those people whom he thought proper to pass had been passed by, until the 1st November was over, and when the roll appeared on that date more than one-third of the ratepayers of Ipswich were off it; and in the following month they were compelled to pay their rates. If the hon. member chose to contradict that statement he (Mr. O'Sullivan) was prepared to give the names of the ratepayers passed over and also the name of the collector.

The HON. C. POWERS said one of the suggestions made at the conference was that ratepayers should have an opportunity of being put on the roll at any time. That would be a matter that could be fully discussed when a Bill dealing generally with the Local Government Act was introduced. At present he thought it would be sufficient to confine it to all persons who were on the roll, because otherwise they must provide the machinery for the new way of taking the roll.

Mr. TOZER said that was not the point he had taken. It was that they were providing machinery which appeared to be in direct contradiction to clause 221 of the present Act. The question now was whether it would not be advisable to put, at the end of the clause, a proviso to the effect that only the ratepayers whose names were on the voters' list should be entitled to vote?

The Hon. A. RUTLEDGE said the practice of many municipalities—he was not at all disposed to think it was a legal practice, but it had never been tested yet—was this: One ratepayer might have, say, a dozen different properties, separately valued and rated. He might pay £30 or £40 in rates; on one property he might have only 5s. to pay, and if he paid £39 15s., and omitted to pay the 5s. on that one property he was put off the voters' roll. It was certainly not right or just that such a man should be deprived of his right to vote. More than one municipality had dealt with him in that way, and he was satisfied that the law did not authorise such proceedings. He hoped that when they were amending the local government laws generally that evil would be remedied. He thought all ratepayers should have a right to vote on the question as to whether a loan should be contracted, whether they had paid their rates or not.

Mr. GLASSEY said he was rather in the dark as to who were considered ratepayers. He was inclined to think that every person who occupied a house, whether he paid rates directly or indirectly, was a ratepayer. He believed he could prove by the highest legal authority probably in the world that such was the case. The question had been fought out in many law courts in the old country, and the qualification for every vote, both in municipal, parliamentary, parochial, or local elections, was based on that fact. Lord Chief Justice Coleridge, when a member of the House of Commons some years ago, in speaking on Mr. Goschen's Local Assessment Act of 1869, declared distinctly that whether a person who occupied a house paid rates directly or indirectly he was to all intents and purposes a ratepayer, and should be possessed of all franchises pertaining thereto; and that view had been held by some of the most eminent legal authorities in England. He was one of a party who took a great interest in having decided in the English law courts what actually constituted a ratepayer, and whether a person who occupied a house and paid the rates or an extra amount in rent, which amounted to the same thing, should be debarred of his right to vote. In the old country in all the local government administration, they had an occupiers' column and a proprietors' column in the rate-book. The occupier's name was inserted for voting purposes, and if the landlord failed to pay the rates the tenant did not lose his franchise. But here, in what he might call an infant country, the question arose who was a ratepayer, and it appeared that unless the occupier of a house paid rates direct, he was not entitled to vote, except he made special arrangements which secured to him that right. The law should be so amended that no special arrangement should be required. They wanted a radical change in the law to enable every occupier, after residing a certain time in the district, to vote on all local matters. The occupiers were affected very materially from a sanitary point of view by the way in which municipal affairs were managed; and as they had the health of themselves and their families to guard, they should have votes. It was absolutely necessary, in the interest of the whole people, that every occupier should have a vote, in order that the best sanitary system possible might be adopted. At the present time they had no vote, and if a local authority's voters' list was compared with the parliamentary electoral roll under the different local authorities, it would be found that the number of names on the former was not one-tenth of those on the latter. He was entirely opposed to a law which prohibited a person from voting unless he paid the rates, and he hoped that they would soon have the law amended in the direction he had indicated.

Mr. BARLOW said that some time ago there was a Rating Bill introduced in the New South Wales Parliament. He was not sure whether that measure had been passed or not, as he had not looked at the statute book. Sydney had got into a bad sanitary condition, as the hon. member for Bundamba had suggested, owing to the voting power being in the hands of the landlords, and that Bill provided that a tenant after residing a certain time in the district, could demand to have his name inserted on the municipal roll for a number of votes proportioned to the rates paid. For instance, if the rates were sufficient qualification for four votes, and there were four tenants, each tenant was entitled to one vote, and the landlord to four votes. With regard to the matter referred to by the hon. member for Charters Towers, Hon. A. Rutledge, he (Mr. Barlow) remembered that on one occasion about five years ago he lost his votes in Ipswich because he did not pay the rates on one single allotment. If his memory served him correctly, he searched the rate-book, or inquired what rates were due, but as that one allotment, valued at £10, was not included, he lost all his votes. He had never been waited upon by a rate-collector.

Mr. GLASSEY said he did not see why any difficulty should arise with regard to a rate-collector calling. In the old country, when the collector called he left a demand note, and the date of his call was put down on that notice in order to protect the ratepayer in his vote. If the collector did not call, the ratepayer could go to the office and pay his rates; but there should be some guarantee or evidence that the collector actually called, and that was furnished by the demand note.

Mr. TOZER said the clause stated that a poll should be taken of the ratepayers, and the ratepayers mentioned in the statute were those who were on the municipal list. He therefore moved that the following amendment be added at the end of the clause:—

At every such poll only those ratepayers whose names are upon the voters' roll then in use shall be entitled to vote.

He did not propose that amendment because he disapproved of the suggestion made by the hon. member for Stanley. He moved the amendment in that form because a good deal more machinery would be required for the proposal of the hon. member for Stanley.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said he failed to see that more machinery would be required to carry out his proposal. It would only be necessary to alter a few words, and say that those who were responsible for the rates, whether they were householders or leaseholders, should be entitled to vote whether the taxes were paid or not. He never could see any reason why the 1st of November should be the day on which the rates should be paid, and he did not think any hon. member could give a reason. He was always under the impression that the date should be the 1st of January. That would not interfere with the election of aldermen, because there would be from the 1st of January till nearly the end of February to make up the roll. People hardly ever thought of paying their rates on the 1st of November; and he had often heard them say that they would prefer that the date should be altered to the 1st of January.

Mr. SMITH said the reason why the rates were made payable on the 1st of November was because the voters' list was made up at the beginning of November. Then the revision court must sit before the beginning of the year, and it was necessary to allow sufficient time for the revision of the roll before the 1st of January, because some of the meetings of the revision

court might lapse. The nominations took place on the first Tuesday in February, and it was necessary that the revised roll should be available for that date. The hon. member for Stanley made a mistake when he said the roll could be prepared between the 1st of January and the 1st of February.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said he never said anything of the kind. He said it could be done between the 1st of January and the end of February. The revision court was only a nominal affair, because the whole matter was settled by the clerk of the municipality. According as the rates were paid the names were put down, and a red mark was made across the names of those who were dead or had left the district. He believed the hon. members for Ipswich would agree with him when he said that in Ipswich all the preliminaries connected with making up the roll could be done in one week; and he was sure that the ratepayers of that municipality would prefer that the limit of time fixed for the payment of rates should be the end of the year. As the elections did not take place until February, they did not see why they should pay their rates in November, or why they should not pay them at the end of the year. There had been hundreds of complaints made to him in Ipswich in reference to the matter. The rates were not payable at the end of the year or at the end of a quarter, but in a nondescript month that they could not remember. The hon. member for Bowen could not have mixed much in municipal matters. The revision of the rolls did not take a day in Ipswich, and he did not believe it took much longer in Brisbane. He had mixed a good deal in municipal matters, and the most painful part of it all was the depth to which municipal matters entered into his pocket. Someone had said that the pocket was the sorest part about a man, and he had always found that to be the case in November. He would much prefer to have the evil day postponed for a month or two. If that postponement would throw the work of the council back for one hour he would not ask it; but he hoped the hon. member for Wide Bay would take some notice of the remarks made by the hon. member for Bundamba, that whether the rates were paid or not, householders, and those who were responsible, should be able to vote upon any important matter.

Mr. McMASTER: If that were the case, we would never get any rates.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said if that were the case, why should municipalities employ rate-collectors? They never could get the rates in without a rate-collector.

Mr. BARLOW said if there were no rate-collectors he did not think there would be any rates at all in some municipalities. He did not believe that people would pay for the sake of voting. In regard to the statement about rate-collecting in Ipswich, he was not aware of what had been said. He believed that the rate-collector there raked in all the money he could before the 1st of November, because his credit with his employers depended upon how much money he collected. He had heard many complaints about dunning for money; people of all shades of political opinion had told him the same thing.

The HON. C. POWERS said he was prepared to accept the amendment of the hon. member for Wide Bay, because the machinery was already provided. He did not think they could go into the whole question of voting at the present time; but he might say that, as the occupier ultimately paid the rates, he should have the vote. The occupier had to pay the rates in the shape of rent, if he did not pay them directly. When

he was acting as returning officer, he saw a man come in and apply for fifteen voting-papers, and he obtained them. First of all, he asked for voting-papers for himself, and then he asked for them for himself and a partner, both of whom appeared upon the roll as rate-payers. Then as chairman of a company, owning land, he asked for and obtained three voting-papers. But that matter could not be dealt with at present, and neither could that regarding the 1st of November. He presumed the 1st of November was the date chosen, because the endowments were paid upon the rates received during the previous year, and those who had not paid rates would be able to do so by the end of the year. He hoped hon. members would see their way to accept the amendment.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said if the hon. gentleman was prepared to accept the amendment, he was not. His opinion was that everyone who was entitled to vote, whether his rates were paid upon the 1st of November or not, should be allowed to vote, and he understood that was what the hon. member for Bundamba was urging. In reference to what had been said by the hon. member for Ipswich, he might state that he had not been referring, in the remarks he had made previously, to the present rate-collector in Ipswich who was a manly, friendly, honest man, who had always done his duty remarkably well, and he was glad the hon. member had given him that opportunity of saying so. He had referred to something that took place some years ago.

Mr. GLASSEY said he wanted to make this clear: that in all cases the property should be held responsible for the rates, but the occupier should have the vote.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said the amendment before them would not have that effect.

Mr. WATSON said it would be a great pity if a ratepayer was disqualified for the want of paying a portion of his rates. He recollected the leader of the Opposition deciding a case in favour of Mr. Merry at Bulimba, who had paid £8, and neglected to pay 5s. The amendment of the hon. member for Wide Bay did not go far enough.

Mr. SMITH said he had been accused of ignorance by the hon. member for Stanley. He wished to show that he was right and the hon. member wrong. The voters' list had to be made up on the 2nd day of November. Then a public notice was to be inserted in the local paper, giving seven days' notice of the roll being open to inspection. After that the revision court sat at any time between 20th November and the 1st December. His contention was that, if the court did not sit on the day appointed there would be an adjournment for seven days, so that that would bring it up to nearly the end of the year. The Act wisely allowed time for those processes to be gone through. As to a roll being made up in two hours, he had never heard of such a thing.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said by the hon. member's own showing that brought it up to twenty days.

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

On clause 3, as follows:—

"Section two hundred and fifty-eight of the said last-mentioned Act shall hereafter be read and construed as if the words 'or concrete' had been originally inserted therein instead of the words 'iron or other incombustible material.'"

The HON. C. POWERS said he would move the clause, but the objections which had been raised against it were so apparent that he would not press it.

Clause put and negatived.

On clause 4, as follows:—

"Any by-law made for the registration of dogs or goats may impose reasonable fees or charges for or in respect of such registration."

The HON. C. POWERS said reference had been made to some proposed amendment in connection with that clause in reference to the Towns Police Act, but he did not think the municipal authorities would pass any by-law where the police could not take the matter in hand.

Mr. MORGAN: Why should the fees go to the consolidated revenue?

The HON. C. POWERS said the fees went to the municipal authorities.

Mr. GROOM said dogs were registered under the Towns Police Act, and the fees went to the Treasury.

The HON. C. POWERS said perhaps hon. members were under the impression that by putting the Towns Police Act in force they could deal with dogs, but they wanted to deal with goats also.

The HON. A. RUTLEDGE said it was necessary to have a provision of that sort. By the Local Government Act Amendment Act of 1886 the municipal council were authorised to make provision for the registration of dogs and goats. The thing which had been omitted was provision for charging a fee for registration. The clause seemed to be the complement of the amending Act of 1886. Licenses in respect of dogs could only be demanded in those towns which had been proclaimed under the provisions of the Dog Act.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked if he understood the hon. gentleman to say that the Dog Act fees went to the general revenue?

The HON. C. POWERS said the existence of the Towns Police Act did not affect them. There was a special Dog Act which was only in force in a few towns, and was only extended by proclamation.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said he had simply asked what became of the money. Did the municipalities get it?

Mr. GROOM: They will get it under this clause.

The HON. C. POWERS said it was intended to give the councils power to impose the fee.

Mr. STEPHENS said he was surprised to see so much fuss made over the clause. In South Brisbane they imposed fees for the registration of dogs, and the people paid them. They had a police magistrate over there who was a very good-natured sort of fellow, and he had said he would see whether he collected the fees or allowed the council to collect them. The municipal council said they would collect the fees, and they did collect them, and everything was going on smoothly.

Mr. MORGAN said it was all very well to tell them what they did in South Brisbane. They did many strange things there. The point was that if those powers were given to the municipalities they would come into conflict with the police authorities in the collection of the fees, and the result of that would be that the people would evade payment and the work would not be efficiently done. It would be useless to pass the clause unless the Government instructed the police authorities not to interfere with that sort of revenue which properly belonged to the local authorities.

Mr. McMASTER said that in North Brisbane the police collected the fees for the registration of dogs, and the money was paid into the consolidated revenue. All the local authority had to do was to find a well to drown unregistered

dogs in and to bury them when they were drowned, and any dogs that might be found dead in the streets, and those came to a considerable number of late. Within the last month the municipal council had to bury something like 100 dogs. He did not think the Bill would enable the Municipal Council of Brisbane to make a by-law for the registration of dogs and receive the fees. He would be very glad if it did, but he thought the people would still continue to go to the police court to register their dogs.

Mr. GROOM said he was sure the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill had no desire to do any injustice. He would take the Municipality of Toowoomba to illustrate what he wished to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to, as he was practically acquainted with that municipality. The Act for abating the nuisance occasioned by dogs had by proclamation been extended to the town of Toowoomba, and was in force there, and under it, dogs had to be registered on the 30th September in each year. It had been suggested that the Government should withdraw the proclamation where the Act was in force, and where the municipal council passed by-laws for the registration of dogs; but it should be remembered that the Act contained provisions of a most important character, and which it was not desirable should be withdrawn. For instance, there was one section which said—

"And be it enacted that if any dog shall in any street of the said towns or upon any highway in any part of the said colony, rush at or attack any person, or horse, or bullock, whereby any person shall be endangered or property injured, the owner or keeper of every such dog shall forfeit and pay a penalty or sum of not less than twenty shillings nor more than five pounds for every such offence over and above the amount of any damage which such dog may have occasioned."

It was therefore evident that it would be very serious to withdraw the proclamation enforcing the Act, and it would be better that the police should be instructed not to interfere with the registration of dogs under the Act.

Mr. REES R. JONES moved the omission of the words "dog or" in the first line of the clause. That would make the clause apply only to goats.

The HON. A. RUTLEDGE said there was a difficulty about that, as in places to which the Act was extended there would be no provision for the registration of dogs.

Mr. REES R. JONES said the Act could be easily extended to any municipality by proclamation. He did not want to have two different Acts under which people would be liable to pay a registration fee for dogs. The people should not be harassed in that way, and he thought they should defer the matter until they had a new Dog Act similar to the one they had in New South Wales, which applied to the whole of the colony, and under which every person owning a dog must register it, and pay a license fee for it, unless it was a sheep or cattle dog. The mongrels that existed in some of the country districts were a greater nuisance than those in the town.

The HON. A. RUTLEDGE said the hon. gentleman's argument would be all very well if their municipalities were confined to towns to which the proclamation of the Act could be extended, but they had a number of shires. There was the Shire of Toowong, for instance, and that comprised not only the suburb of Toowong, but a large extent of country all round it, and there was the Shire of Ithaca. They could not extend the Dog Act by proclamation to those places, and the consequence would be that there the dogs would go scot-free, and the councils would not have the power to impose a registration fee upon them.

It was really a matter for departmental arrangement, and the Government might very easily instruct the police that where any municipal authority made provision for the registration of dogs, they should mind their own business and not meddle with the registration of dogs at all.

Mr. REES R. JONES said the clause only provided for the registration of dogs and the imposing of reasonable fees.

The HON. A. RUTLEDGE: They can register dogs under the Act of 1886.

Mr. REES R. JONES said it would be better to defer the matter until they had a proper Dog Act for the whole colony, the administration of which was in the hands of the municipalities and divisional boards.

The HON. C. POWERS said that as there might be some clashing between the local authorities and the police, he would move an amendment providing that the by-law should not be in force in any town to which the provisions of the Dog Act had been extended by proclamation.

The HON. A. RUTLEDGE: Then the municipalities will not get the revenue.

The HON. C. POWERS said it would not be fair to allow two fees to be charged, and if they passed that clause that could be done. The Governor in Council was not likely to extend the provisions of the Dog Act to any place unless at the request of the local authorities, and, in order to prevent two charges being made, he would introduce a proviso dealing with the question.

The HON. A. RUTLEDGE said no proviso was needed, as it could be done by a departmental arrangement. Of course the law in force could not be repealed by departmental arrangement, but it might be allowed to remain in abeyance by the police. There need be no collision between the police and the local authorities, because in cases where the municipal authorities had by-laws dealing with the subject, the people would register their dogs under the municipality. In reference to what had been said by the hon. member for North Rockhampton, he would point out that by paragraph 10 of clause 2 in the Local Government Act of 1886 a municipality might impose by-laws—

"Regulating the registration of dogs and goats, and authorising the sale or destruction of unregistered dogs or goats."

All that was now wanted was the power to impose a registration fee for dogs.

Mr. McMASTER said that if the local authorities destroyed dogs and they had no Act of Parliament to authorise it, but merely a by-law, some person might inquire by what authority it was done, and might prosecute the municipality. No by-law could override an Act of Parliament. It would be best to leave the clause as it was until a proper measure was introduced.

Mr. REES R. JONES said that with the permission of the Committee he would withdraw his amendment, after what had been said by the hon. member for Charters Towers. The municipalities could make by-laws providing for the registration, sale, or destruction of dogs or goats, and if they destroyed the dogs or goats they would not be liable to an action.

Mr. GROOM said that those hon. members who had had any experience in local government knew that collision did occur, and that two fees were exacted from people, and now the Committee was being asked to legalise that. Under the section of the Act of 1886 which had been referred to, the municipal authorities

had no power to levy fees; but it was now proposed to give them that power, and the result would be that there would be collision with the police. In the municipality of Toowoomba, to which the provisions of the Dog Act extended, the police compelled the registration of dogs before the 30th of September, or else the dogs were shot. If that clause were agreed to the inspector of nuisances could go to a man and ask for a registration fee for a dog, and if it were not paid he might summon the man. Who were to be masters—the police or the municipal council?

Mr. REES R. JONES said it could be easily remedied by a proviso to the effect that wherever by-laws dealing with the subject were in force the Dog Act should not apply.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. STEPHENS said he trusted the Bill would pass as it was, as the local authorities should manage all such matters. In South Brisbane, although the Dog Act was in force there, there was no difficulty, as the matter was arranged between the clerk of petty sessions and the town clerk.

Mr. McMASTER said he wished to understand whether the local authorities would get the fees if they went to the trouble to register all the dogs. He failed to see why if the local authorities had all the trouble they should not get the registration fees. If they got those fees the local authorities would be only too glad to undertake the registration; but as long as the police had the power to register dogs the fees would be taken to the police court, and the police and the local authorities would be at loggerheads.

Clause put and passed.

The HON. C. POWERS moved the insertion of the following new clause to follow clause 4 of the Bill:—

It will not be necessary to register dogs under the Act entitled an Act for abating the nuisances occasioned by dogs in the streets of certain towns and on highways in New South Wales, wherever such by-law shall be made and fees imposed.

Clause put and passed.

The HON. A. RUTLEDGE moved that the following new clause be inserted to follow the last new clause:—

Any by-law heretofore made by a municipality, which would have been valid if made after the passing of this Act, is hereby declared to have been valid.

The HON. C. POWERS said it would make the proposed clause clearer if, after "by-law" the words "for the registration of dogs or goats" were inserted.

The HON. A. RUTLEDGE said the only possible subject the clause as proposed could apply to was the registration of dogs or goats. If municipalities chose to make by-laws about railways, or loans, or anything else that was *ultra vires*, the passing of the clause would not validate them. It only referred to by-laws which were not valid now; but which would have been valid if the Act had been in force at the time they were made. There was no necessity for the insertion of the words suggested by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. REES R. JONES said he objected to a clause giving an indemnity to the mayor of South Brisbane and one or two other places where they had taken money without legal authority to do so. He did not think it came within the scope of the Bill.

The HON. A. RUTLEDGE said the same provision was inserted in the Act of 1884, and for the same purpose, because certain things had been done as matters of convenience. Some municipalities had charged fees, for which there

was no legal authority, for the registration of goats; and unless there was a clause of that sort any person who had paid 2s. 6d. for having his goat registered would have an action for damages against the municipality.

The HON. C. POWERS said he would move the insertion of "such" after "any."

The HON. A. RUTLEDGE said how could there be "such" by-laws unless they were made under that Act? The by-laws referred to were by-laws made before the Act came into existence. The word was out of place.

The HON. C. POWERS moved that after the word "by-law," the following words be inserted, "for the registration of dogs or goats."

Mr. STEPHENS said he clearly understood what the hon. member for Charters Towers meant, and he thought the hon. member was quite right. If the word "such" were inserted it could only refer to by-laws made after the passing of the Act. What the hon. member wished was to validate by-laws passed before the Act came into operation, and that could have been passed afterwards.

Mr. MORGAN said he thought the words proposed to be inserted were unnecessary. The clause was perfectly clear as it stood. It simply meant that by-laws which were *ultra vires* before the passing of the clause would be no longer so when the clause was passed. They would be validated.

The HON. C. POWERS said there was no objection to validating the by-laws.

Mr. REES R. JONES said he would suggest that the clause should be made to read "Any by-law hereafter made for any such purpose shall be," and so on.

Mr. McMASTER said the matter had been explained very clearly by the hon. member for Charters Towers. A by-law that had been passed a month ago would continue to be *ultra vires* until the clause proposed was passed. The clause would validate such by-laws. Clause 4 already mentioned dogs and goats, and what was the use of repeating the same thing over again.

The HON. C. POWERS said he quite understood the argument of the hon. member for Charters Towers. If the proposed new clause formed part of the previous clause dealing with dogs and goats it would apply; but it was an entirely new clause in the Local Government Act Amendment Act, and he did not think it would apply in the way the hon. gentleman had pointed out.

The HON. A. RUTLEDGE said no language could be simpler than that which he had used. His new clause simply provided that by-laws which would have been valid if made after the passing of that Bill, should be declared valid, although they were made before the passing of it.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. H. M. Nelson) said the hon. member had not shown that any harm could arise from the insertion of the words moved by the hon. member for Burrum. They would make the clause complete, and remove all doubt. It did not follow that because the hon. member for Charters Towers had no doubt on the point that a doubt did not exist. It was simply a matter of stubbornness on the part of the hon. member.

The HON. A. RUTLEDGE: It will make the hole thing ridiculous

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

New clause put and passed.

Mr. STEPHENS said there was another new clause he should like to see inserted. The Divisional Boards Act gave power to the authorities to destroy noxious weeds, and he thought the same power should be included in the Local Government Act; but he would not press the clause that night.

Clause 5 passed as printed.

On the schedule, as follows:—

"The Schedule.

Municipality of [name].

Proposed loan for [state nature of work].

FOR.

AGAINST.

"NOTE.—Strike out 'for' or 'against' according to the way you wish to vote."

Mr. BARLOW said he was sure that the schedule as it stood would lead to no end of confusion and inconvenience.

Mr. MORGAN said he had an amendment to propose—that all the words in the schedule, with the exception of "for" and "against" be omitted. The object of all recent legislation had been to make matters of that kind as simple as possible. Hon. members took it for granted that all voters had some common sense; but as the schedule stood in the Act it had led to any amount of confusion. He would like to see simply the words "for" and "against" inserted with regard to a loan, because the voters could clearly understand what they were voting for.

Mr. GROOM said that, like the hon. member for Warwick, he had had some experience with regard to municipalities, and he knew that the simpler they made voting-papers the more easily were they understood by the voters. He had consulted the leader of the Opposition on that matter, and the hon. gentleman was good enough to say that it would meet the difficulty if the ballot-paper simply contained the words "for the loan" and "against the loan," one line above the other, leaving the voter to strike out the top or bottom line as he wished to vote.

Mr. TOZER said they must make it plain what the voter should strike out. In England voters had to put a cross opposite the name of the person they voted for, and many persons when they came out here did not understand how to vote. He would assimilate the voting in connection with loans, to the voting at municipal elections.

Mr. SAYERS said he could bear out the view that the simpler the voting-paper was made the better. The local option ballot-paper was one of the most absurd things he had ever seen in his life, and he had known a number of men to vote in the opposite way to that in which they intended to vote. If "for the loan" and "against the loan" were only printed on the ballot-paper people would understand what they had to do.

The HON. C. POWERS said he would accept the suggestion to have two lines on the voting paper—namely, "for the loan" and "against the loan," printed one above the other, and he would alter the note so as to read "Strike out 'for the loan,' or 'against the loan,' according to the way you wish to vote." He moved the omission of the words "municipality of [name], proposed loan for [state nature of work]."

Amendment put and passed.

The HON. C. POWERS moved that after the word "for" there be inserted the words "the loan."

Amendment put and passed.

The HON. C. POWERS moved that after the word "against" there be inserted the words "the loan."

Amendment put and passed.

The HON. C. POWERS moved that after the word "for" in the "note" to the schedule there be inserted the words "the loan."

Mr. BARLOW said he would suggest that the directions be left out of the voting paper. If they printed the words "for the loan" and "against the loan" in two separate lines people would know that if they wished to vote for the loan they must strike out the words "against the loan" and *vice versa*. It was a great mistake to put in those directions, especially as no directions were printed on parliamentary ballot-papers.

Mr. STEPHENS said the Bill stated that the ballot should be taken in the same manner as the ballot for councillors; but there were no directions on the ballot-papers for councillors. If a person wished to vote for a councillor, he simply left the name clear, without any mark of any kind; and he thought it would be much better if all ballot-papers, whether for loans, councillors, or members of Parliament, were printed in exactly the same way. He had had experience in taking different kinds of polls, and he knew that there was often a difficulty in explaining to people how they should vote.

Amendment put and passed.

The HON. C. POWERS moved that after the word "against," there be inserted the words "the loan."

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

The House resumed, and the CHAIRMAN reported the Bill with amendments. The report was adopted, and the third reading of the Bill made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Adjourn!

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS said: Mr. Speaker,—I think it is rather hard after having lost so many hours that we should not get through the next item on the paper. The Diseases in Sheep Act Amendment Bill is not a contentious measure, and could be got through in five or ten minutes. No member of the Government wishes to force business on at this hour unless hon. members are willing; and if hon. members object to going on now, I will move the adjournment.

Mr. MACFARLANE said: Mr. Speaker,—There is no objection to going on with the Bill if the members on the Ministerial side will make a House; but we do not see why we should make a House to transact Government business.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: The members belonging to this side are in the building.

The HON. A. RUTLEDGE said: Mr. Speaker,—I do not know as much about the Diseases in Sheep Act Amendment Bill as I should like, and I do not think we should go on with the measure in the absence of those qualified to speak on the subject. I object to going on now.

ADJOURNMENT.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS said: Mr. Speaker,—I move that this House do now adjourn. The business to-morrow will be Supply.

Question put and passed.

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