

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 9 OCTOBER 1889**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 9 October, 1889.

Petition—claim of Margaret Cockfield.—Questions.—Questions Without Notice—vote on account—state of the loan votes.—Companies Act Amendment Bill—message to the Legislative Council.—Local Government Acts Amendment Bill—third reading.—Formal Motion.—Harbours Bill—first reading.—Supply—the sugar industry.—Adjournment.

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

## PETITION.

## CLAIM OF MARGARET COCKFIELD.

The HON. A. RUTLEDGE presented a petition from Margaret Cockfield, of Charters Towers, widow, praying for relief for loss sustained by reason of her late husband, John Frederick Cockfield, having been dispossessed of a piece of land granted to him under occupation license in 1879, and since granted to the Dalrymple Divisional Board; and moved that it be read.

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

On the motion of the HON. A. RUTLEDGE, the petition was received.

## QUESTIONS.

Mr. ISAMBERT asked the Colonial Treasurer—

How much money has been paid each year to the British India Company during their term of contract up to date, in addition to the annual subsidy of £55,000—

1. For the immigration service?
2. For freight and other services?

The COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. W. Pattison) replied—

1. The total amount paid for passage money is £902,653.

2. The total amount paid for freight and other services is £125,524.

The total subsidy amounts to £443,706, which makes a total of £1,471,883. For the information of hon. members I will now lay upon the table a return showing the exact amount paid each year under the above heads. I move that the paper be printed.

The SPEAKER said: I would point out to the hon. gentleman that the paper being an answer to a question will necessarily be printed, and that no special motion is required.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.

## VOTE ON ACCOUNT.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said: Mr. Speaker,—I will ask the Colonial Treasurer, if I may, without notice, if the vote on account for the current year has been exhausted. I think it must have been; if so, what arrangements have been made for paying current liabilities.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said: Mr. Speaker,—The vote has been exhausted. The Auditor-General has signed the usual warrant in accordance with past practice. The general Estimates have been protracted so long that we have been obliged to adopt that course; but, considering that a certain amount has been passed, the Auditor-General has seen no objection.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: When I did that, there was a great row.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: It was the usual custom of the late Government, and I am following the example they set me,

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH : We had to introduce a Bill in 1887 to put it right.

#### STATE OF THE LOAN VOTES.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said : Mr. Speaker,—I wish to ask the Colonial Treasurer whether he will lay on the table of the House at an early date a return showing in detail the present state of all the loan votes. I can, of course, give notice of motion for the return, but I think the Government should supply it without an order.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said : Mr. Speaker,—I shall have much pleasure in laying all the information available before the House before the Loan Estimates are brought on for consideration—probably on Tuesday next. By that time the information will be available.

#### COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

##### MESSAGE TO THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Hon. J. Donaldson) said : Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that this Bill be returned to the Legislative Council with the following message :—

MR. PRESIDENT,—

The Legislative Assembly having had under consideration the Legislative Council's message, of date 24th September last, relative to the Companies Act Amendment Bill—

Disagree to the Legislative Council's amendment upon their amendment in clause 18 (clause 17 as now printed).—Because it is desirable for the protection of the public that any change in the capital of the company should appear on the memorandum of association.

Agree to the Legislative Council's amendment upon their amendment in clause 21 (clause 23, line 27, as now printed).

Agree to the Legislative Council's amendment upon their amendment in clause 22 (clause 24 as now printed).

Agree to the Legislative Council's amendments in the new clause following clause 22 (clause 25 as now printed).

Insist on the transposition of clauses 23, 24, and 25 (clauses 18, 20, and 21, as now printed), and on their amendment in clause 25 (clause 21 as now printed).—Because the clauses refer to the same matter, and as transposed by the Legislative Assembly, are in the same order as in the Imperial Act from which they are adapted. The amendment of clause 21 is necessary, to prevent conflict with clause 51 (clause 44 as now printed).

Insist on their amendment in clause 23 (clause 29 as now printed).—Because intending shareholders, and persons dealing with the company, are more likely to obtain full information through the statement made in memorandum of association.

Insist on their amendment in clause 30 (clause 31 as now printed).—Because it is dangerous to allow registration of transfer without the signature of the transferee.

Insist on their amendments in clause 43 (clause 36 as now printed).—Because this Act only deals with companies under the Companies' Act of 1863.

And do not insist on the other amendments with which the Legislative Council disagree.

Question put and passed.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

##### THIRD READING.

On the motion of the HON. C. POWERS, this Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be returned to the Legislative Council, by message in the usual form.

##### FORMAL MOTION.

The following formal motion was agreed to :—

By Mr. HODGKINSON—

That there be laid upon the table of the House, all letters, papers, telegrams, reports, and instructions relating to a purchase, or proposed purchase, of horses by Inspector Douglas, on behalf of the Police Department, from Messrs. Sutherland and Dickson, of Normanston.

#### HARBOURS BILL.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS (Hon. J. M. Macrossan) in moving—

That leave be given to introduce a Bill for the better regulation, management, and improvement of harbours, and for other purposes relating thereto—

said : Mr. Speaker,—It will be in the recollection of many hon. members that during the last Parliament a motion was moved by the then member for Townsville, Mr. Brown, dealing with the management of ports and harbours, and a great deal of sympathy was expressed by hon. members on both sides, and especially by the present leader of the Opposition, with that motion, but I think it was decided that it was not proper to insist that anything should be done during that session of Parliament. The Bill that I now ask for leave to introduce has been framed for the purpose of carrying out the idea suggested in that motion. It is a general Bill, and does not apply to any particular harbour ; but the people connected with any harbour wishing to take advantage of it will get a special Bill passed asking for certain powers, as is done in several places, and especially in New Zealand. A great deal of information has been obtained by the Harbours and Rivers Department for the purpose of framing this Bill, and especially from New Zealand and from Melbourne, where the harbour trust system has been successfully carried out. It is not intended to go any further with the Bill than to lay it on the table of the House, so that it may be placed in the hands of hon. members that they may digest it during the recess, and also for the purpose of obtaining intelligent comments upon it from gentlemen connected with harbours and rivers, and from the Press. The Bill is, of course, too long to justify us in entertaining the idea of putting it to a second reading this session, therefore I think there is no necessity for me to say much upon the subject. I was rather surprised at the hon. member for Burke (Mr. Hunter) taking the most unusual course of objecting to the Bill being introduced. That is a course which I do not remember to have been taken in this House before. However, as I have stated, it is not the intention of the Government to proceed with the Bill further than to have it introduced and placed in the hands of hon. members and before the country. I think, Mr. Speaker, I may very reasonably ask for leave to introduce a Bill for the better regulation, management, and improvement of harbours, and for other purposes relating thereto.

Mr. HUNTER said : Mr. Speaker,—The reason I called not formal to this motion was because I understood it was the intention of the Government to go on with the Bill after it was introduced. I thought some explanation was necessary on account of the speech in introducing the Gold Fields Act Amendment Bill, which the Minister for Mines and Works delivered. That Bill was read a second time early this session, and it contains some very valuable provisions of importance to the mining industry. It contains clauses to prohibit Chinese and other aliens obtaining miners' rights upon our goldfields, and many other valuable matters are dealt with in it, and I thought if the Government could see their way clear to go on with another Bill, that Bill being a short measure, should first receive consideration. During the passage of the Mines Regulation Bill the Minister for Mines and Works asked us to strike out clauses relating to gold returns being furnished by millionaires monthly or quarterly as the House might think fit. The mining members were agreeable that those clauses should be struck out of the Bill, believing that this Gold Fields Act

Amendment Bill would become law and that they would be embodied in it. It now appears that that Bill is to be shelved, and I thought it my duty before any other Bill was introduced to ask for some explanation as to whether the Gold Fields Bill would be proceeded with if there was sufficient time to proceed with the new Bill.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said: Mr. Speaker,—I do not know, of course, what is in the Bill, but I cannot conceive of a Bill dealing with harbours that does not relate to trade. And a Bill relating in any way to trade must be introduced in committee.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: I quite understand that, but, as I have said, it is not the intention to go on with it; only to put it in the hands of hon. members.

Question put and passed.

#### FIRST READING.

On the motion of the MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS, the Bill, having been presented, was read a first time, and the second reading made an Order of the Day for that day fortnight.

#### SUPPLY.

##### THE SUGAR INDUSTRY.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that you do now leave the chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to further consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. GLASSEY said: Mr. Speaker,—Before you leave the chair, as I daresay you, Sir, and most hon. members are aware, there is a small account outstanding since Friday last which it is desirable should be squared up. I do not think the course I am about to take will have come upon the Government or upon hon. members with surprise, as it was pretty well understood that this course would be taken on the first opportunity to vindicate the rights of hon. members to address this House on a question which they consider of some importance, and upon which they consider something should be said. It must be within your recollection, that a most extraordinary course was adopted by the Government on Friday evening last to stifle free discussion. Notwithstanding the plausible excuses set up for the course then pursued by the Government, I think it was unprecedented, not only in the history of this colony or of any of the Australasian colonies, but in the histories of older countries of the world. I was deprived on that occasion of the liberty to offer certain observations I had intended to make, and there is no other course left me than the one I am now pursuing. I may say I take this course with some degree of regret. I regret it because it is necessary, and still more I regret that the Government should have resorted to what I regard as despicable means to obtain a party advantage under most extraordinary circumstances. We all pride ourselves upon being ruled by the majority, and we have reason to do so; but it is well that a Government should understand that they should rule with some degree of circumspection, and it is not wise at all times for a Government with the advantage of overwhelming numbers at their back to take a course which is extreme, which may be used, when a struggle arises, by others as well as by themselves. It is well to have a giant's strength, but it is not at all times wise to use it with a giant's power. I contend that the Government on Friday, knowing full well that they had a giant's strength, used that strength with a giant's power, and adopted extraordinary means by the assistance of an unscrupulous

majority to gain an advantage. It has been contended that there were several opportunities when we might have spoken on the sugar question. That is perfectly true. There have been opportunities; but when it was conveyed to hon. members on this side—and conveyed with perfect accuracy—that it was intended to carry the discussion right through the session without coming to a division upon it, it would not have been wise, we considered, for hon. members on this side to lend themselves to that, and consequently we remained silent, allowing others to take that course. We determined we would be no parties to such a thing as that. That is the reason why hon. members on this side refrained from speaking when opportunity offered. It has also been said that I on one occasion moved the adjournment of the debate for the purpose of speaking. It is perfectly true that I moved the adjournment of the debate, but before I did so I informed the hon. member for Herbert that I was anxious to do so for the purpose of giving the hon. member for South Brisbane, Mr. Jordan, an opportunity of speaking on the day when the debate was to be resumed. We all know the keen interest which that hon. gentleman has taken in the abolition of black labour in the colony from the very inception of the movement—if indeed he was not the first to initiate the opposition to black labour. At the time I moved the adjournment of the debate the hon. member for South Brisbane was too unwell to remain and speak that night, and to give him an opportunity of doing so, I moved the adjournment of the debate, but I did not intend to speak myself. The question arises as to how the matter now stands. We had a long discussion on the subject yesterday, and some hon. members were extremely anxious to put themselves right with the country and their constituents for the vote they gave on the subject of black labour on the Thursday previous. It does not require a very astute student to ascertain how the matter now stands. The Government and most of their supporters were pledged against the reopening of the black labour question, but, unfortunately, when the matter came to a division on the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, and they had an opportunity of giving effect to their pledges, they were found on the other side, voting against that amendment. That party, to the number of thirty-one, voted against the amendment which declared that the coloured labour question should not be reopened, and they also voted that no encouragement should be given to the sugar industry. The coloured labour question may be reopened at any time. That is how the matter now stands. I apprehend that it will require a tremendous amount of explanation from those hon. members to change the minds of the country, and to make the people believe that that is not the situation to-day. Hon. members opposite may say, "We did not vote for black labour, or for its continuance," as much as they like, but by their votes, as recorded in the "Votes and Proceedings," they unquestionably declared that the black labour question may be reopened at any time, and that no encouragement shall be given to the sugar industry. An hon. member said that if I had been permitted to speak on Friday last it was my intention to move an amendment on the motion. That is so, and I have the amendment with me now. I believe there are other industries in the colony which need encouragement as well as the sugar industry. In fact, I am not acquainted with a single industry in Queensland which at the present time is not more or less languishing and requiring encouragement. What form that encouragement should take is not for me to say,

but the amendment I proposed to move on the motion of the hon. member for Herbert, was this: To omit the words "sugar industry," with the view of inserting the words, "manufacturing and other producing industries of the colony;" so that we should have an opportunity of devising the best means possible for encouraging not only the sugar, but all our manufacturing and producing industries. However, I was not permitted to move that amendment, and I regret that I should have been forced to take the course I am now taking; but the right of free speech must be vindicated, and that is why I feel impelled to take the course I am now pursuing. I have no doubt that the Government thought they had arranged the time so nicely for coming to a division on last Thursday, that nothing more could be said. No doubt they considered themselves smart on that occasion; but did they think for one moment that members on this side were not observers of their little game? If so, I can assure them that they were mistaken, and I have no doubt that as we proceed they will be mistaken on other matters. Hence they were extremely annoyed with the efforts which were then made to continue the discussion, and they then took an extraordinary course, and did what, in my opinion, was illegal. They took a course which, I fear, will be bitterly repented of by some persons, and which may do injury in the future. If it were possible to reverse the decision arrived at on Friday night, I should be extremely pleased. You, Sir, will pardon me for referring to the matter, as my sentiments may be considered to be those of an interested party; but I consider your ruling was a most just one. I think your ruling, Mr. Speaker, was a most just one. But the Government finding their little efforts foiled, determined to rely upon their overwhelming majority, and took a most unusual course. If we were inclined to be unscrupulous when opportunity offers, I would remind them that two parties can play at that game. I should regret if the party I am connected with should attempt it; but you may rely upon it that on every occasion when the opportunity offers, we shall assert and vindicate our rights to the best of our ability, and avenge our wrongs as well. It is a very sweet subject, this sugar question, and we are very loth to leave it; and, possessing a natural propensity for sweet things, I want to have a little taste of it myself. I have never heard so many encomiums passed on black men in my life as during this discussion. In fact, the black man has been turned into the white man, and the white man into the black man. Every statement uttered in favour of the black man from the Government side of the House seemed to be received with a considerable amount of satisfaction, and the responses were generally responses of applause. On the other hand, sentiments of an opposite character with regard to white men, and particularly when it was said they could not do so and so, were generally received with the same show of applause. In fact, with that party, the black man seems to be a favourite, while the white man, who always endeavours, and I trust always will endeavour, to obtain a reasonable wage for a fair and reasonable day's work, is sometimes considered a very objectionable character. We were told some time ago, that there was no necessity to make any fuss about this black labour business, that the question was settled long ago, and some persons were very angry with the leader of the Opposition when he said, "I wish I could believe so." Indeed it was considered he was a man very void of faith. But I think that those who have watched the debate, and watched the movements of hon. members during this long debate on the sugar question, will have no doubt come to the conclusion that

my hon. friend, when he expressed that doubt, had some grounds for doing so; and I think that, if it had not been for an observing public carefully watching and scrutinising the action of hon. members during the debate, probably the debate would not have ended as it did, but we should have had a distinct declaration, not only by vote but by speech, that the continuance of black labour was to be an established order of the day in Queensland. But public opinion, it seems to me, has been too strict, and although there is a probability of the question being reopened in accordance with the votes given last Thursday, it is doubtful whether the supporters of black labour have sufficient stamina and sufficient determination to declare the question distinctly an open one. It was said during the discussion that the planters came here by some special Act of Parliament. I have endeavoured to ascertain where that Act of Parliament is, in what year it was passed, and what its name is, but up to the present I have failed entirely to discover that there is any such Act in existence. I did discover an Act passed in 1868 to regulate to some extent the Polynesian labour traffic; but I cannot find a single Act of Parliament inviting the planters to come here, and giving them leave to obtain any quantity of black labour for the working of their plantations. I am inclined to think, notwithstanding that the statement was made by a gentleman occupying a prominent position in the Government—the present Minister for Lands—that such an Act of Parliament does not exist. At any rate I should be extremely glad to have it pointed out to me. It has also been said that the question of the abolition of black labour has never been properly put before the colony. That was said distinctly by two Ministers, the Minister for Lands and the hon. member for Burrum, Mr. Powers. Indeed the Minister for Lands went so far as to say, not only that the question had not been put fairly before the country, but that it had been entirely misrepresented, and he believed wilfully misrepresented. The hon. member for Burrum said the same thing, and added his belief that if the question was put fairly before the country, the country would reverse its decision and give it in favour of black labour. I have been looking up some documents as to how the matter was put before the country in 1883, and I must say that all my researches point to the fact that the question was put fairly and honestly and explicitly before the electors of the colony during that memorable election of 1883. I was then in the old country, but corresponding with persons here. Having made up my mind some time before to come out to Queensland, I had a great many newspapers sent to me by my friends, so that I might see how the contest was going, and how the question might be disposed of on that occasion. I think nothing could be plainer, more distinct, and explicit than the way the subject was put before the country by the leader of the Opposition. I will read the following extract from the *Courier* of 11th August, 1883, where the hon. gentleman is reported to have said at a meeting in the Town Hall on the previous evening:—

"We see how there had grown up a strong vested interest in kanakas, which could only be cut down by degrees, and by affirming at the earliest possible moment that the labour of the future is to be white and not black."

I think, Mr. Speaker, there could be nothing plainer or more distinct than that; and when the earliest opportunity offered, in 1885, an Act was passed to the effect that at the end of 1890 no further recruiting in that particular trade was to take place—that the traffic should cease. Again, the hon. gentleman's then colleague in the

representation of North Brisbane, Mr. Wm. Brookes, said, at a meeting in the Town Hall on August 17, which appears in the *Courier* of the following day :—

"We spared neither efforts nor money to prevent smallpox and measles and cholera from coming into our midst, but he would tell them that if all their terrible epidemics were to come together they would not constitute such a terrible calamity to Queensland as the permanent establishment within our territory of coloured labour."

Again, my hon. friend, the member for South Brisbane, Mr. Jordan, in an electoral address to the electors of that constituency, on the 28th July, 1883, said :—

"I am opposed to every description of coloured labour."

I think that is pretty explicit and plain. The late Mr. Francis Beattie, member for Fortitude Valley, said in an address to the electors of that district, which appears in the *Courier* of August 11th, 1883 :—

"I should deem it a great calamity if anything were done to encourage the introduction into this colony of coloured labour of any kind for any purpose."

Ransack the whole of the papers relating to that memorable contest; read speech after speech, and address after address of the gentlemen who then sought election, and particularly of those hon. members who now sit on this side of the House, and you will find that they gave a most distinct and emphatic pledge that they would go for the abolition of coloured labour. And yet, in the face of that, we find two members, now Ministers of the Crown, stating during this debate, that the question was not put fairly before the people on that occasion. Another statement has been made by certain hon. members—that white men cannot work in the canefields on plantations, and particularly that they cannot do chipping and trashing. I have never worked in a canefield, Mr. Speaker, but I have visited many, and watched very carefully the whole of the operations connected with sugar-growing, and I must say that I never met a white man worth his salt, if he cared about working at all, who could not either chip or trash or do anything else on a sugar plantation equally as well, if not better, than any black men I have yet come across. I wonder who opened up this colony and the other colonies as well?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I am one of them.

Mr. GLASSEY: The hon. member is one, and he is not a black man. It has not been black men who constructed nearly 2,000 miles of railway lines in Queensland, and nearly 10,000 miles of telegraph line; and I do not think it will be contended that those lines are being kept in repair and worked by black men. I do not think it will be contended for a moment that it was the black men who cultivated our primeval forests, particularly those in the district represented by my hon. friend, the member for Rosewood, where most exemplary efforts have been made by his countrymen, and where we see them now enjoying the full fruits of their industry and toil in that splendid piece of territory. And yet, in order to prop up a falling cause, in order, if possible, to retain a semi-servile slavish band of labourers for a given purpose, we find members stating coolly in this House that white men cannot work in the sugar fields—that they cannot do chipping and trashing. It is admitted that they can plough and work with the axe and with maul and wedges clearing land, but it is asserted that they cannot work with the hoe; I say that is saying something that will not be borne out on investigation. It has also been contended that working in the canefields is unhealthy—that white men cannot stand it; but I think if we look over the return

moved for by my hon. friend the member for Enoggera, Mr. Drake, we shall see that it is not very healthy for the black man, because I find that the death-rate for the number of kanakas brought here—those who have returned, those who have died, and those who are left—is nearly 17 per cent. That is a pretty high rate, and I should extremely regret that the death-rate of white population employed in the sugar fields should approach anything near that figure. But I venture to say that the argument, that the work is so unhealthy that white men cannot stand it, would not be borne out by investigation, if such an investigation were made. Then, it has been contended that white men will not do the work; but why? It has been argued, no doubt with some degree of truth, that it will not pay to grow sugar by white labour; therefore, it amounts to this—that white men will not do the work because they are not sufficiently paid for it. I say: Pay them properly, and the white men will do the work. I hope hon. members will pardon me for saying that if sugar-growing cannot be made to pay except by servile slavish labour, if white labour cannot be employed at reasonably remunerative rates, so far as I am concerned I will be no party to supporting the sugar industry, or any industry that will not pay fair wages. It has been contended that the planters tried to get white labour. I am not going to say they have not done so, but I fear the inducements they offered were such that their efforts failed, and deservedly so; and I fear that unless they offer further inducements than those offered by the planters of Mackay to parties to come from Germany to work on their plantations, they will fail again. I shall refer to that further on. The wages paid to farm labourers at Bundaberg seem to be moderately low, that is for men working on farms and plantations; still, the prices that rule there were not by any means offered by the Mackay planters to induce white men to come out and work on the plantations there. I find in the report published by the Immigration Office this year, it states that at Bundaberg—

"One hundred and sixty-eight agreements made at this office were entered upon during the year; but, beyond this, one hundred and eighty engagements were brought about between employers and employed, though not ratified by any formal agreement. The average rates of wages have been: For farm labourers, £31 10s. per annum, with rations; ordinary labourers £33, ploughmen £35 10s., married couples £48 10s., and domestic servants 10s. to 11s. a week, with rations."

So far as appears from this return, there is no difficulty whatever in obtaining labourers for the plantations at Bundaberg at the rates now offered; but it must be admitted on all hands that when we find the very meagre rates offered by the planters at Mackay, as mentioned in a famous pamphlet published some time ago, it is no wonder that white labour could not be procured at those rates. I have a letter here from a gentleman at Mackay. I am sorry to say that I have not the permission of the writer to give it in full, but in that letter it is stated that planters in the Mackay district have been offering as low as 7s. a week to men to work on the plantations. I have also a return from some of the labour agents in Brisbane showing that as low as 13s. a week has been offered to white men to work on plantations.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: 13s. a week and rations.

Mr. GLASSEY: Yes; 13s. a week and rations, and I shall presently show what is the value of the rations which they offered. When we consider the statements made in the letter to which I have referred—for the accuracy of which I cannot vouch—and find that planters actually offer 7s. a week to white men to work on the plantations,

can it be wondered that white men cannot be found to do the work? Offer fair and reasonable wages, and white men will be found to work on plantations as they do in other industries. If they are fairly paid and fairly housed, as I think they have a right to be, white men will, I am sure, work on plantations. Now, I come to consider the wages offered some time ago by the Mackay planters. I dare say hon. members are aware what those wages were, and I think it is not to be wondered at that white men could not be procured to do work on the sugar fields on the terms offered. I have taken a few figures on this subject from the Mackay planters' pamphlet, published in 1884, and reprinted in *Hansard*, volume xlv., page 1480. The wages offered by the planters in that pamphlet are £20 a year, or about 7s. 6d. a week, and as half the first year's wages were to be kept back until the expiration of the agreement, that would leave only 3s. 9d. a week to be paid to the person employed during the first year. And what rations were these labourers to receive? They were to receive 8 lb. of flour. I calculate flour to be worth about 2d. per lb., so that the value of that would be 1s. 4d. per week. They were also to receive 12 lb. of beef, which at 2d. per lb. would be 2s. a week; also  $\frac{1}{2}$  lb. of tea which at 2s. per lb. would be 6d. a week; and 2 lb. of sugar, which at 2d. per lb. would be 4d. a week; so that the total value of the rations was 4s. 2d. a week. Sixteen men were to occupy a house 16 feet by 16 feet. I value that at a high figure, I think, when I put it down at 6d. a week to each man. The value, therefore, of rations and house rent may be stated at 4s. 8d. per week, and if we allow that the labourers received the 3s. 9d. a week kept back for the first year, it is seen that the total value of wages, rations, and house rent offered to Germans to come out here and work on the canefields is 12s. 2d. per week. I ask any hon. member in this House, or any person outside, how it can be wondered at that white men cannot be procured for sugar plantations when such miserable wages are offered, and such miserable rations and wretched houses allowed? I do not wonder that white men will not do the work on such terms. Offer them fair and reasonable remuneration, good food and lodgings, and an abundance of labour can be obtained. Now I will refer to the hours of labour. According to this pamphlet, the hours of labour are twelve hours a day during six months of the year, and ten hours a day for the rest of the year. In the event of a labourer being absent from sickness—I wish the House and the country to pay particular attention to this, and notice what inducements are held out to white men to work on sugar plantations—he was to receive no wages but was to be charged 9d. a day for rations. These inducements held out to white men to come here and work on the sugar plantations are marvellous. No wages when sick, and to pay 9d. a day for the food consumed! The labourers were also to have night work or overtime, and Sunday labour, but no extra pay was to be allowed for that. I do not wonder at all that white men cannot be procured on those conditions, and I would be extremely sorry if they could; and I trust the time will come when we shall see the development of the union among labourers to which the hon. member for Toowoomba, Mr. Groom, referred in his address on this question, and that they will demand a higher price for their labour, and declare that they will not work for the miserable wages now offered. Again, no wages were to be paid in wet weather. If we take 12s. 2d. as the total amount, including wages and rations to be paid to those labourers, that will give 2d. per hour, or about the same as

was received by the London dock labourers for whom so much sympathy was evoked some time ago in this and the other colonies of Australia. Here we have the miserable spectacle of planters offering white men in Germany 2d. per hour to come to Queensland to work on the sugar plantations, and yet we have members in this House crying in all their anguish and simplicity that they cannot get white men to work in the canefields. I hope they never will be able to get white men to do the work on such conditions. But I will now proceed to another aspect of the matter, and ask how the men who are offered such miserable wages can be expected to bring up families? I presume they are not supposed to be married, that they are supposed to be celibates and remain single. But supposing they were married and had wives and families, what would be the condition of the lives of those people living under such conditions? Pen and tongue could not accurately describe it. I have seen the condition of people under similar circumstances in other parts of the world, but I hope this House will be no party to bringing about such a state of things as we have left behind us in the old country. I think I can vouch for the gentlemen with whom I am associated on this side of the House that they will be no party to anything of the kind; and I say that if an industry cannot prosper without grinding people down to a mere animal existence, it would be a sorry thing indeed if it did prosper. No man in this House would be more anxious to render by his vote than I should, all the aid and assistance I could in a reasonable manner to encourage the industry in a fair way. Before I leave the question with regard to the inducements held out to these persons to come from Germany, I must say that I consider labourers engaged under such conditions would be absolutely degraded, as I am sorry to say labour is already degraded in some parts of Germany. I trust the day is not far distant when men and women labourers will, by the energy of the schoolmaster and the light of the Press, emerge from their present condition, and receive better remuneration than they get at the present time. I must refer to some parts of Germany to show how persons are degraded in connection with labour. I will quote briefly from a letter of the Secretary of State to the United States to the Government of that country, giving a review of the returns in connection with labour from the various countries of Europe. I think it will startle hon. members when they find the miserable condition to which the people of Dresden are reduced:—

"Owing to the temporary absence of Consul Mason from his post, his report on the trade conditions of his district was received too late for any extended review herein. As the wages in Dresden, however, differ very little from those ruling in other portions of Saxony, the figures given under Leipzig and Annaberg may be taken as a fair estimate for Dresden. There are some features in that portion of Consul Mason's report relating to female labour, which may be of interest to American readers as presenting a picture graphically illustrating one phase of life in Continental Europe.

*"Women and Dog Teams.*

"The consul says:—An important factor in the labour of Germany is not inquired of in the circular—viz., the labour of dogs. I have heard it estimated that women and dogs harnessed together do more hauling than the railroads and all other modes of conveyance of goods united. Hundreds of small waggons can be seen every day on all the roads leading to and from Dresden, each having a dog for the 'near horse' harnessed, while the 'off horse' is a woman, with her left hand grasping the waggon-tongue to give it direction, and the right hand passed through a loop in a rope which is attached to the axle, binding her shoulder; thus harnessed, woman and dog trudge along together pulling miraculous loads in all sorts of weather. The vitality and indomitable endurance of the German race are most forcibly illustrated by these women-workers, who, adds Mr. Mason, 'are the descendants of

the matrons who bore the soldiers who fought under Arminius, and baffled, captured, and destroyed the Roman legions in the forests of Germany, and are themselves the mothers of the men who carried victory on their bayonets from the fields of Gravelotte, Metz, and Sedan."

And that is the reward they receive for their heroism and pluck, and that is the reward received by labourers in every part of the world, unless they manfully band themselves together to vindicate their rights and demand reasonable rates of pay. Here, then, we have the Mackay planters going to a country for labour where it is degraded to such an extent, and holding out the miserable inducement of 12s. 2d. per week, ultimately, I am sure, though not intentionally, of degrading that labour, and reducing it to the depths to which these women in Germany are reduced. I cannot allow myself to express what I feel towards people who would do that, but I will say this: that no language can be found strong enough to denounce a social system where this miserable state of things exists. We have been told by various speakers that the employment of black labour creates labour for whites. I confess I have endeavoured to ascertain how that could be brought about, but it has completely baffled my comprehension. Perhaps my intellect is of such a nature that it cannot be enlightened, but I want some more logical arguments advanced to convince me than have yet been given, that by the employment of black men you increase the employment for white men. One member went so far as to say that if 20,000 kanakas were employed, more employment would be created for white people. Well, I have heard nothing to convince me on that point. We have 1,000 coal miners here at the present time. I wonder if we imported 800 or 900 black men to work in our mines whether they would cause employment to be found for more white coal miners, or would they not elbow our own people out altogether? Or if we manned the ships on our coast with black men, would it create employment for more sailors? If we put black men on the railways would that create employment for more whites? I confess it has baffled me from the beginning to know how it could be logically worked out that by the employment of coloured labour you find more employment for white people. I have no doubt that is advanced as a plausible argument for the working people to give encouragement to this system of labour. I do not know what it may do for the general body of the working people; but I confess it would take a tremendous amount of that kind of reasoning to convince me on that subject. It has been contended further, that in consequence of the discouragement given to coloured labour, the manufactories of the country have been interfered with. I suppose the sugar fields have been so prosperous for so long a time that the manufactories would have been going in full swing. If it had not been for this little check, those places would have gone on swimmingly; there would have been a perfect boom in the manufacture of sugar machinery. I do not think there is anything to warrant that contention. I do not think the production of sugar in any part of the world is in such a flourishing condition that a large amount of machinery is constantly required to meet the growing demands of the people for sugar. There was I admit a considerable boom in the iron manufactories in the production of sugar machinery, but that does not go on for ever. Once the machinery is manufactured, erected, and in working order, unless there is a constant demand for more sugar the planters might require persons to repair the machinery, but to tell us that in consequence of the check on the introduction of coloured

labour damage has been done to the ironworks of the country is to tell us something that cannot be established logically. Another argument that has been advanced is, that if we stop the supply of coloured labour we shall have the whole of the people of the North coming to Brisbane—that we are going to have a Northern invasion, in fact. I wonder what the hon. members for Burke think of that. Are we going to have an invasion of the people from Croydon and the far North in consequence of the check put upon the supply of coloured labour? We had that stated in the debate by a gentleman for whom I have the highest respect, and who seldom indulges in exaggerated statements. I am not allowed by the rule of debate to quote the hon. member's exact statement, but it was to the effect that if coloured labour was not continued a decisive blow would be struck at the production of sugar in the North, and we would have the 67,000 people who are depending on the sugar industry coming to Brisbane and demanding work or food from the Government. Is it not preposterous to hear such a hard-headed, cool, and collected man as the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Philp, make such an exaggerated statement as that? The hon. gentleman in making the statement did not appear to be excited or carried away in any manner to justify such an exaggeration. He says that we would have the 67,000 persons affected by the production of sugar coming down to Brisbane to ask the Government for food, or employment to obtain food, and yet by a return laid on the table of the House this session, we find that there are actually only 74,000 people in the North altogether. Well, we are told that 67,000 of them will be coming to Brisbane to elbow out the people here, and demand work or food from the Government. These are the kind of arguments we have heard during the debate, put forward with all the eloquence which the gentlemen using them could command. It is said, in order to carry on the industry, that the planters must have cheap and reliable labour. It must be admitted on all hands that the application by the Mackay planters for Germans to labour upon their plantations did not lack any element of cheapness, whatever might be said about its reliability. A proposal to give 12s. 2d. per week to Germans to come out from Germany to our sunny clime does not lack any quality of cheapness, though I will not speak as to its reliability. But cheap reliable labour, the planters say, they must have, otherwise this industry will be seriously injured, if not absolutely destroyed. For whose benefit is this cheap reliable labour wanted? I think I have clearly shown it cannot be for the benefit of the labourer, nor do I believe it is for the benefit of the country that cheap labour should be encouraged, because where we have a large pile of money kept in the hands of a few there is poverty, misery, and degradation amongst the many. Such a system as that cannot be perpetuated for long, and only for so long as to enable the labourer to realise his true position; and I venture to say he will then make his power felt, as he did in London some time ago in the memorable strike of the dock labourers, which evoked such widespread sympathy upon the part of the people of this young country. What is wanted by many of the planters is not only cheap and reliable labour, but semi-slavery, and that we have set our faces against in this country. We shall not be always here, but we shall leave our children behind us, and we do not want to leave a system of semi-slavery established behind us, so that those children may have to defend their rights, as the people of America had to do, or consent to a system of slavery which may perhaps not be of so evil a character as the slavery we have



known and read about, but which is similar to that to a great extent. Then we are going to have another class of labour according to the suggestion of one of the most eminent members of the Government, if not the most eminent—though I have no desire to make invidious distinctions. The hon. member who has made this suggestion—Mr. Macrossan—has not done so rashly or hastily, we may presume, and I am certain he must have taken some time to consider the suggestion before he announced it to the House. I say we have heard from that gentleman of another class of labour for the sugar planters, and that is Italian. I will give you a sample of the condition of the Italians in their own country, to show that they are not a desirable class of labourers to have in our midst. A more degraded and demoralised class of labourers cannot be found in any part of the world than is to be found in Italy, except perhaps in Russia, where they may be to some extent on all fours with the labourers in Italy. I admit that in my own country, Ireland, labour is considerably reduced and tremendously degraded; poverty and misery are to be found on every hand, while wealth is to be found piled up in abundance. But what do we find in Italy? I shall quote for the information of hon. members some statements as to the condition of the agricultural labourers in some parts of Italy, and then, I think, I may venture to say they are not a very desirable class of labourers to have in our midst, and I for one shall oppose the introduction of such a class of labour so far as I can. I am now quoting from the American "House Executive Documents, for the second session of the 48th Congress, 1884-5, vol. xxv.—Labour in Europe." The extract is as follows:—

"There are no fixed wages for agricultural labourers, it all depends on agreements between masters and labourers, agreements which are generally broken to suit convenience. Landowners do not hesitate to take advantage of the general destitution of the suffering country people, they only pay for labour when it is required, and bargains are usually made through sub-managers, the latter frequently compelling peasants to accept provisions instead of money.

"The only possible answer to be made as to wages paid to agricultural labourers would be by calculating them for the whole year on the basis of the following table.

"Replying to questions put by a parliamentary committee of inquiry into the condition of agriculture, especially referring to the manner of lodging agricultural labourers, the following information was obtained:—Thirty-five communes, especially in the conular district of Rome, reported a total lack of shelter; in fifty-three communes there were straw-covered shelters. To the question, 'On what do the people sleep?' Forty-six communes answered, 'On the bare ground or on straw.' One hundred and fifty-three communes reported that they slept on a kind of straw bag. Only seventy-five communes reported that they sleep on regular beds."

Then follows a tabular statement of the wages paid per day to agricultural labourers and household (country) servants in the district of Rome, with or without board and lodging. In the case of those who are paid part in money and part in food, the following daily wages in money are paid:—Men, 11½ cents per day (equal to about 5½d. of our money); women, 5½ cents; and children, 4 cents. On the few regular farms, where they are working constantly in and out of doors, the following daily wages are paid:—Men, 19½ cents; women, 9½ cents; and children, 6½ cents. Farm servants, male, without board, receive per day, 11½ cents; dairymen, with board, 14 cents per day; shepherds, with lodging and part food, 9½ cents per day; and servants, female, with board, receive per month, 77½ cents. The highest average wages paid to these are 1 dollar 93 cents per month, the average being 96½ cents. This, Mr. Speaker, is the country from which we are to get a supply of labour to take the

place of the kanakas when the latter disappear. Well, I do not know what the opinion of other hon. members may be on this subject, but I can give my own opinion very distinctly. Any attempt which is made to bring such a class of labour here, to settle down on the sugar or other lands of the colony, at miserable wages—and ultimately these people would become citizens amongst us, for unquestionably we could not keep them from enjoying the franchise—would have a most demoralising effect upon labour generally. It would degrade labour, and ultimately bring ruin upon labourers generally. I shall certainly, on that account, oppose as far as I can the introduction of such a class of labour. Various causes have been assigned for the depression in the sugar industry. Well, this country is not alone in the depressed state of that industry, because in nearly every country in the world where sugar is grown the same depression exists. Lately there has been a little spurt, I will admit. During the last few months prices have gone up. But the great factor in bringing about the present crisis in the sugar industry is over-production. While prices were high, the boom to which I have referred took place in the manufacture of machinery, and in the opening up of new sugar fields, and enormous prices were paid for those lands which were opened up; but when the prices of sugar declined it was found that the profits would not pay the interest on the capital which had been sunk during an abnormal period. While I am on this subject of over-production, I may say that the same arguments which have been made use of by hon. gentlemen with respect to what the sugar industry has done for this colony—and no one will deny that it has done much for Queensland—were used by the Jamaica planters when they appealed to the home Government for some means of redress. Towns had sprung up in consequence of the sugar industry, churches had been built, schools established, and so on. They used exactly the same arguments, and in almost the same words, that we have heard in this House. But the hon. member for Toowoomba, in speaking upon this question, showed conclusively—I do not think his arguments can be controverted—that no matter what price is paid for labour the sugar industry cannot be made to pay at present. In Java, where 250,000 free labourers have been given to the planters at a very small remuneration, even there the cry of the planters is for more assistance to enable them to conduct the industry profitably. The same applies everywhere, and to Queensland among other places. Now, there is no doubt that dry seasons have had very much to do with bringing about the present depression in the sugar industry. But there is another element causing that depression which has not been thoroughly discussed—that is, the enormous estates which were taken up by the planters at a time when the industry was prosperous, and when they thought the boom was going to continue. Large estates were taken up, and no doubt mortgaged to enable the planters to prosecute their business more profitably. On referring to the question of wages, it is a most singular thing that the wages paid to white men by the planters, according to the hon. member for Herbert, are smaller than the money expended upon kanakas. I have not yet been convinced as to why the planters should persist in paying higher wages to black men than to white men. It has, of course, been contended by some hon. members that the kanakas can be relied upon to work more continuously than white men, and that has been advanced as an argument in favour of continuing the system. But they only offered labourers from the Continent of Europe 12s. 2d. a week, including rations

and lodgings. It is stated at page 35 of the report of the hon. member for Herbert and Mr. King that a kanaka costs in Queensland 16s. a week, while they only offered white men 12s. 2d. a week! Their report states:—

“In Queensland, however, at the present time, allowing for the cost of introduction fees payable under the Pacific Islanders Act, wages, rations, and all other expenses, it is calculated that kanaka labour (indentured) costs about 16s. per week.”

If they had offered 16s. a week to white men, instead of 12s. 2d., the probability is we should have had a large number of white men working on the plantations of the colony at the present time. These are the facts as stated in their own report. Referring to the depression in the sugar industry, there can be no doubt that over-production is the great factor which has brought about low prices; and low prices, in addition to dry seasons, and large unproductive estates have helped very materially to bring about the present serious depression in the sugar industry in Queensland. As I said before, the same thing obtained in Jamaica, and other sugar-producing countries, and the same arguments were used to induce the home Government to render assistance to the sugar planters of Jamaica as are used by the planters of this colony to induce the Government to render assistance to them. I am quoting from a paper called *The Grocer*, which circulates largely among the retail grocers and wholesale merchants, and is considered the organ of the trade. The number I am quoting from is the latest I have been able to procure, and is dated August, 1884. In the course of a review of the sugar traffic in the West Indies and the petitions that were sent to the home Government for assistance, the writer says:—

“As indicating the general opinion in the West Indies of the present very serious condition of the sugar industry in those colonies, and also the remedies proposed, the Barbadoes petition, presented by Lord, Derby on Monday night to the House of Lords contained the following passages:—That in the colony where your petitioners reside the cultivation of sugar is the principal industry upon which the public revenue is based, and the institutions of Government supported, by which the labouring population earn wages, and upon which the prosperity of the whole community depends.” After explaining the disadvantages under which their sugar is placed in the markets of the United Kingdom in consequence of the foreign bounties, and the United States in consequence of treaty disabilities, the petitioners say:—“That ministers and churches, schools and schoolmasters, with other institutions, must cease to exist, if the staple of the island ceases to pay the cost of production. That with distress and disaster staring them in the face, and the prospect in the near future of utter ruin overwhelming them, your petitioners look to your right honourable House for relief.” That relief comprises three points: First, the most favoured nation clause with the United States, so that if Spain obtains advantageous terms for Cuban sugar, we should claim the same treatment for our produce; secondly, reciprocal tariff arrangements with the United States (or Canada), by which in return for the admission duty free, of British sugar into the States (or Canada), the taxation of articles imported into the colonies from either of those colonies shall be removed; thirdly, an international conference for the abolition of bounties.”

We know what the result of that conference has been; it was referred to by the hon. member for Toowoomba when he last spoke on this question. There will not be much fuss made about that conference, if the British Government can help it. It will be allowed to “depart in peace and sin no more.” They found they were tackling a very ticklish subject when they took up the question of sugar bounties in connection with Continental countries. The writer goes on to say:—

“Similar expressions of responsible opinion have been received from Trinidad, the Leeward Islands, and the mail this morning has brought the following important documents from British Guiana: 1. A petition to the Queen, signed by the elective members of the Court

of Policy. This quotes the value of exports for 1883 a £3,172,011, 98 per cent. of which was the product of the sugar-cane. Of the imports—namely, £2,224,716—the greater portion was required in connection with the sugar industry. The vitality of the whole colony, therefore, depends upon this industry. The introduction of the best machinery and skill is then referred to, as showing that every endeavour has been used to make sugar at the lowest possible cost. The petitioners then declare that by the treaty of 1815 between Great Britain and the United States ‘the planters of this colony are placed at a ruinous disadvantage,’ and they pray that steps may be taken to secure most-favoured-nation treatment with America. The second document is a petition to the House of Commons from the inhabitants of British Guiana, most numerous and influentially signed by planters, merchants, and representatives of all classes in the colony. This points out that the population, which is 258,780, is dependent on the products of the sugar-cane; it refers to previous periods of depression, especially that which was caused by the equalisation of the duties on free and slave-grown sugar; it claims credit for the energy, the expenditure of capital, and the introduction of free labour by which the colony became prosperous, in 1883 exporting 120,000 tons of sugar, valued (without reckoning by-products), at £2,400,000, nearly one-half of which was shipped to the United States. It goes on to complain that British Guiana not being autonomous, the colony has no power to touch matters of vital importance, and is placed at a disadvantage with independent countries, and with those colonies which are able to make their voices heard through their own representative Government and resident Ministers in London, and having thus no political status by means of which redress for grievances could be obtained, the colony presumes to lay its claims directly before Parliament. The petition further deplores the prospect of being shut out of the American market by the projected commercial treaty between Spain and the United States, and it prays for the extension to the British West Indies of most-favoured-nation treatment, and for the establishment of reciprocal arrangements with the State. The third document is a petition to the House of Lords, signed by the Mayor of Georgetown, on behalf of a public meeting of which he was the chairman. The resolutions passed at the meeting are embodied in the petition. They express ‘alarm at the unprecedentedly low prices of sugar, caused principally by the large bounties on export of beetroot sugar granted by Continental governments, and the prejudicial effects thereof on the producers of sugar in this colony and the British West Indies; and the meeting pledges itself to support the present efforts that are being made in Great Britain and the colonies to relieve the sugar industry of the disadvantages and unfair competition to which it is at present subjected.’ The petitioners further say that ‘they view with much interest and appreciation the efforts that are being made by other sugar-growing colonies of the Empire, and also by associations in England, to bring before your honourable House in Parliament assembled the precarious position of those colonies in regard to the present condition of the sugar interests, and the unfair, if not unnatural, competition to which those interests are at present subjected by reasons of bounty-fed sugar from Germany and other Continental countries being admitted into England on equal terms with the sugars of her own colonies.’ In praying for relief the petitioners specify a countervailing duty upon the import of bounty-fed sugar into Great Britain as one of the means.”

I might quote numerous other documents, Mr. Speaker, to show that the same condition of affairs that we find here, with regard to the production of sugar, obtains in other countries; the same arguments are employed—what the planters have done to develop the resources of the country, and so forth—and they ask in almost the same words for the same means of relief. I may say, in confirmation of what has already been said, that undoubtedly the low price of sugar, the unfair competition of the bounty-fed sugar from the Continent, the large estates that were taken up by planters when they thought the “boom” was going to continue, the late dry season, and other elements which have been at work, have done much to bring about the present severe crisis in connection with the sugar industry in this colony. The hon. member who introduced this subject says, and says with perfect truth, that the low price of sugar has been one of the primary factors in bringing about the present very disastrous results,

and I think that all the efforts that are being made and that may be made will hardly suffice to render that substantial aid to the planters, and to give them that immediate relief which they require. In the majority report of the Royal Commission on the sugar industry, Messrs. King and Cowley say, at page 30, paragraph 9:—

“Since 1883 sugars of all classes have fallen in price fully 50 per cent., and there can be no doubt that this fall, which is likely to be permanent, has been a principal cause of the depression of the sugar industry in Queensland.”

Further on, in paragraph 10, they say:—

“At the present time, however, it must be borne in mind that the cost of black labour in the colony has increased by more than 50 per cent. since 1883, and we find that this increase in working expenses, concurring with a great fall in the price of sugar and unfavourable seasons, has caused the working expenses of the plantations generally to exceed the value of their produce; this result, with no better prospect in the future, naturally alarming capitalists, and causing them to refuse the accommodation required to carry on with.”

They also assign another reason, Mr. Speaker, why capitalists were a little alarmed, but I am not going to refer to that. They themselves have sufficiently established the fact that the low price of sugar, and the increased cost of kanakas have been alarming elements in inducing capitalists not to give their money with so free a hand as they had done previously. In paragraph 11, page 30, of the report the same gentlemen say:—

“It is clear that unless by some means the production of sugar can be rendered profitable in Queensland the entire extinction of the industry must come about in time—and in a very short time, we fear. A rise in the price of sugar in the markets of the world is scarcely to be looked for, as other countries are fostering and encouraging the extension of the industry by every means in their power, and the supply has already more than overtaken the demand.”

If hon. members examine this report, without bias or prejudice, they will see that the condition of the industry is such that it will take a tremendous amount of assistance to render the relief that this industry requires at the present moment. After referring to other matters in connection with the question, Messrs. King and Cowley, in their report, at page 26, go on to show the condition of some of the largest plantations in the North. They say:—

“The most northern plantation is that at Weary Bay, in the Cook district. This year Commissioners were unable to visit, but they have learned from evidence supplied by the manager that, after the expenditure of £100,000, it is about to be abandoned. The only plantation in the Port Douglas district has ceased operations, and is in the hands of a liquidator. At Cairns there were a few years ago three plantations. One (Hop Wah) is abandoned, and the machinery removed. The others are still at work, but neither are paying interest on the capital invested. Hambleton is still in the hands of the original proprietors, who have invested £150,000 in its development. But the Pyramid Plantation is now in the hands of the mortgagee, the pioneers having had to relinquish it after expending the sum of £130,000. On the Johnstone River there are four plantations. On one the mortgagee has foreclosed, but is still carrying it on. The others, as is shown in the evidence, are not at present paying expenses, notwithstanding the fact that they are in the hands of wealthy proprietors and are replete with every appliance for economical working. The Herbert River (Ingham) plantations are in no better condition, although also in the hands of wealthy proprietors. They are all being worked excepting one (Gairloch), which has lately been sold and is now closed. Another (Hamleigh) has passed from the hands of the original proprietors for one-tenth of its cost. Macnade, lately the property of the Sugar Company, Limited, has been taken over by the mortgagee for a sum of £35,000, although it cost the previous owners over £130,000. The Victoria and Ripple Creek Plantations are still held by their original owners; but, like all the others, fail to give any return on the capital invested. In this district there are eleven farmers who supply from 600 to 700 acres of cane to the Victoria mill. These small growers also suffer from the depression, and are

unable to make more than bare working expenses. On the Burdekin Delta there are three plantations in active operation, and another, on which £200,000 has been expended, is now closed. Here the effects of the depression are painfully evident, as two of the three working plantations have lately passed from the hands of the first proprietors, who have lost their all and are now the managers. At Mackay, which has heretofore been regarded as the chief centre of the sugar industry in Queensland, there are twenty-two plantations with mills, a large number of farmers growing cane, and two Government central mills. Here, for the season ending 31st March, 1887, 16,138 tons of sugar were manufactured, while 16,062 tons were made the following year, but during the 1888-9 season the falling-off was very great, only about 5,500 tons being produced. Evidence went to show that in no single instance either amongst farmers or planters was a profit being made, all the plantations being carried on at a loss.”

The same thing is to be found in every district.

“At Rockhampton there is only one plantation (Yeppoon) now in existence, the Pandora Mill having been closed some time since. The Yeppoon plantation is in liquidation, and was sold for £10,500 during the visit of the Commission to that district. About £40,000 had been expended upon it.”

Then they refer to Bundaberg, which is a little more prosperous, and which I hope will continue prosperous, and grow cane by white labour. I ask hon. members to read this report carefully. There has been no lack of coloured labour; there has never been any break in the procuring of sufficient labour to work the plantations; yet notwithstanding that they are in a most deplorable condition of insolvency, and I say, though I do so with regret, that no assistance this House can offer within any degree of reason will be sufficient to afford immediate and adequate relief to the planters in the districts to which I have referred. I do not of course speak of Bundaberg, because there the conditions are altogether different from the conditions in other places. In one important particular there is an enormous difference between the gentlemen who drew up the reports presented by the Royal Commission. I referred some time ago to the large estates as being in my judgment one very serious element which hindered the operations of the planters, and prevented them from obtaining those profits which would have accrued from their enterprise had their plantations been smaller. I find that in five districts the planters have selected land far in excess of their requirements. Of course it is not for me to dictate to the planters as to what course they should take in the conduct of their business, and I should be very sorry to do so; but I must say that, to an observer who desires to ascertain what has really brought about the serious depression in the sugar industry, it appears that this acquisition of large estates is one of the primary factors. I find that in the Port Douglas district the area of land selected is 56,384 acres, and the area under cultivation 3,000 acres; in the Cairns district the area selected is 80,000 acres, and the area under cultivation 5,500 acres; in the Ingham district the area selected is 202,161 acres, and the area under cultivation 6,333 acres, of which 5,933 acres are devoted to sugar, and 400 acres to other crops; in the Townsville district, including the Burdekin Delta, the area selected is 272,064 acres, and the area under cultivation 2,690 acres, of which 2,240 acres are under sugar, and 450 acres under other crops; and in the Mackay district the area selected is 420,520 acres, and the area under cultivation 24,320 acres. The total area of land selected in those five districts is 1,031,129 acres of which only 41,825 acres are under cultivation, so that there are about 900,000 acres of unproductive land held by the planters in those sugar districts. I do not know what effect the holding of such a large area of unproductive land may have on profits in the sugar industry, but I know what effect a very large

area of unproductive coal property would have on the profits derived from a going coal mine. If a person had 1,000 acres of coal property, and after spending a large sum of money on the purchase of that property, it only produced a limited supply of coal, no profits would be derived therefrom, the unproductive property would be a dead weight around the neck of the going concern and prevent it yielding a profit, and I think the same thing will apply to those large unproductive estates in the sugar districts of the colony. I said just now that the reports of the Sugar Commissioners differed in a most important particular. I will now refer to that difference more fully. I would like to know why there is such an alarming difference between the report of the majority and the report of the minority with respect to the wages paid to white men on the sugar plantations? Both reports state the number of white men employed on the plantations to be about 2,500, and Mr. Groom states that they receive in wages about £100,000 per annum. I suppose that is in addition to rations. In the report of the majority, Messrs. King and Cowley, it is stated that the sum of £200,000 per annum is paid in wages to the same number of men. That seems to me an alarming discrepancy, and I cannot account for it. I should like to have some explanation as to how they arrive at those figures. There is exactly 100 per cent. difference between them.

Mr. PAUL called attention to the state of the House.

The SPEAKER: There is a quorum present.

Mr. GLASSEY said: Mr. Speaker,—The commissioners perfectly agree with regard to the rate of wages paid to the kanakas employed on the plantations, and also as to the number employed; but I make the wages, including of course the rations, more than is stated by the commissioners. Both reports state that there is £50,000 a year paid to kanakas in the shape of wages, but according to the calculation which I have made 7,000 kanakas at, say, 16s. a week, would cost £291,200 per annum. I admit that the gentlemen making these reports give exactly what is paid in wages, but they do not state what is the cost incurred in the shape of rations. But the discrepancy between the two reports with respect to the wages paid to white men seems to me to be altogether alarming, one stating the amount at £100,000 and the other at £200,000. It is not for me to pass an opinion on such a discrepancy, and we will have to leave the matter to the Sugar Commissioners to settle. Now considerable stress is laid on the necessity of finding labour for the planters. I am not an old resident of Queensland, but I ask why the planters should be favoured more than other employers of labour? It has been contended that they have rendered very signal service towards the development of this country. I will not say that is true or untrue, but compare them with other employers of labour, and let us ask why the planters should be favoured more than other people? Any reasonable person will ask the same question, and I should like to hear a substantial reply given. Why should they be favoured more than the proprietors of gold, copper, or tin mines, or the proprietors of ironfoundries and shipbuilding yards? Why should they be favoured more than the farmers of the Darling Downs or Rosewood? Those persons do not come to the Government and ask to be provided with a particular class of labour—especially black and reliable labour. Why is this demand put forth by the planters, and why should they be the favoured class? I do not know whether they consider themselves favoured or not, but their demands seem to show that they wish to be, and, of course, their labourers

must have black skins, and must at all times be reliable. Well, Sir, Chinese have been prohibited from the goldfields, and quite right too. We are agreed that they should be prohibited, and now we are pretty fairly agreed that the kanaka shall be prohibited as well. I trust we shall be agreed also that cheap Germans, and by all means cheap Italians, shall be kept out of this colony, unless they come here on the same conditions as other labour. The money of the State should certainly not be spent in bringing people here who will demoralise and degrade labour. We are fairly well agreed that the sentiments of Australasia go in the direction that no more black skins shall inhabit this country. I should be sorry if anything should occur to abuse those in our midst. Treat them kindly and fairly, but get clear of them as soon as possible, so that they will not reduce the wages of our own people.

The HON. P. PERKINS: A black skin is as good as a white one beyond the grave.

Mr. GLASSEY: If a man with a black skin comes here and takes up his position as one of ourselves, maintaining wages and becoming a citizen of the country, we may then deal with him, but, under present circumstances, such is not the case. New South Wales has decided positively that white men shall man her ships, and so has Queensland. I think we shall all heartily rejoice when the present mail contract is over, and when the ships now manned by coolies will be manned by those of our own colour. It has been contended that kanakas do not compete with white men, but I do not think that contention can be borne out. In Maryborough, Bundaberg, and Rockhampton it has been proved beyond a doubt that black men compete largely with white men. The hon. member for Warrego said the other night that many of the kanakas were to be found on the stations and other parts of the colony, and I contend that they compete very largely with the white men of Queensland, and will do so so long as they are here. It has been said, "Look at the amount of money we make out of these black men. The whole of it filters through them and comes into the pockets of the whites." Mr. Speaker, the A all and B all of some men is to make money by any means. They say, "No matter whether the people have black skins or yellow skins; no matter from whom we make it, let us make money. What does it matter what kind of labour is used, so long as we benefit thereby?" But, Sir, there are higher considerations even than making money. There are finer and nobler aspirations than mere making money. One of the highest and noblest, in my opinion, ought to be the development of the best interests of our country, and to preserve it for white men who will be well treated, well paid, comfortably housed, so that they shall to some extent enjoy the sunshine of life. I do not share the opinion of these money hunters. Perhaps it would have been better for me, from a financial point of view, if I had paid more attention to making money. However, I do not envy those who make it, and I do not begrudge it to those who make it by a system of semi-slavery. We should, however, be guided not so much by a desire to make money, as by a desire to clear our country of an obnoxious evil. When we get clear of this system we shall have no more of the kidnapping that we have heard of in the past. The fair fame of this youthful country will not be tarnished as it was some time ago. I think we shall all rejoice when the last black and yellow man have disappeared from our midst, and when there will be no more of this kidnapping and requiring people

to work against their will, thus disgracing the best interests of the people of this country. Nations are not always made up by the making of money and the grasping after money. They are built up by better means, they stand more erect as they are on more solid foundations, and then the superstructure raised thereon is rendered more durable. Something has been said about federation, and that seems, according to some persons, and according to the opinion of the hon. member for Stanley, to be a dream. Nearly all movements are dreams at first, and perhaps this is a dream; but I think it is a dream that will shortly be realised. I may be wrong, but I am perfectly persuaded that one of the primary elements to keep back federation would be the continuance in our midst of a system of black labour. I feel perfectly convinced that the statesmen of Australasia generally have made up their minds that this system of coloured labour shall disappear, and that the best arrangements possible will be made to bring about a closer federation for the mutual benefit and happiness of the whole of the people of these young nations. When that federation comes, as I think it soon will—not Imperial federation, as I am thoroughly opposed to that, and think we have had too much imperialism in the past, and we should have something better in the future—I say when the federation I speak of comes, I feel assured it will be for the ultimate good, not only of one colony but of the whole of the Australian group. It has been contended that no social danger attaches to a system of kanaka or other coloured labour. I do not agree with that contention. I think there is always a social danger in the establishment in our midst of a large number of persons with whom we cannot mix and associate in the closest possible ties of friendship and otherwise. I say that if we permit this evil to remain, grow, and develop, we shall have a tremendous social danger to fear, which may yet bring about very serious and disastrous results. If we turn over the pages of some of the books in our library we can see that similar arguments to those advanced here were used by the supporters of slavery in America when they contended that the slaves did not constitute a social danger. Those arguments were used in America prior to the years 1861, 1862, 1863, and 1865, when the social danger brought about very serious results.

Mr. ISAMBERT: They are not over yet.

Mr. GLASSEY: As my hon friend says they are not over yet. We do not want to bring about here any such serious results as took place in that splendid free country a few years ago. Why, one of the best men that perhaps the world has yet seen, and certainly one of the best America has seen, became a victim to that social danger. I refer to that magnificent statesman and splendid man, Abraham Lincoln, who fell the victim of an assassin, to that "no social danger," because he thought to wipe out, and I am pleased to say did wipe out, the wretched stain that tarnished the fair fame of his country. He became the victim of a person who thought he was wronged because he was prevented from trafficking in human flesh and blood. Something, Mr. Speaker, has been said in the course of the sugar debate about the "Mackay Toast," that toast was to curse Sir S. W. Griffith, and by the way, I may say I could not but admire the splendid way in which the hon. member for Mackay, Mr. Dalrymple, turned that matter off by telling us it was a joke. No doubt it was a joke, and the hon. member wished to let down the jokers as lightly as possible; but if the same spirit was developed as was developed in America, I have

no doubt the same results would follow. I do not say that my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, would be the victim of such a spirit as that, but someone holding a similar position and similar opinions might, perhaps, become a victim. I believe it has been contended by some hon. members, that the North was fairly agreed that black labour should continue; but I am pleased that the hon. member for Townsville, the Minister for Mines and Works, has altered his mind on that point—I do not know that he ever had his mind made up to the contrary; but if he had, he is now clearly of opinion that the North does not favour coloured labour, and particularly the constituency he represents. That is a fact, as I shall show from some documents I have received from Townsville. I think I shall be able to show that the working people of that constituency and the North generally, are entirely opposed to coloured labour and the reopening of the coloured labour question. I do not want to quote from the speech delivered by the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Philp, in which he laid so much stress upon the opinions of a gentleman named Page, to the effect that kanakas did not do so much harm when employed upon the plantations. I shall read now from an official document of the Trades and Labour Council of Townsville on the subject, and it will be seen that the opinions of Mr. Page are not borne out. The document I have received is as follows:—

"Trades and Labour Council of Queensland,

"Townsville Branch,

"May 6, 1889.

"To Thos. Glassey, Esq., M.L.A.

"Dear Sir,

"Judging by current events and signs of the times, I believe an attempt will be made to gain an extension of the Polynesian Act for five years. As the platform of our council is 'North Queensland for the white man,' we hardly need inform you that we are entirely opposed to any such extension. Carpenters, bricklayers, wharf labourers, builders' labourers, tailors, butchers, painters, and other societies have a voice at our board, and that being the case, you will admit we are entitled to some consideration. At our general meeting on Thursday evening last it was resolved that we solicit your assistance in our endeavours to oppose any further extension of the Act in question. I now ask you, on behalf of the above council, to oppose any further extension of the Polynesian Act during next, or any, session of Parliament.

"Believe me,

"Yours faithfully,

"EDWARD Y. LOWRY,

"President.

"P.S.—Shall be happy and willing to at all times forward you items of news that may at any time assist you in furthering our cause. Secretary is writing Macrossan and Philp re the above matter.

"E. Y. L."

I do not know that that letter has had anything to do with confirming the opinion of the Minister for Mines and Works when he said that the majority of the people in his district, and he believed of the North, were opposed to coloured labour.

The HON. P. PERKINS: Was that letter written in Brisbane?

Mr. GLASSEY: It was written in Townsville, and I will hand it to the hon. member to read it for himself, if he likes, that he may see the handwriting and judge of the locality in which it was written. To make myself perfectly clear in what I previously said about the employment of coloured labour, I may say that, while objecting very strongly to the employment of coloured labour in any industry, I consider the sugar planters should be placed upon equal terms with all other employers of labour. The laws of the colony prevent the employment of kanakas in any other branch of business but that of sugar-planting, and

although Chinese are engaged in other industries, there is a very strong feeling in the colony against the employment of coloured labour of any kind. It should be either reduced to a minimum or entirely abolished. I wish to make my meaning perfectly clear, and I say that the planters have no right to ask to be treated differently from other classes of employers. The proprietors of manufactories and other branches of business are precluded, and properly precluded, from the employment of coloured labour, and I see no reason why the sugar planters should be treated differently to all other classes of employers. For that reason, I contend that whatever legislation may be effected in this House, all classes of employers must be placed upon terms of equality. Any branch of industry which cannot afford to live, and to pay those engaged in it, unless by employing people at miserably low wages, which will not enable the employes to procure the reasonable comforts of life, should not be encouraged by this House or by legislation. Of course industries that are conducted by the Government are paid by the country, and the country will mostly agree that those who are employed by the Government should be paid well and sufficiently for the labour they perform. But any person, whether employed by the Government or by outsiders, who does not receive sufficient wages to maintain himself and his family in reasonable comfort, and to effect some savings for old age and infirmity, that person is not sufficiently paid. In mining, I know, reasonable wages are paid—I refer chiefly to gold-mining. Whether the mine is able to pay it or not, there is a standard rate of wages paid to the workmen, and if those wages cannot be paid the mine ceases to exist as a mine. That is the direction which I hope will be taken by our future legislation. Therefore, if the sugar industry cannot pay reasonable wages to its workpeople, and the planters are not satisfied to receive reasonable profits—or whether they receive reasonable profits or not—I wish to be perfectly clear on this point—if they cannot pay liberal wages to their workmen, then I say that industry has no right to be encouraged in our midst. We have seen too much of this competition in humanity in the past. I heard no longer ago than to-day remarks made with reference to the late strike of dock labourers in London, of the numbers of poor people who had their money invested in those docks who, in consequence of the strike, would have no dividends paid to them, and that they did not get more than 2 per cent. on their investments. What an awful state of affairs this is, notwithstanding that the labourers are reduced to poverty and destitution! I suppose the result ought to be that those people should be exterminated as fast as possible, and allow others who will work for less take their places, in order that the dividends of the dock companies may be increased. If, Sir, a single pound of sugar was never made in this country, and could not be made, except under such conditions, I, for one, declare that that pound of sugar should never be produced. I want to make that perfectly plain and distinct, as far as I am concerned. But if this industry can be conducted on reasonable lines, and if disasters of an unforeseen character have overtaken it, those engaged in it have a perfect right to appeal to this House for some relief, if legislation can do it, and I can assure hon. members who represent that industry that they will find no one more ready and willing to assist them than myself, and to render all the assistance I possibly can in my humble way. If the sugar industry requires railway facilities for carrying its produce, I think the State should provide them. If the planters find it necessary and desirable, and believe it will be ulti-

mately successful if irrigation is established in their midst, I say the State should render that assistance. But if they cannot work their plantations except on conditions such as I have mentioned, by starving their labourers and bringing in a wretched servile race with diabolical social habits, which it is not necessary that I should name, then I say, away with the industry altogether. I do not say this with respect to the sugar industry alone, but to any other industry. I am a very poor judge of public opinion in this country if the people who have come here and settled amongst us will allow themselves to be shifted about as mere emblems on a chess-board, as they have been in the past. I am a very poor judge indeed of the character of the men and women of these colonies if they will not show that they are determined to set their faces against the evils from which they suffered and which they have left behind them in the old land, and to prevent those evils from growing up in our midst. I am perfectly confident that if coloured labour, or any other kind of servile labour, is attempted to be perpetuated here, that there are men of sufficient stamina and ability to be found within the confines of the colony who will prevent any such disastrous consequences from arising. We want industries that will pay good wages; that will enable the workers to work for only a reasonable number of hours, and enable them also to procure for themselves and their families decent homes, where the sexes may be divided, where decency and social privacy can be maintained, where the best social surroundings can be developed, and where the best men and women can be grown, so that the future of this colony may be conducted by a vigorous people. I have stated, Mr. Speaker, that coloured labour of any kind has not been a benefit to the white labourer. I am positive and can prove, so far as my investigations have gone, that coloured labour has not been the benefit to the white worker that has been alleged. No doubt I shall be met with the argument that had it not been for the kanaka labour employed on the plantations the sugar industry would never have been established, and that the white labour employed in the manufacture of machinery, and so on, would never have been employed. But, Sir, if one class of labour—and I think I know something about all classes of labour—can only be maintained by a system of servile labour, I say the very class of labour it is supposed to benefit would be the first to resent it, and to vote for the abolition of anything which they regard with so much detestation. I have referred already to the social surroundings and condition of labourers in the old country, and I will refer now more particularly to the house accommodation provided for them in some of the older towns there. I will go to Scotland—the land of Burns and Scott, and of my hon. friend, the member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. McMaster—and I will take Dundee. There we find there are no less than 8,620 houses of only one room each, occupied by 23,670 persons. One small room; it may be an attic above, where land is cheap, as Paddy says, or it may be below in a cellar; or it may be like those Continental places we hear so much about, where there is only one miserable privy for the private accommodation of a whole number of toilers. That is the condition of affairs in the old land, brought about by the miserably low wages paid to the people. Then, Sir, we have 16,187 houses of two rooms occupied by 74,374 persons. Two rooms! I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this House what can be the moral condition, the moral teaching and training that can be taught in places where whole families—fathers and mothers, sons and daughters—

sleep in one miserable room? Those are not isolated cases. They are to be found, unfortunately, too often in the old country—brought about by the enormous competition that prevails, the bartering of human beings to see how little pay they are prepared to take, and how little they can contrive to exist on. Read the papers in connection with the social surroundings of the London dock labourers, and see their miserable, pitiable condition. I am pointing out the advisability of preventing that miserable state of affairs from growing up in our midst, and of avoiding as much as possible the employment of servile and wretched cheap labour, which must ultimately bring that state of affairs about. As I said before, what we want is such a system as will encourage all industries that will give the workers good wages, reasonable hours, and enable them to effect some savings to provide for themselves when old age and infirmities overtake them, as they must do. Low wages bring about one inevitable result, that is premature old age with the prospect of the workhouse at the close of the toiler's life, or what would perhaps be much better, in the words of the poet Burns,

"Death, the poor man's dearest friend,  
The kindest and the best."

I say death would be preferable to the social conditions and surroundings of vast numbers of the toilers of the world, and if we were to do anything which would perpetuate those evils here we should be committing not only a moral but a social wrong. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, what savings a man can effect out of 12s., 14s., or even 16s. a week, to provide for old age or for sickness or disease, when overtaken by those calamities? How is it possible out of such wages to procure the medical aid and comfort so necessary in such cases? It cannot be procured at all, and the result is premature old age or death; that must be the result to persons labouring under such conditions. If social life is to be happy and enjoyable the labourer must be properly remunerated. But the toilers, I am sorry to say, seldom enjoy life, particularly under the conditions I have described. It is one perpetual and relentless grinding toil with them, day after day, week after week, month after month, year after year. I know something of this from experience, and can speak with feeling on the question. I have seen and suffered it in my youth, and felt it in my growth through life; and I will, as far as my ability will allow, prevent such a state of things being established and perpetuated in this colony. The toiler's life under such conditions is a dark one, always in gloom without a single break or bright spot in the cloud. But it is said we must have cheap reliable labour or the sugar industry will not succeed. Unless it has this reliable labour it cannot live. Who must it live for? Has the great mass of the people been created by Providence simply to support the planters or any class of that kind? I do not wish to say a single word of disparagement of the planters as a class, but I ask, was humanity created for any such purpose, or have men a right to enjoy the product of their own industry, or, at any rate, so much as is necessary for their support and social comfort, or must it continue, as heretofore, to go into the pockets of others, or has any man a moral right to deprive them of the fruits of their own industry? The condition of the great mass of the working people in the old country is, as many members are aware, such that they have to work on and grind on, and in the winter time, or when employment is scarce, they have to go to the parson or the landlord—the person who lives in the castle built with material that has been toiled for by others—to cringe and beg for blankets to keep them warm, or for coal or a dress

for the wife or children. That is the state of affairs in the old land. We do not want such a state of affairs here; but I am perfectly certain that that will be the inevitable result if we have men compelled to work for 12s. or 14s. a week. I hope that no hon. member will think for a moment that I have unnecessarily wasted the time of the House. I was determined to vindicate my own rights as a member of the House against a wrong which I conceived was inflicted upon me on Friday evening last. I have not since I entered the House attempted to waste one single moment or to occupy more time than was requisite to place my views before the House on the questions then under consideration. Nor do I intend to do so on the present occasion. I tell hon. members and the Government that, which ever party may be in power, I shall always vindicate my right so long as I occupy a seat in the House. I do not suppose that the gentlemen with whom I am associated would do such a thing as was done here on Friday. In fact, I am sure they would not. But if I am put down by false and oppressive means at any time, I will take the earliest opportunity of vindicating what I believe are my constitutional rights. I hope that the legislation passed in this colony will be such as will develop the resources of the country by the best possible means, and that we shall do nothing that will permanently injure the workers of the country. Undoubtedly, as education develops, and the workers see their real position, and know their power—which I hope will always be used in a legitimate way for their own social elevation and the elevation of the people generally who live here—they will endeavour to prevent such a state of things as would be brought about by the employment of great numbers of men at miserably low wages. These are the principles which, I trust, and which I am certain do, animate the party with which I am associated, knowing perfectly well the opinions held by the leader of the Opposition, for whom I entertain the highest respect, and did so before I came to this country. But whatever my respect for the hon. gentleman, or my attachment to the party, or my political obligations may be, there is only one course that I know of open to me, and that is to obey to the letter the dictates of a free and unfettered conscience, and work for the good of the country in which I live. I trust that I have said nothing in my remarks to cause an angry feeling on the part of any hon. member, especially of those members who are interested in the sugar industry. If I have done so, I hope it will be taken in the spirit in which it was uttered; I had no intention or desire to create any angry feeling, and if I have said anything offensive it was done unwittingly, and I regret it. The principles which I have enunciated are the principles which I truly hold and will enunciate on all fitting occasions. These principles are like the hardy oak of our British hills, which is not less mighty when the storms of winter sweep round its naked boughs and spend their unavailing fury upon its unsheathed and unbending stem, than when the summer sunbeams cool themselves in the deep shades of its verdant foliage and the zephyrs seem to linger where the honey dews had been. I stated, Mr. Speaker, in an early part of my speech that I intended to move an amendment on the motion before the House, and I now move that all the words after the word "that" be omitted with the view of inserting the words "in the opinion of this House it is desirable early next session to adopt some means for encouraging the manufacturing and producing interests of the colony."

Mr. BARLOW said: Mr. Speaker,—I have listened with much interest to the very able and eloquent discourse which has been delivered by my friend the hon. member for Bundamba. The amendment which he has proposed opens up the



whole question of protection to native industries, the encouragement of those industries which are adapted to our colony and circumstances, and which therefore have a direct bearing upon our fiscal policy, and tend to the comfort and well-being of the population. I feel that the reason why this amendment has been moved is, that members on this side had no opportunity of speaking to an original motion which was before the House, and to which by the Standing Orders they are now not permitted to refer. On the occasion in question, I rose simultaneously with the hon. member for Bundanba, and as I had prepared a few remarks to offer to the House, I do not think it is out of place that I should take this opportunity of placing those views before it. There is much in the latter part of the speech of the hon. member for Bundanba which at first may seem to go a long way further than most hon. members have been prepared to go, but those remarks cover a great and important social question which has to be faced in every country in the world, and which must be faced in this young country of ours if we are ever to have any position among the nations of the world, or even emerge from a mere state of pupilage. It appears to me that the finest nationalism, the truest policy which will bind together our colony, and enable us to take a position among the nations of the world, and which will bring us to that point, which will render us ultimately independent of external influences, is the policy shadowed out in the amendment of the hon. member for Bundanba, and in no way is this policy more intimately connected with the country than in the question of wages. Now heaps of misrepresentation have been hurled at my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, on account of certain views which he is supposed to hold upon this important question. I have searched the writings of the hon. gentleman; I have listened to his speeches; and I have never been able to detect in those writings or speeches anything but an assertion made in bold unmistakable language, that the labourer is entitled to participate in the fruits of production in proportion to his contribution thereto. That is the beginning and ending of all the deliverances and utterances that have been made by the hon. the leader of the party to which I am proud to belong, on this most important subject. I ask you, Sir, for what reason do people leave the old country and for what reason do they seek a new home in these southern lands? The only object they have in view is to better their condition, and having in this land obtained what they were unable to obtain in older countries—a full share of political power and an immunity from those burdens which the long course of the world's history, including the monstrous development of feudalism, has laid upon them—I say, in this new world, under happier and better conditions, they now seek for such a permanent improvement in their condition as shall raise them to a higher plane than they ever occupied or could hope to occupy in the old land. The doctrine of unrestricted competition must surely tend to the reduction of wages or profits, and everything else. We are told that wages depend upon supply and demand. I believe they do to a large extent; but we are also told by the great writers on the subject that there is a standard of comfort below which the labourer will not submit to work, and which has an important effect in interfering with these laws of supply and demand. Now, it is my aim, and the aim of this party, to raise that standard of comfort—to permanently raise the standard of comfort to every worker in this colony—to permanently raise them to that plane which was so eloquently set forth in the preamble of

1889—6 N

the Bill introduced by my hon. leader, and which met an untimely fate in another place—to give the labourer time for social, political, and intellectual occupation. While I listened to the hon. member for Bundanba I could not help thinking how eloquent and grand was his exposition of the question. I could not help thinking while he was speaking of his small position in this world, how, if he was poor in the things of this world, he was rich in that faith which must tend to raise and elevate humanity; how he spoke of the necessity of not being rich at the expense of others, and how he spoke of the possibility of pressing these matters to such a point that the labourer shall not be deprived of comfort and consolation in this world, if not in the next. Now, that has been the aim and object of the party with which I am associated, and it is the tenet I have held ever since I was able to think for myself. Our efforts have always been consistently and continuously directed towards the elevation of those who form the largest portion of the human family, and who are in that sense by far the most important. Now, the great questions which have been opened in this and in the debate to which I am not permitted to refer, have all had to do with a proposal that, in order that a certain class of wealth should be produced in this colony of Queensland, some form of labour which is content with a lower standard of civilisation, and a lower plane of comfort and existence than obtains among other workers should be established and fostered in our midst. I say, unhesitatingly, that if this is to be the price of the production of any export in this colony, I trust I shall remain long in this place to oppose what I believe to be a false, misguided, and misjudged policy. Now, Sir, what are the wages of labour? Labour is the whole capital of the worker. It is his only resource, and if he did not use his political power for the purpose of protecting himself, he would certainly be the most foolish being on the face of the earth. I am sure that I have always held these opinions, that any degradation of labour, or any permanent lowering of wages, or any permanent reduction of the standard of comfort, must seriously injure the State. There is no pleasure to me like that of paying, so far as my means will allow, the best wages for any kind of labour; and although I do not labour with my own hands, I would resist in the interest of the commonwealth as strongly as any labouring man in the community, anything which would have a tendency to unduly reduce wages or lower the comfort of the labourer. In reviewing the history of the sugar industry in this colony, I feel satisfied of this: That the days of large estates are not only numbered, but they have absolutely gone. The only remedy I can see is in some form of co-operation—co-operative growing of the produce, and its manufacture by some form of central mills. I know that these doctrines are not popular, but the doctrines of justice and right have never been popular in this world, and they never will be to the end of time. If people are content to glide along the stream of public opinion, and to run with the opinions of those supposed to occupy the same plane in society—if there be planes in society—they may have an easy time of it; but the moment any person takes up the vindication of an abstract right which he has arrived at by a process of reasoning, and which he can justify to his conscience and intellect, that moment that man runs counter to the prejudices of a large section of the community—that part of the community which is constantly engaged in the accumulation of wealth, and whose doctrine is the doctrine "Let us eat, drink, and be merry, for to-morrow we die." And if they must get money, no matter how, such a person runs counter to the prejudices of these people, and he is sure to earn for himself abuse, vilification,



insult, and misrepresentation. That is the history of the world, and though the forms of persecution are not what they were at one time, the persecution still exists quite as strongly. We have heard a very great deal from hon. gentlemen about an exodus from the North which is to take place if the sugar industry is not propped up. The population of this colony is about 400,000 souls, and from the returns annexed to the Decentralisation Bill we learn that the population of the North is about 70,000. That includes all the miners of Charters Towers and of the other goldfields, the population around our coasts and the pastoral lands in the vast interior and of the Gulf country, and the sugar industry is really responsible for only about 10,000 people. We have been told over and over again in every form of reiteration, that if we do or fail to do certain things that are demanded of us, this population will come down to Brisbane famished and starving, and demanding redress and relief. For my part I shall be happy to contribute according to my means to their support if they do come down, rather than that an iniquitous system should be perpetuated, one that cannot fail to have the ultimate effect of placing a blot upon this colony. I notice in the Loan Estimates there is an item of £250,000 for immigration.

The SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is out of order in referring to the Loan Estimates, as they are not before the House.

The Hon. Sir S. W. GRIFFITH: That is a matter now before the House, as the motion is one to go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. GROOM: And the Loan Estimates have already been referred to a Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER: I find I have made a mistake. I am obliged to the hon. gentleman for the correction. I was speaking without looking at the notice paper.

Mr. BARLOW: I was observing, if I am in order, that a document has been referred to the Committee of Supply, which is entitled "The Loan Estimates for the year 1889-90," and that the first item upon it is an item of £250,000 for immigration for two years. Surely if this trouble is coming upon us for having done what is just and right, and what we think proper in connection with the sugar industry, there is a very simple remedy, and that is to suspend the operation of the Immigration Act for a time, until this absorption of labour has taken place. The comfort and credit of the colony does not consist in its having an immense number of people, but in having a population well fed, well housed, well clothed, and well taught, and who are engaged in the useful arts of industry in building up this young country. I am quite sure these well-seasoned immigrants from the North will form a valuable contribution to the Southern population, far more valuable than could possibly be afforded by any equal number of persons coming out from the old country without colonial experience, and without any knowledge of the way in which things are done in this country. I therefore respectfully recommend to the attention of the Government, that if they have any fear of an influx of men out of work from the North, in consequence of steps taken or refused to be taken by this House, they have a simple remedy in the suspension of free immigration. We contend against the importation of the refuse of population of other countries, but we are always ready to welcome any labour that comes here to form a part of our country, so long as it does not come here under conditions that will tend to reduce the rate of wages, or lower the standard of comfort. We have many wants yet in this

community, and, as I pointed out when the Estimates were going through last session, we have not a single small arms or cartridge factory here. We have not a powder mill or the means of defending ourselves.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Or a paper mill.

Mr. BARLOW: Yes, we have not got a paper mill, and there are many other wants that might well be supplied. There is plenty of room for the absorption into our labour market of all those people in the North, if they should unfortunately have to come amongst us. I do not believe there is anything like such a large number of persons likely to be deprived of their means of subsistence. I do not think that the town of Mackay, for instance, which is supposed to be the very heart of the sugar industry, would be entirely abandoned if the sugar industry were wiped out to-morrow. There must be some industries in that town besides the sugar. I have visited Mackay, and though I did not make myself intimately acquainted with the town, yet I could see there were other industries there. Then there must be some back country; there must be something or other to support the town. It may be that the sugar industry is the principal industry; but to believe that if that industry ceased to exist the whole of the inhabitants of Mackay would, with one accord, put up their shutters and come down to Brisbane is, to my mind, absurd and impossible. There are other places in the North which are partly dependent upon the sugar industry, and although there might be a little suffering and trouble for a time, until people fell into their places, things would ultimately right themselves. I remember the Canoona rush taking place before Rockhampton had an existence, and I remember the Government of New South Wales were obliged to send vessels up to bring the people back to Sydney. But they did not all come back. A great many of them remained there and formed the commencement of the prosperous town of Rockhampton. We are not going to be scared. We should be very unwise if we were scared by any of these bugbears which are raised. Our business is to go forward and do what we consider to be right, and what the great bulk of the people of this colony believe to be right. I do not wish to rake up any sores, but I cannot help saying that on this side of the House sit, to a very large extent, the representatives of the great centres of population. It is true that in one or two cases—notably in the case of North and South Brisbane—there is a divided representation; but that does not prove anything. Anyone casting his eyes over the list of the members of the Liberal party will see that they represent all the large centres of population. All these large centres of population have, upon a distinct issue, propounded to them in 1883, and repeated in 1888, distinctly pledged their representatives against the introduction of any class of servile labour. A remedy has been suggested by the Minister for Mines and Works, and I must say that with the exception of the hon. member for Rosewood—whose suggested remedy was more of a fiscal character—no other hon. member has made any actual suggestion for any other importation of labour but the Minister for Mines and Works. I believe that all the hon. member for Bundamba read about the country population of Italy is true. I am happy to say that I have been for forty-one years in the colonies, and I have no desire to quit them; and I have, therefore, not had an opportunity of looking at the countries of Continental Europe, but I know that the great bulk of the respectable frugal farmers of Northern Italy, who hold their lands upon what is called

the "metayer" system would not be at all likely to come here. In the first place they are manifestly a conservative people, and they have the advantage of living under a land system which is, perhaps, one of the most perfect which could be devised. Hon. members know that the "metayer" system is one by which the landlord finds the land, and in some cases the seed for the land. The rent is paid in the shape of a fixed proportion of the produce. I cannot say off-hand what that proportion is, but I believe it varies in different places. That system should commend itself to hon. members of this House as being eminently fair, as both parties benefit by it if the crops are good, while if the harvests are bad both parties suffer together. There is none of that unfortunate system of land tenure which prevails in the United Kingdom, where rents are paid in money, and where the tenant must convert his produce into money in order to pay a fixed sum of money to his landlord. That is a very different thing. Under the British system, whether the harvest is good or bad, the tenant has to pay a certain fixed amount. I am quite certain, from what I have read on the subject, that the "metayer" tenants of Northern Italy would not come to this colony; and the only class of Italians who might be induced to come, would be the beggar population of the towns—lazzaroni, as they are called. I would almost prefer to have the French convicts from New Caledonia to having those persons. I should like to know what would be the effect if a gang of banditti established themselves in some of our ranges. It would be a curious experience if the Colonial Treasurer of this colony were carried off by banditti who had established themselves in the mountains near Rockhampton—Mount Archer and Mount Berserker, I believe they are named. In Italy it is by no means an uncommon thing for respectable citizens and men of means to be kidnapped by banditti and held to ransom. That is perhaps an extreme case; but I feel certain that nothing could be worse for our population, or for our progress as a nation, than to bring this class of people here whom we should ultimately have to admit to our electoral rolls. We should have a system of degradation and deterioration which is something fearful to contemplate. I believe these Italian lazzaroni are the lowest class in the world but one—and they are the Maltese. I believe they were spoken of at one time as possible immigrants to this colony. They are, I believe, a combination of everything that is bad—of the Italian, the Greek, with a touch of the Arab or Saracen from the African coast. They are probably the worst race on the face of the earth; but the low-class Italians would be a permanent deterioration of our civilisation. They would keep by themselves; and what we want above all things in this country is the immigration of a class which will mix with the general population. We do not want these cliques and clans set up in our midst. We want to have races which will come here and help to form the great Australian race of the future. Why should we not have in Australia the grandest race the world ever saw? We have one of the finest climates in the world; we have the freest institutions in the world; we have at present, if we are careful of it, a very high standard of civilisation, and a very high standard of comfort. What we want is to bring out races of people who will not segregate themselves in clans and classes, but will freely mix with our population. I believe the importation of Italians will fulfil none of these conditions. Our police expenditure in the North would be greatly increased, the statistics of crime would go up,

and I do not believe that if those people were brought into the colony and set to work they would work. They will not work in their country, which is very analogous to our own, and I do not think the lazzaroni of Southern Italy are at all likely to work here. Therefore, I think the remedy proposed, though no doubt proposed in good faith, is one which cannot in any way be held to meet the exigencies of the case. Something has been said in the public Press and other places about the competition of beet sugar. I have always contended that it is not merely the competition of beet sugar which is causing the trouble. There has been an over-production of cane sugar as well, which has had the effect of closing the market in many places against those countries which cannot produce cane sugar at the lowest and cheapest rates. If the House should decline to accept this amendment, and refuse to vote for the fostering of the sugar industry among the other industries which are comprehended in the expansive amendment submitted by the hon. member for Bundamba, they will inflict a very serious injury upon the credit of the colony; it will injure the credit of the colony if it goes forth that this legislature is not willing to foster the industries of the colony and to take every possible step to make us a self-dependent community. When I say a self-dependent community, I do not necessarily mean an independent State. I believe and trust we shall long remain allied with the United Kingdom, but it will be an alliance, not a dependence. It will be a friendly alliance, an alliance of affection, an alliance of common interests. Therefore, for any legislature, or for any Ministry, to say that they will not foster the interests of their country will be to inflict a very heavy stab at our own credit in the home country. We have already, as has been frequently pointed out, an immense railway system which is not paying its expenses, and we have in the Loan Estimates, which have been referred to Committee of Supply, an indication of the borrowing of something like £5,000,000. I was very much struck with a remark of the Commissioners for Railways during their Northern tour. Those gentlemen were reported to be giving their opinions upon the railways of the country, and they said that while the construction of the railways was everything that could be desired, while the engineering works were entitled to their highest commendation, what struck them in connection with the railway system of the colony was the want of traffic. The only way by which to induce a sufficiency of traffic on our railways to pay the interest on the money spent on their construction, without pressing on the wages of labour by taxing the necessities of life, is to foster and encourage the development of our own country. There is a peculiarity about cane sugar which was insisted upon on a former occasion, and that is that it can only be grown in certain climates and by a certain class of labour. Sugar-cane will not grow all over the world; it is only capable of being grown over a very small portion of the earth's surface. On the other hand, beetroot—the great competitor of cane—has a very much wider range. It ranges all over the temperate zone, and I believe it could be made to pay if grown here. I am perfectly certain it would be a remunerative crop in the southern part of Victoria, which is now under potatoes. That is a crop which does not afford much profit, while beetroot would afford a very much larger profit. Cane sugar is, and always must be, a special, a peculiar, and a limited industry. Those facts are often lost sight of. We cannot grow cane all over Queensland. We cannot grow it all over the North. It is only in small parts of the country—on the banks of the Northern rivers—

that cane can be grown. People often talk on this subject as if the entire North were one vast field of cane. The cane area is very small indeed, and when you get beyond a certain boundary you cannot grow it at all; whereas its great competitor—beet—can be grown all over the temperate zone, and I believe to a very large extent in Australia, especially in the southern portions of the colony of Victoria. I know that at one time it was proposed to grow it there, and calculations were made which showed that it could be made to pay without putting on a much higher protective duty than the Victorian people were at that time prepared to submit to; but, being a new and untried industry they were not prepared to go into the cultivation of the beet. But I am almost certain it was tried there, and I believe with very fair success. One of the points insisted upon in the debate on this subject has been that the German people are tired of the bonus on their sugar production; but I think I can appeal to my hon. friend, the member for Rosewood, who is in constant communication with Germany and German friends, that there cannot be a greater fallacy. The profits of the drawback on duty given there go into the pockets of the great bulk of the people. The system of taxation which prevails there is much more fair and perfect than ours, because it is levied upon the rich and the poor alike, and the agricultural population of Germany benefit from this tax to a very large extent. In fact, it has been shown in many articles which have appeared in recent magazines and financial papers, that the very existence of the German army depends to a great extent upon this industry.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: No; they only get 4d. a day.

Mr. BARLOW: I say the very existence of the German armies depends upon this industry, because Germany is wedged in between two powerful neighbours, and must maintain at all hazards an immense military force; and until this great military armament can be set aside by some system of arbitration, or by some International Government, it is absolutely necessary that it should be kept up, and it can be kept up in no other way except by encouraging a large population; and a large population can be supported in no other way than by finding the people employment. That, so far as I have been able to read, is the head and front both of the protective system of Germany and of the duty on beetroot sugar. That duty assumes the form of a drawback, and thereby does not appear on the German Budget, but it really forms a very considerable bonus on exportation. With regard to the prices of sugar, I have before me a copy of the report of the Board of Trade, entitled, "Progress of the sugar trade," with an appendix in continuation of the statistical tables contained in Parliamentary paper No. 353, of session 1888, and other information. It is a return furnished to the House of Commons on the motion of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, and the results are given in tabular form. It says: "Calculation as to the amount of bounty on sugar given by the undermentioned countries," and the columns, reading horizontally, are, France, Germany, Belgium, and Holland. The first item is:—

"Total production of sugar: France, 555,000 tons; Germany, 990,000 tons; Belgium, 150,000 tons; Holland, 30,000 tons. Estimated proportion of surplus sugar manufactured to total production—France, 36½ per cent.; Germany, 25 per cent.; Belgium 20 per cent.; Holland, 16 per cent. Amount of surplus sugar: France, 200,000 tons; Germany, 250,000 tons; Belgium, 30,000 tons; Holland, 6,000 tons. Rate of duty: France, 50 francs per 100 kilos, plus 10 francs on all sugar; Germany, 10s. 3d. per cwt. —namely, 6s. on all finished sugar and 4s. 3d. on the roots; Belgium, 45 francs per 100 kilos;

Holland, 27 florins per 100 kilos. Estimated total loss of revenue from surplus sugar escaping duty: France, £1,000,000; Germany, £1,000,000; Belgium, £550,000; Holland, £162,000. Estimated bonus on production, dividing total loss of revenue by quantity produced: France, £7 4s. per ton; Germany, £1 per ton; Belgium, £3 13s. per ton; Holland, £4 10s. per ton. Total sugar exported: France, 159,000 tons; Germany, 619,000 tons; Belgium, 111,000 tons; Holland, 96,000 tons. Apparent bonus on export, dividing total drawback on surplus sugar exported by total quantity exported: France, £3,180,000, or £20 per ton; Germany, £1,000,000, or £1 12s. per ton; Belgium, £550,000, or £5 per ton; Holland, £162,000, or £1 14s. per ton. Estimated bonus on production, dividing total drawback on surplus exported by quantity produced: France, £5 14s. per ton; Germany, £1 per ton; Belgium, £3 13s. per ton; Holland, £4 10s. per ton."

Then the report says:—

"The reduction in the price of sugar in the period covered by the tables has been very great—in raw sugar from an average price, including duty, of 42s. 4d. per cwt. in 1855-59, to an average price of 13s. 6d. in 1888; and in refined sugar from an average price, with duty, of 57s. per cwt. in 1855-59, to an average price in 1888 of 17s. 6d. Much of the reduction in price has taken place since 1874, when the duty was abolished, and half the total reduction of price to the consumer in the period may be considered to arise from the abolition of the duty, and half from other causes connected with the supply and demand of the article itself. The net effect is that the people of the United Kingdom pay only about £16,500,000 for the large amount of sugar they now consume annually, whereas seven or eight years ago they paid from £20,000,000 to £24,000,000 for about 25 per cent. less quantity, and even the 8,000,000 cwt., which was all the consumption thirty-five years ago, cost, inclusive of duty, as much as thrice that quantity, which is the present consumption, now does. All this is, of course, subject to the qualification stated in the preceding paragraph, that the consumption in question is not all the final consumption of the people of the United Kingdom; but, in another way, the fall of price, being the fall in a raw material used in manufacturing, must be assumed to have stimulated the industries in which the fall has occurred."

So that the remarkable fact is brought out by this official return, that the people of the United Kingdom pay £16,500,000 sterling for a large quantity of sugar now, whereas seven or eight years ago they paid from £20,000,000 to £24,000,000 for 25 per cent. less quantity. Could there be any more striking illustration of the complete collapse of the sugar industry in respect to the general footing upon which that industry stands. I do not think any commentary is required on a state of things which is so self-evident. These things lead back to the argument that the want of coloured labour has not been the cause of the collapse, if it has collapsed, of the sugar industry in North Queensland. I deny that the planters have not had all the labour they require. I maintain it is an entire fallacy and mistake to say that the sugar industry has been denied anything. That industry has had, and now has, all the labour it can require. It is true that the price of the kanaka has risen, like everything else that is ruled by the law of supply and demand. It is impossible to take those people from a number of comparatively small islands from time to time continuously, without producing somewhat the same effect as if you went into any of the great shooting grounds in the United Kingdom—preserves, as they are called—and kept on continually destroying game. Of course it would become scarce, and in course of time there would be none left. This is what has been going on in connection with the kanaka business. The kanakas have been brought here from their islands and having obtained an insight into our civilisation, and learned the real value of their services, they demand a certain rate of wages; and we find from these causes that the kanaka has become lately a very expensive luxury, and very possibly some of the profits that the sugar producers made years ago has been absorbed in the increased value of kanakas,

I was never more amused than I was in Mackay when conversing with a very respectable man, who spoke of his having been sold off as an unsuccessful planter, and referred, no doubt very properly from his point of view, to his stock in trade of kanakas having been sold below their value. It certainly was against my nature to hear these people spoken of in that way, but I suppose it was considered all right in those latitudes. But there is no doubt that the increased price of the kanaka has caused some of the constriction which has taken place in the sugar industry. The kanaka has been a scarce and expensive article, but hitherto the planters have had all they wanted. The only point at issue is whether after an extension of time has been granted for this traffic, the traffic should now come to an end or not. In the face of the competition in sugar, particulars of which I have read to the House from the trade returns, I do not think it would have made the slightest difference what sort of labour had been employed by the planters, because other sugar-growing countries have suffered in the same way, even those which have had an abundant supply of coolie and Javanese labour. It has been the immense over-production of cane sugar, and its being crowded to some extent out of existence by the invention of beet sugar, further stimulated by the bounties of France, Germany, and Holland, that has brought about the present state of affairs. That, I think, is indisputable, and cannot be contradicted. A remark has been made about the Colonial Bank of Jamaica having made a favourable report, and stated that things are getting on very nicely, and that the prospects of that institution are progressing. I have heard a great deal about the Colonial Bank—the Anglo West Indian Bank—which has branches in the West Indian Islands, and I believe it is about the slowest establishment in existence. For a time the depression in the sugar industry in the West Indian Islands reduced that Colonial Bank to the very unpleasant predicament of semi-insolvency, but, of course, the wise measures which have been taken by the British Government of late years, and the spirit of enterprise which was introduced into the West Indian Islands by a very distinguished gentleman who was their Governor, and who, in fact, I believe, induced some of the black negro population to do a little work—I say that these things have produced a small amount of prosperity in the West Indies. But that by no means proves that the production of cane sugar by black labour is on a safe or sure basis, or that it has escaped the great competition of beet sugar which has been harassing and destroying it for so many years past. Apart, however, from all other questions connected with the introduction of servile races, there is the question of the possibility of a war of races. I was reading the other day in a magazine relating to the United States that the question of a war of races is becoming a very serious matter in that country; that the problem of how to deal with the negro population in the Southern States, now that they are freed from slavery, is becoming a very serious problem, which may interfere with and impede the progress of the United States. What with the negro vote, and another vote which I need not refer to particularly, the United States Government is in a very unpleasant position, and the statesmen of that country are obliged to make concessions to those two votes which very often prevent them doing their duty in a straightforward way to their country. In the magazine to which I refer there was a suggestion made that it might become necessary to purchase the island of Cuba and send the whole negro population there, and turn them out of the United

States bag and baggage. It cannot be denied that these races will not work, and will not take their share in the development of the nation as do the white races with which we are familiar. If that is the case it is very strong testimony in justification of any fear we may entertain of a war of races. I would invite the attention of the House to the state of affairs in Singapore, where there is a large Chinese population. I am told that the Chinese there are a most turbulent people, and as troublesome to the Government as it is possible to conceive. They have their organisations of secret societies, which they call "hongs," and in San Francisco they have also their secret societies and courts of justice, independent of the courts of justice of the State. I believe it has come to this point in San Francisco, that the police of the State of California are almost obliged to make terms with these people, and enter into treaties with them, offensive and defensive, and that if any crime is committed in the Chinese quarter, instead of the ordinary minions of the law taking the matter in hand, the ordinary warrants being executed, and justice being carried out according to the law of that State, the police are obliged to enter into treaties with the heads of the Chinese organisations, or hongs. Sometimes the criminals are surrendered on certain conditions, but at other times they are never surrendered at all, and it is quite possible for a white man to enter into the quarter occupied by the Chinese, and never be heard of again. He disappears as completely as if the earth had opened and swallowed him up. These are some of the evils with which the introduction of servile races is attended. Where is there a man in this colony who does not go in for the administration of justice? It is unnecessary for us to have standing armies to carry out our laws, because every man in this country is his own policeman, and is directly interested in the maintenance of order and social discipline and economy. It is very different with Scotchmen; the nation typified by the music of the volunteers now passing this building. Wherever a Scotchman goes he sets himself to work to improve his condition, and this is specially seen in the enterprise of Scotchmen in the early days of Victoria. They take their share in the work of building up the nation, and always conform to the laws of the land. But the races to which I just referred have their own separate organisations, and should not be tolerated in a free country. Now, the hon. member for Bundamba very ably said that if any industry requires a special form of cheap labour, that industry is not in itself in any way desirable. It is one thing to protect an industry by keeping out the cheap productions of other countries, but where an industry wants to settle itself on our soil and work itself on a basis of cheap labour, I say we are better without it. We may suffer a little loss in our exports and imports, but we must be gainers in the end. If we keep out that which degrades and destroys, we must be gainers in the end, and therefore I support the contention of the hon. member for Bundamba, that any industry which requires special treatment is one which should be kept at a distance. Now, I was speaking on a previous occasion about the question of cheap European labour. I do not believe in it. I do not think it is at all desirable to bring out people here who cannot at once take up their position in the ranks of labour. It is a mistake to subject people to disabilities. We want the immigration of free men. It is true that every person who comes here has to accommodate himself to the circumstances of the colony, but it does not follow that we should go out of our way to help him. In the "Votes and Proceedings" of 1886, volume ii., page 907, will be found the details of an

experiment which the leader of the Opposition made by sending a gentleman to prevent the undoubted enslavement of the cheap labour of Germany. Having told the planters they could have this labour, the least that the hon. gentleman could do was to send home a gentleman in order that that labour should not be unjustly treated, and upon this very slender foundation a charge has been built up against my hon. friend of wanting to inundate the country with cheap labour. I feel sure there was nothing further from the intention of my hon. friend than to inundate the country with cheap labour of any kind. I believe he is just as staunch as I am in his desire to uphold the rights of labour, and I know he has written and spoken noble sentiments in that direction which have never been answered. They have been ridiculed by people who have not the sense to comprehend them. They have been ridiculed by persons who have never gone through the processes of thought which that hon. gentleman has gone through; they have been ridiculed by people who never knew as much as the hon. gentleman has forgotten, and those views show that the charge of attempting to inundate the country with cheap labour is wholly inconsistent with facts. At the utmost it was a very doubtful experiment, and I am very glad that it came to nothing. I rejoice to see our German countrymen coming here. They are a race from which I have sprung. They are our cousins and brothers, and when they come upon terms of equality and bring their valuable qualities of steadiness, sobriety, and honesty of purpose, and mix with our population, the German people are among our best colonists. I need only go to the electorate of Rosewood, and there find a standing model and example of what the German colonists have done. That great electorate, which has been neglected and allowed to stand still for want of encouragement, has a population second to none in the colony. When I first came here, more than twenty years ago, I passed along the railway line, and at the present Rosewood gate the scrub was right up to the line. Now what do we see? In all directions we find cultivation, industry, and prosperity. We find the same in Fassifern, and wherever the German people are settled down. I think the experiment of cheap German labour having been unsuccessful, if ever it was tried, should never be tried again. The planters have been told unmistakably that black labour cannot be agreed to, and I hope no attempt will be made to bring here cheap labour of any form. I say if sugar cannot be grown by white labour, then it is an artificial export. It has been denied often that it can be grown by white labour, but that question has to be solved. I do not believe that white labour can grow sugar under all conditions under which it is now grown. It is possible that some operations in the way of cultivation with which I am not familiar may be necessary in order that white labour may be employed, but if it cannot be grown by white labour, then I say it is a very doubtful benefit to this colony to grow it at all. I wish to say a few words now about Mauritius. Hon. members will remember that on the 5th May, 1884, occurred a great financial disaster—the suspension of the Oriental Bank Corporation. I well remember in Melbourne the feeling of uncertainty and disquietude on the day the shutters of that bank were put up. Now, the main cause of the failure of the bank was the depreciation of sugar properties in the island of Mauritius. The advances that had been made by that bank upon sugar properties were exactly analogous to the advances made by banks in Victoria and by capitalists upon sugar plantations in the North of Queensland, only the capital invested was very much larger.

The causes which led to the want of remunerative returns from those sugar plantations were very similar in both cases. The Oriental Bank Corporation was farming the greater part of the island of Mauritius, and was carrying on the greater number of the plantations there from bad to worse. There was another reason operating in the suspension of that institution, and that was the depreciation of silver, but to go into that would take us too much out of our way. One of the main causes was the enormous sum invested in plantations in Mauritius, which plantations ceased to pay, and that from causes exactly analogous to those operating in North Queensland. I should remark that Mauritius always had coloured labour, and the plantations there are entirely worked by coloured labour, and by the importation of coolies in vast numbers from India. The same causes were operating slowly and surely upon the plantations in the island of Mauritius that have been operating slowly and surely for years past in North Queensland. It is true the embarrassment and fall did not occur at the same time, but that is because the plantations in North Queensland were not so far advanced. Mauritius is an old sugar country in full working order, while the plantations in Queensland are not in full working order, and pressure came upon Mauritius before it came upon ourselves. These are facts which are set forth in the reports and balance-sheets rendered to the shareholders of the Oriental Bank Corporation. I believe there is another colony where sugar has been tried, and that is Natal. I do not profess to know much about it, and I have not had time to look the matter up, but I understand the plantations there are worked by coolies, Chinese, and Kaffirs, the aboriginal population of South Africa, and even there cane sugar has not been a success. I believe we are indebted to the non-success of cane sugar in Natal for the presence of a very able gentleman in this House, who came to this colony from Natal. It has not been a success there, any more than in Mauritius, though they had the advantage of black labour, and it brings us back to the original statement that the over-production of cane sugar, and the competition created by beet sugar, have been the causes of the decay of the industry in all these places. There has been a little prosperity in Jamaica, but that has been due to causes to a great extent outside the sugar industry. I believe a very large trade in fruit has been established between Jamaica and the United States, and the very able gentleman who lately presided over the destinies of Jamaica, by his ability and foresight, has been the means of placing that colony in a position of something like decent respectability, and in that the Anglo-West Indian Bank shared to some extent. I would regard the admission of kanakas into North Queensland, and the extension of the Act permitting their importation with some degree of equanimity if we could be sure that the kanaka was a finality. But I am as certain as that I am standing in this House that the kanaka will not be a finality. I do not see how it is possible, if the sugar industry is fostered by the admission of kanakas for a further period. It will only acquire strength by that which it feeds upon, and it will at length demand some other form of coloured labour, and it will demand reciprocity treaties with the southern colonies. It will demand coloured labour, and we shall have in this House a Northern party, like a party in the House of Commons, who will direct their attention to one thing and to gaining one particular object. They will direct their attention to gaining coolie labour. The kanaka must waste away in his own islands by the deportation of the healthy males, and he

must become more expensive year after year, until his capital value will be raised so high that he will not pay. Then the sugar industry, having gained strength by what it feeds upon, will demand the worst and most demoralising form of human labour it is possible to conceive, and that is Chinese or Indian coolies. We do not want to see Mauritius reproduced in this colony. We have a higher and a nobler destiny for Queensland than that, and if the people of North Queensland cannot find any better employment than to act as mean whites to the planters, let them come South, and we will stop immigration for a time and make room for them. If necessary—so far as my vote goes—I will help to support them, and will, according to my limited means, help to support them myself; but I certainly will not, because of any bugbear of a number of people not exceeding 7,000 or 8,000 coming to Brisbane and the south and centre to find employment, be induced to give my consent to a state of things that will ultimately lead to the introduction of coolies or any other form of coloured labour. Reciprocity is a matter that so much affects my constituents that I feel bound to say something about it, and to amplify the remarks I made upon the subject last session. There has been great talk about this glorious intercolonial freetrade and this colonial federation. The federation of the colonies, so far as the apprehension of offenders, the defence of the colonies by sea, and many other things go would be a very good federation; but when it comes to the farmers of West Moreton, Rosewood, Fassifern, Stanley, Lockyer, and a great part of Bundamba being sacrificed in order that an artificial form of industry may be set up in the North for the benefit of capitalists, many of whom do not belong to our country, I say I would rather be obliged to remain out of the House if I could not get elected upon the basis of opposing any such arrangement. It may be called selfishness, but surely if the colony of Victoria cannot stand against the competition of New Zealand, Queensland cannot. Victoria, which has a fine climate, and is adapted for the growth of farm produce, cannot stand against the competition of New Zealand; and one of the first things which would be demanded in any reciprocity treaty between the colonies of Queensland, Victoria, and New Zealand, would be a reciprocity in the matter of farm produce. My idea of a reciprocity is not to admit things which we can grow ourselves, but to admit things which we cannot grow. If there was any special product in Victoria or New Zealand which could not by any possibility be grown here, then in that case a reciprocity treaty upon the basis of an exchange of our sugar for that commodity, might be a very good thing; but as it is, the loss would be all on one side, and the gain all on the other. I have no hesitation in saying that the farmers of West Moreton would be worse than insane if they returned to this House any man who would lead up to a state of things which would cause a reciprocity treaty to be entered into which would put their produce out of the market, by allowing unrestricted competition which would turn West Moreton into a sheep walk. These remarks may appear extreme. I was asked on a previous occasion, "What is West Moreton compared with the great sugar industry?" But we who represent West Moreton, where our interests are concerned, are not going to consent to anything which, in a long train of ideas and consequences, may end in the destruction of the principal mainstay of that district—the agricultural industry—in order that a special form of industry may be maintained and fostered in the North. I, for one, have not the slightest hesitation to go to any district in West Moreton to refute the

fallacies which have been brought forward about this sugar industry. I should have the undivided support of any electorate in West Moreton, in giving utterance to the views which I am now giving utterance to. These grand ideas are all very well; but we must creep before we walk. Intercolonial federation, reciprocity treaties, and freetrade and all those kind of things will be all very nice when they are all started upon the one basis; but in the meantime they are impossible and impracticable. If federation were brought about, one of the first things which would be demanded by a party in this House, who are sent here to represent the sugar industry, would be—not the general interests of the colony, but of the one particular interest they are connected with. I have not the slightest doubt of the truth of that. The federation of the colonies is not, in my opinion, the giving up of any of our individual rights. I believe the United States of America is one of the greatest federations in the world. In that great federation there are certainly some things which I would not surrender to any federal Government; but, as a rule, the rights of individual States are well preserved. Those persons in this colony who clamour for the American constitution do not know what the American constitution is. They do not know the immense power possessed by the Senate of the United States, and they do not understand what liberty they enjoy under our constitution. Any federation will have my most strenuous opposition that would place our interests, which have been built up after so many years with so much care and painful energy, at the mercy of any other industry which is said to be superior to our interests, and which insists upon being protected at our expense by reciprocity treaties. It has been said that we on this side of the House are actuated by an intense hatred against the kanaka and against other forms of the human family because they have black skins. It has been industriously circulated in pamphlets and newspapers that we have a personal hatred and contempt for those men because they happen to have black skins. Nothing can be more unjust. We are accused of being what is called the "Exeter Hall party." Who have done so much for the protection of the aborigines all over the world as the Exeter Hall party? Who have protected the inhabitants of the South Sea Islands and of other parts of the world, where the inhabitants have black skins, and where they were preyed upon by unprincipled adventurers, like the Exeter Hall party—that much maligned party? These are the men who have protected the black skins, and who have sent missionaries to them, and who have made it possible to trade in the Fiji Islands. I can remember the time, even in my short life, when it was not safe to go to the Fijis. When I first landed in Sydney in 1848 it was an exceedingly dangerous thing to go to those islands; and what has caused the change in the state of affairs? It has entirely been brought about by the Liberal party in England—the party which is called the "Exeter Hall party," and who have been charged with cant and hypocrisy.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: They are a lot of thieves.

Mr. BARLOW: These are the people who have gone down to those islands and made trade possible. The Exeter Hall party still exists, and will exist long after the people who speak against them have ceased to exist. They have vindicated themselves in the past, and they will vindicate themselves in the future. I say there is no hatred on the part of any man on this side of the House against any man because his skin is black. We have a hatred for those who would enslave the man with the

black skin, who would rob him of the fruits of his labour. We have a hatred for those who would reduce him to a mere chattel, and who would put him down on the auctioneer's bill as they would put down a horse or a mule. These are the people we do not like; but we have never, either in this House or anywhere else, shown any feeling of hatred against a man simply because his skin is black. In his own place and in his own country he is a useful and valuable member of the great human family, and he may be working out a destiny we know nothing of. It may be that he is destined to disappear in the course of years; but I say that the Liberal party in England, and the Liberal party in Queensland, have done their very best to protect the black man. They have not abandoned him, or made him a mere money-making machine, or sold him like a bullock in the shambles. They have always done their best to rescue him from those who would work out his destruction. I remember reading about a case that occurred at a station near Myall Creek, in New South Wales, of the poisoning of blacks with arsenic, and at another station they murdered the blacks, for which, I think, five men were hanged in Sydney. It was before I came to the colony, but the recollection of it was fresh in the minds of the people at the time. I know that Mr. J. H. Plunkett, as noble and good a man as ever lived, the then Attorney-General of New South Wales, was hounded almost to death, because he stood up for the equal punishment of those men who murdered those aboriginal blacks. The whole power of the social fabric of Sydney at that time was exerted to save the lives of those scoundrels who, it was proved, had murdered those unfortunate blacks, but thanks to Mr. Plunkett, unsuccessfully; and the entire story may be found in Flanagan's "History of New South Wales." Mr. Plunkett was a man who was animated solely by a sense of justice.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: He was just a Government hack.

Mr. BARLOW: I am sorry to hear the hon. member speak in that way of a man who was the proudest ornament of the hon. member's country and church. The hon. member is the first man, and the first Irishman I ever heard say a word against him.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Bad men have come out of Ireland as well as good.

Mr. BARLOW: There is a story told about four timber-getters who were bathing in a Northern river—

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Was it not a creek?

Mr. BARLOW: I object to these interruptions of the hon. member.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member must not interrupt the hon. member for Ipswich while he is speaking.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker,—I should like to know what is the question before the House.

The SPEAKER: The question was, "That the Speaker do now leave the chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply"; to which it has been proposed, by way of amendment, to omit all the words after "that," with the view of inserting the following, "in the opinion of this House it is desirable early next session to adopt some means of encouraging the manufacturing and producing interests of the colony."

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Lord save us! If that is the case, go on. I will not interrupt the hon. member any more.

Mr. BARLOW: I was saying that four timber-getters were bathing in a river, and while they were bathing, an alligator seized one of them, upon which, it is said, the other three ran away and left the man to his fate. But a kanaka who happened to be there went into the river and, with his axe, fought the alligator, and rescued his employer. In doing so his shoulder was so lacerated that for months afterwards he was laid up helpless in the hospital, and the white man whose life he had saved at the risk of his own never went near him; and the newspaper report adds that when he came out of the hospital his white master refused to employ him because he could not do a day's work. That is a very fair commentary on the hardness of heart which is engendered by allowing men to have control over a servile race. It is a cruelty of the feeling begotten in the hearts of white men, when they are allowed to hold their human brethren in anything approaching a state of slavery. I look upon that kanaka as a hero, and if I had my way I would decorate him with the gold medal of the Royal Humane Society.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: And put a ring in his nose.

Mr. BARLOW: If this is a specimen of the treatment kanakas receive in the North of Queensland, I think it will be a very good thing when kanakas are no longer allowed to come into the colony. It was said by an hon. member on one occasion that kanakas were unfit to intermarry with whites, and when asked about it in the city of Brisbane, he cast a deliberate slur and insult on the electors of this free country by asking the gentleman in return if he would give his daughter's hand in marriage to thousands of the electors of the city of Brisbane, adding, "I know he would not." Of course, in these matters there are certain social observances to be honoured, but there is a great difference in marriage questions between the electors of Brisbane and kanakas; and yet this gentleman, who is a member of Parliament, put kanakas on a higher level than the people who may possibly have had a share in sending him to this House. I will now refer to a paper in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, written by a Mr. Gilbert Parker. This gentleman appears to have been globe-trotting in the North, and he is giving his impressions of the state of things he met with there. We know there are a great many people who come to this colony for a few weeks, and go away fancying they know more about it than you do, Mr. Speaker, who have been here all your life, and are, I believe, a native of the country. This gentleman came here, passed a certain time among congenial society, and then I suppose he went home and posed as an authority upon the state of things in this colony. The first place he visited in connection with his investigations at Bundaberg was Phillips's hotel; and he says at the outset—

"Mr. Phillips's hotel is a kind of planter's house, and I had the good fortune to meet not only a number of planters there, but also many principal citizens, and some members of the Chamber of Commerce, and an irrigation enthusiast, who is trying to bring the Chaffey Brothers to Bundaberg on a joint stock scheme, to revolutionise the district. He has many followers, and there is a company being formed composed of many of the principal planters."

I hope that whatever the Bundaberg people do they will have nothing to do with Chaffey and Co. Mr. Parker goes on to say:—

"Meanwhile, however, the Bundaberg planters are in better heart than those of Mackay. Even now, about Townsville and Mackay, owing to the closing of mills and plantations, Europeans can be got for 15s. a week 'and found.'"

If that is the case, the best remedy is to cut off some of the free immigration, and provide those people about Townsville and Mackay with



passages to places where labour is not so superabundant. He says that Europeans can be got for 15s. a week and found.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Fifteen shillings a week is too much for a fool.

Mr. BARLOW: I must appeal to you for protection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member for Stanley has no right to interrupt the member who is addressing the House.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I was addressing a remark to another member.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order in speaking in any way so as to interrupt the member who is in possession of the House.

Mr. BARLOW: Mr. Parker, after stating that Europeans can be got for 15s. a week and found, says that the small farmers are throwing up their places.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I would not give the hon. member 2s. 6d. a week.

The SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member will not continue to interrupt. It is out of order to make a noise while an hon. member is speaking, or to interrupt him in any way.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: But really, Mr. Speaker, he is not worth 1s. 6d. a week.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member must allow the hon. member who is in possession of the House to speak.

Mr. BARLOW: I shall not be deterred by any interruptions from saying what I have to say. I pay my way, and what I may be worth to any hon. member has nothing to do with the question. If what Mr. Parker states is a fact, the Government should take some steps to equalise the matter; and if people are not able to pay their own passages, the Government should do the same as was done in connection with the Canoona rush—take the people to places where they can earn a fair wage without reducing the wages of others. I have endeavoured as far as possible, without reading extracts for the mere sake of reading, to say what I intended to say on the occasion when I was prevented by an event which took place when I rose to address the House at the same time as the hon. member for Bundanba. The question now remains in the hands of the House, and I sincerely trust that the assistance referred to in the amendment of the hon. member for Bundanba will be afforded to all the industries of the colony. Perhaps it may be unusual to take the course which has been taken in connection with this amendment, but in my humble opinion the circumstances are such as to justify the course taken. We are sent here to do our best for the people who sent us here, and it should be our endeavour to foster not only the sugar industry, but also the other industries of the colony.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: We know all about that.

Mr. BARLOW: I have been interrupted continually, Mr. Speaker, during my remarks; and if any hon. member will bring me a book suitable to the occasion I will still go on, because I will not submit to being interrupted. I have claimed your protection over and over again, and I ask you whether I am to be systematically interrupted in this way. While advocating the cause of the farmers of West Moreton I have been interrupted persistently by a gentleman who was put into this House by the votes of those very farmers. I cannot understand why, if we do not agree to differ in politics, we should not agree to co-operate for the interests of the great district we represent. I do not regard Ipswich, Stanley, Fassifern, and Rosewood as anything but

artificial divisions of the district of West Moreton; and I think it is particularly hard that one West Moreton member should be interrupted by another West Moreton member. We may support different political parties or factions, but in matters affecting the interests of the district we should all be one, because "united we stand; divided we fall." I think the treatment I have received to-night has been ungenerous, unkind, and uncalled for; and with all respect to you, Mr. Speaker, I wish I had received more protection in the course of my remarks than I have received. If I had been called to order as one of the members for West Moreton has been, I should have bowed to your ruling and desisted at once, and I think I have good reason to complain of the treatment I have received. I have endeavoured to put before the House the reasons why I support the amendment of the hon. member for Bundanba. I have no object to serve, except to endeavour to do my duty, and to carry out the great trust that has been reposed in me. I gain nothing at all by being in this House, except a considerable amount of labour; and I think it is unfair and unjust that, while I am advocating and pleading the cause of the farmers of West Moreton, I should be treated as I have been. I am not directly returned by farmers, but the constituency I have the honour to represent is dependent to a very great extent on farmers, and to a still greater extent on manufactories. I think, on an occasion like this, the representatives of West Moreton should sink all differences—when matters affecting their own interests are before the House. However, I have said all I intended to say, and shall cordially support the amendment of the hon. member for Bundanba.

The SPEAKER said: With respect to what the hon. member has said in regard to interruptions, I think when an hon. member is interrupted seriously, in a way that is intended to be offensive, he is quite justified in making a complaint; but so far as I could judge from the remarks of the hon. member who did interrupt him, they were not intended in any way to be offensive. They were only remarks such as are often made in the course of debate, without being in any way personal or offensive. If I had thought for one moment that the hon. member who interrupted intended to be offensive, I should have taken more serious steps to prevent a repetition of such conduct. I would point out that the rules of the House with regard to interruptions are particularly strict, but it has not been the practice to enforce them in their entirety without there is some more serious cause than there appeared to be during the time the hon. member for Ipswich was speaking. I have, however, to express a hope that in the course of the discussion hon. members will be careful not to interrupt other hon. members who are in possession of the chair in any way that can be considered offensive. I may point out that the hon. member who has just sat down has been particularly guarded in his speech to-night to avoid in any way transgressing the rules of the House, and I hope other hon. members will be equally careful not to transgress our rules.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said: Mr. Speaker,—I am entirely in accordance with you in your decision on this matter. I have never had any occasion to find fault with any of the Speakers of the House. Generally, I think I have been rather a favourite with the Speakers of this House, but I notice that the hon. member for Ipswich is very sensitive. He is a very fine polite gentleman, a very able man; but of course if an hon. member gets up and talks for three or four hours stonewalling and makes a jackass of himself it is no business of mine. I do not see,



Sir, why I should not occasionally murmur, or groan, or grunt, or roar when I hear statements made that are entirely opposed to the interests of the district for which the hon. member has laboured for the last four or five hours to-night. The hon. member tells me in your presence and in the presence of the country that he is advocating all the time the interests of West Moreton, for which I am a member. Of course, there are other members for that district, but we are all simply midges, little fleas, or something of that sort, before the immense wisdom of the hon. gentleman who has been sent into this House to teach us politics. Well, Sir, he is very modest. He has stated to the House and the country that he will never come into this House unless he gets enough votes to send him in; that if he does not get enough to send him in, he will stop out—

Mr. BARLOW said: Mr. Speaker,—I wish to explain—

The SPEAKER: The hon. member can only make an explanation with the consent of the hon. member who is in possession of the chair.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: When I have done the hon. member can explain. It is on record in *Hansard* that the hon. member was so supremely modest that he had said he would not come into this House without he got enough votes to put him in. He will not break the doors, I hope. He has laboured wonderfully in the interest of West Moreton. Really, I think they ought to give him a leather medal for all he has done. How has he pointed out that he is going to benefit West Moreton, for which myself and a few other very inferior fellows are members? He proposes to take 10,000 of these people from the North and bring them down here. I think West Moreton would be far better without them. Of course that is only my inferior kind of an opinion; it is nothing at all in comparison with that of the hon. gentleman, who has been reading about the wild asses of Arabia, the wars of Russia, and all those high-flown novels. He is a terrible reader, and a terrible writer; he has an immense brain, only it gets diseased every few weeks or something of that kind. Only for those unfortunate quarters of the moon, why the House could not stand it. We might as well all go home and leave all of the legislation of the colony to himself. Really, I do not think I am of any use to West Moreton any longer. If we get these 10,000 kanaka people spread all over West Moreton, of course it will improve that district. That is the way to grow our cabbages. That sort of rubbish doesn't go down with me. The hon. member talks about interruptions, but notwithstanding the sarcastic, heavy, solemn manner of the hon. member, we will have our little jokes, and I would advise him to throw away the Salvation Army and to become one of ourselves. I would advise him to throw off that fine, broad, solemn, whitechoker, narcotic way he has got and become a white man. The moment he does that and becomes one of ourselves we will talk to him. Why, Sir, I am almost afraid to pass him in the street without putting my hand to my hat. My ideas conflict sometimes whether to kick him or put my hand to my hat, and between the two I don't do anything—I allow the hon. gentleman to pass like any other article or dummy that passes me in the street. I can tell him that while I am in this House I do not allow him to measure himself three or four inches better than I am. I do not think the few words I said across the House to-night were at all intended as insulting to him. They were simply intended to enliven the monotony of the funeral oration he has been giving us for the last four or five hours. During half the time he was talking

there were scarcely a dozen members in the House. I do not object to stonewalling; I have been at that game myself in my lifetime, and I have no objection to it; but if the hon. member thinks he is the member, the only member, for West Moreton, and a few rangers in Ipswich, I can tell him that he is entirely astray. He is simply on the same level as the rest of us. I do not say for a single moment that he is not an able man. There is no doubt at all about that. The hon. member is here in the first blush of his parliamentary life, but when he has been about thirty years in this House, as I have been, he will come down to our level. He is now up in the clouds, and no one in the House knows a single thing but himself. I am perfectly satisfied that after the hon. member has been here a few months, or a few years longer—that is, if he gets a majority of votes to return him to the House—he will come down entirely to our level. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that the hon. member is a charitable, kind, gentlemanly, good-hearted man, but I would advise him to put up with our jokes, and take us as he finds us. The hon. member must have known when he came into the House that he would not find us all as pure as himself, and that he was setting himself a Herculean task to raise us to his own ideas of purity and morality. The hon. member had the kindness to tell me in this House a short time ago that it was not the first time he had to check me for my advocacy of vice and immorality.

Mr. BARLOW: I regret it.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I accept the hon. member's regret, and pardon him for saying what he did. I believe that if he had been a little longer in the House he would not have said it. I believe he is as honourable as myself; but I would tell him that it is my nature to have a joke. All Irishmen are fond of a joke, but there is no vice or bad temper in our jokes, and I would advise the hon. member to take them in a good spirit. I can tell him that often in his absence, when he was far away, I have spoken of him as an able member of this House, and I can assure him that there was not the slightest particle of ill-feeling in any remarks I have made.

Mr. BARLOW said: Mr. Speaker,—I desire to say, in explanation, that a good deal has been made about a statement I made a short time since to the effect that, if I could not get a sufficient number of votes, I should remain out of the House. What I did say was that I "should have to remain out of the House." If I did not say that, it was evident that that was what I intended to say. I believe the *Hansard* report was wrong, and hon. members have been going by that report rather than by what I said. What I stated was that I was determined to do my duty while I was here, and if I could not get sufficient votes, I should have to remain out of the House. Those are the remarks I made.

Mr. ISAMBERT said: Mr. Speaker,—It is an ill-wind that blows nobody any good, and I think the hon. member for Herbert, although he has received the cold-shoulder from his own party, will see that there are far more friends of the sugar industry in this House than he could have expected. You cannot touch or interfere with any particular industry in the colony without also interfering more or less with the whole economy of our society. The difference between the Conservatives, who comprise the pastoralists and the sugar planters, and the Liberal party is this—that the former always require special legislation of some kind, and the latter always endeavour to advance the interests of the whole colony. At one time the Conservatives required special legislation entirely for the pastoral industry, and at another they

required special legislation for the sugar industry. When the kanakas were introduced in true blackbirding fashion, then the Government found it necessary to pass restrictive measures for the proper supervision of the nefarious traffic. Almost every year something had to be done in the way of special legislation for the sugar industry. What the Liberal party are anxious to do is not only to encourage the pastoral industry and the sugar industry, but also to see that all the industries of the colony should flourish, and that they should all receive every attention on the part of the Government. It has been proved by the Land Act of 1884, that the pastoral industry has been carefully considered. The pastoral tenants have had to relinquish part of their land according to the law, but at the same time they got a great concession. At that time it was determined that the pre-emptive right which the pastoral tenants enjoyed should be taken away; but even for that supposed right concessions were made to them. The Liberal party have shown themselves to be eminently just and considerate in dealing with all existing industries, and they are always ready to give every encouragement to the sugar industry. I believe that the Liberal party is the only party ready to give that industry encouragement, because the Conservative party have not the courage of their convictions. They showed that the other night. The hon. member for Logan said they were in favour of something being done for the sugar industry, but for some contemptible party trick or party purpose not one of them voted for the motion that some steps should be taken early next session to encourage the sugar industry. They denied their convictions, and showed to the country that they played with the best interests of the colony. I most heartily support the amendment which has been moved by my friend the hon. member for Bundamba with such rare ability, and only wish I could follow him in the same strain. We all know that at the last general election the war cry was "no black labour and encouragement to our industries." Everyone felt that something had to be done, and that we should not continue to adopt the time-honoured false means which had been used to produce prosperity—at one time by the nostrum of immigration, and then by borrowing money. Now that these means have been tried, it has been proved that they do not bring about prosperity. The people were getting impatient, and were determined that something should be done. The Conservative party, who were then in the minority, were determined for some reason to come into power, because they had so many irons in the fire. They seemed to have been the agents of some capitalists. They had to go back into power like the dog that had to run up a tree. Now they have got back to power this great National party fulfill their promises most begrudgingly. They have given us a mongrel tariff, and if it was not for Sir Thomas McIlwraith, we would not even have got that. He pledged himself to bring in a protective tariff, and I am really surprised that he got such a great following. I say he has done wonders with such a following of rank freetraders. I do not believe another man in the colony could have brought in a tariff with so little protection in it. The protectionists who raised such a hue and cry, and raised that party to power, are now disgusted with the Government. They say the Government are frauds, and have not fulfilled their pledges. I say that the country from one end to the other is suffering from depression, and that any amount of freetrade cannot make it prosperous—nothing but the development of its industries—not the pastoral in-

dustry alone, or the sugar industry alone, but all industries, and I see no difficulty in doing this. If we are in earnest we can make the sugar industry prosper. We cannot bring about the false prosperity that existed when money was so lavishly spent in building up sugar estates. For instance, on one plantation when the buildings were being put up, forty carpenters were employed, and as soon as the buildings were finished, of course there was no employment for skilled labour, and those men's places were supplied by black men. As my hon. friend the member for Ipswich says, these large plantations will be closed, and will become things of the past; and the sooner the capitalists who have invested their money in the industry disabuse their minds of the fiction that capital is everything, and that human beings are only like the figures on a chess board, to be danced about to make money, the better for them. This colony is rich. Its people possess large tax-paying and consuming powers, and hence we have all the means for carrying out such a fiscal policy as will enable us to support the sugar industry by the only means possible. Hon. gentlemen should not think that the Continental nations are numskulls, and do not know what they are doing. They have better statesmen than we have, and they have had to foster the beet sugar industry. Some hon. members, freetraders, think that in protecting the industry the other interests of the country are ruined.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: No.

Mr. ISAMBERT: Freetraders say that the Continental nations are grinding down the taxpayer to bolster up this industry, but that is not so. The bonus that is given never leaves the country, and the English consumer has to pay for the sugar. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment of the hon. member for Bundamba is a most happy one, and deserves the hearty support of every member in this House who has the welfare of the colony at heart. Do we not find everywhere people asking for employment and finding none? Our industries are in a very depressed state. Our ironworkers are half idle. Everywhere is depression, and yet shipload after shipload of commodities come in here that we could manufacture for ourselves. To show you that something is wrong in the state of Denmark—

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: We are not talking about Denmark.

Mr. ISAMBERT: We have only to look at the details of our imports, amounting to £16 per head, and our exports, to £13 per head. There is no country so rich as Queensland in wool and minerals, and I maintain that our balance of trade ought to be on the right side, and then the borrowing of money would have some sense in it. But the balance of trade being on the wrong side clearly shows that we are not doing our duty in looking after our industries. We are borrowing simply to make good our politico-economical mistakes. Our statesmen cover their blunders and their ignorance by borrowing, and so long as the balance of trade is on the wrong side we shall have no real benefit from this borrowing; and that we do not receive any actual money through this borrowing was proved by a late Treasurer, Mr. Dickson. At the time when we owed £16,000,000 of money he clearly showed that only about £2,000,000 of money had come into the colony, while the rest remained at home. He proved that the borrowing of money by the Australian colonies was looked upon with favour, and that the credit of the colony was not exhausted by the loan that occurred during the last McIlwraith Administration. Of course it was not true that the borrowing powers of the colony were exhausted. Our loans have been

successful, and why? Why can England borrow so much money? It is because the money has been kept in the country. Out of the £27,000,000 we have borrowed I do not suppose we have got more than £3,000,000 in the colony. It is scarcely more than a fortnight ago that we read of 200,000 sovereigns being exported to America, and only the other day 100,000 sovereigns were exported from Queensland to the old country. What does that mean? Is there any politician or statesman on either side of the House who has the least conception of what that means? Is there one man who can suggest a remedy for this evil? If we borrow money we ought to get the money and not send sovereigns away; but we are impounding and pawning our whole productive force, and the longer we go on borrowing, the worse position shall we be in. There is only one solution of the difficulty, and that is that times are changing so fast, and our debts are growing so large, that not 1 per cent. of the money borrowed will ever be repaid. I believe Queensland will then right itself. Is not Australia Felix a happy land for money-grubbers? With regard to this coloured question, does not history prove that wherever an inferior race has been employed it has always been a curse to the country, a curse that cannot be thoroughly removed? Look at America and the frightful war it had to go through. The worst day of reckoning has not arrived yet. America will have to face a day of severe reckoning—a war of races is inevitable, and it will continue until America is a white man's country from one end to the other. We do not want this ill-advised means for bolstering up the sugar industry. I contend there is every means of bringing this industry into a state of more solid prosperity than it has ever yet enjoyed. We can tax ourselves very easily. We can tax ourselves upon our liquoring-up capacities; we can again introduce the beer tax that has been thrown overboard as a sop to the Licensed Victuallers' Association for the publicans' vote. That was the payment the publicans received for their support. That is the act of the great National party. It is this side of the House that represents true nationalism, and not the false nationalism that misleads the people. If we put a £2 or £3 bonus upon every ton of sugar which is grown and exported by white labour, the capitalist will find it to his advantage to take the farmers into his confidence. The capitalist will divide his large estate into reasonable-sized farms, and offer every facility for the growth of cane by white labour. Then people will cease to speak ill of the capitalist. The capitalist will become the servant of the people instead of their cruel taskmaster. But that is not what the sugar planter is anxious for. They do not want to plant sugar for sentiment; they want to make money. As Karl Marx, in his celebrated writings on political economy, clearly proves, capital is respectful and timid, and loves order and peace. But that is only part of the truth. Capital hates no profit, or a small profit, as nature abhors a vacuum, or, in more common parlance, as the devil hates holy water. At 10 per cent. capital can be had, at 50 per cent. capital becomes lively, and at 100, or 200 per cent. there is no crime under Heaven, even at the risk of the gallows, that capitalists will not perpetrate. They foment war, and they trample men under their heels. Have we not instances enough where British subjects, for the sake of petty gains, have supplied arms and ammunition to the very enemy with which their country was at war? Can there be anything more murderous or suicidal than that? But such are capitalists, and they will for a high percentage of profit do anything, and commit any crime under heaven.

Yet they ask for consideration from society. They will make no concessions, and they ask for every consideration.

Mr. LISSNER said: Mr. Speaker,—This is very edifying, and I draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum in the House.

Quorum formed.

Mr. ISAMBERT: Thousands and millions of people may starve from one end of the year to the other, but that does not touch the capitalists; but if they only make 2 or 3 per cent. then there is a cry of pity and lamentation raised because the poor capitalist has not made a proper profit on his capital. Every consideration is shown to capital, and none to human beings. But the time is fast changing, humanity is asserting its rights; human rights will have to be considered, and capitalists will soon find that the more they go into partnership with their fellow-men, and the more they become servants, the more useful will they become; and it is only by stepping down from their high Pegasus that they will be able to invest their money profitably. This capitalistic despotism will fast fall to pieces. As the hon. leader of the Opposition told us in his remarkable article on "The Distribution of Wealth," there are the difficulties, and they must be solved by statesmanship in some form, or they will solve themselves in their own rude way by revolution. Society at present is like a pyramid turned on its apex, and the least circumstance may topple over the whole fabric. We are anxious that society should rest on a basis of productive labour, and that the labourers should enjoy a fair share of the products of their labour. It is on the productive labouring portion of society that the whole fabric exists, and if we lower the foundation we lower the whole fabric. We degrade labour by making it slavery or semi-slavery; we degrade ourselves, and it is this feeling of self-preservation that has animated the Liberal party in opposing these dangerous schemes. I have stated, in the words of Karl Marx, that capitalists have a wide conscience, and are ready to do anything, even to slaying their fellow-men. What has liberated the slave? It is not so much the sentiment of the people, and certainly not the sentiment of freetraders, because freetrade and slavery are close allies. I contend that since the great reformer Luther no such other reformer has stood up to liberate enslaved mankind as the little beetroot and science. On the Continent, with civilised society, they can compete with the exhausted countries where cane-sugar is produced by means of black labour and capital. In the sugar industry, the success lies with those countries that have the greatest productive powers, and the soundest fiscal policy; countries that can stand the most reproductive taxation without exhausting themselves. Of all the cane-producing countries Queensland comes nearest to the Continental countries in that respect, and we can afford similar methods of encouraging the sugar industry. They are the only methods, and there is no use in burking the question. Science has also a great office to perform in the manufacture of sugar, and it would be advisable for the Department of Agriculture to pay particular attention to it, and see that chemistry is more fully and extensively taught; so that the proper treatment of the juice need no more be a matter of chance, but a matter of exact knowledge. A large share of the failures may be attributed to ignorance in the manufacture of the sugar. Cheap labour or slavery and freetrade are inseparable. If it is advisable to buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest; if it is advisable for Queensland to import goods from the cheapest market of the

world, I contend it is far better and more wise, from an economic standpoint, to get the cheap labour into Queensland, and produce the goods by means of that cheap labour; but since money-making is not the object of society, and since man, the whole man and the full man, is the object of society, we cannot afford to be interfered with in our industries by the cheap labour of other countries. One time it is cheap labour products from one country, and another time it is cheap labour products from another, and under such conditions our industries cannot flourish. Then it must be considered that every man, woman, and child is liable to the amount of £10 per annum. How can that be made good if our productive energies have to compete constantly with the cheap products of other countries? It is impossible. Our energies are now taxed to the highest point, and it is absolutely necessary, by legislation and administration, to encourage and protect our productive energies to the utmost, or we cannot meet our obligations. Then there is another thing to be considered in connection with this question. I asked the Colonial Treasurer for certain information, which he kindly promised to supply by to-morrow in a detailed form, but I can give the House a summary of it. From the year 1881-2 to the present time the Government of Queensland have paid in subsidies to the British-India Company for a professed mail service, which it is not, the sum of £443,706; in passage money they have paid £902,653; and for freight £125,524; making a grand total of £1,471,883, or nearly a million and a-half. That sum has been paid to one line of steamers, and one of its objects is to bring cheap labourers from other climes to provide cheap labour for the capitalists. Then for the freetraders it brings the cheap labour products of other countries. Under such outrageous fostering of foreign industries and commerce, how any sane man can call that freetrade passes all understanding. I am a protectionist, and I say that we protectionists would be glad to receive annually 10 per cent. of the amount of the protection afforded to foreign countries by us. If we had that amount of protection we should be more prosperous, and we should not find half a hundred applicants for one situation. Then the Colonial Treasurer would be able to face Parliament with a smiling face and an overflowing treasury. Then the deficit would be a thing of the past; but it seems that our legislators and would-be statesmen cannot open their minds to actual facts until dire calamity comes upon the colony. When the Liberal party were in power I criticised them just as much as I criticise the present Government. If we go on as we are doing, we verify the stigma attached to the Liberal party that Liberalism means deficit. By a slavish and miserable adherence to the principles of the past, a deficit must necessarily be incurred, and then the cry is raised that the terms "Liberalism" and "deficit" are synonymous. When the Liberal party were in power some years ago they made a mess of the colony by their so-called freetrade policy, and there was a deficit. Then Sir Arthur Palmer took the helm of State, and put on a 10 per cent. *ad valorem* duty, £5 a ton on soap, and heavy duties on agricultural produce. Things then went on in a flourishing manner, and there was a surplus. As soon as the Liberal party came into power again, although they would not abolish the 10 per cent. *ad valorem* duties altogether, they reduced them to 5 per cent. They never went so far as to reduce the rest of the duties, because as soon as they went on the line of freetrade again, they met with the same experience as they did in America. When they went on the freetrade tack,

they had nothing but misery and deficits; but when a protective policy was adopted they had an overflowing treasury, and money was as plentiful as if it were growing out of the ground, whilst under the freetrade régime it was as scarce as angels' visits. When they had freetrade in America, America was swamped with British goods. They did just as we have done, and sent away money for everything they required. If they wanted to build a culvert they had to borrow money to do so, and that went on until they could borrow no more, and until they could not pay the interest on the borrowed capital, and then they had to turn round and take up protection. No sooner had they done that than their industries began to flourish, and money became plentiful. I shall show what I think on this subject by means of a simple problem. Suppose a miner takes gold to the value of £10 from the ground. As things are at present, £9 of that money is spent in imported goods. That money passes from the miner to the retailer, from the retailer to the importer, from the importer home to the manufacturer in the old country, and we see no more of it. Now, if of that £10 £1 is spent in colonial products, before A parts with that £1 to B, B must produce goods to the value of £1. Now, when B has the £1, before he parts with it to C, C must produce goods to the value of £1; and this is continued as often as that £1 changes hands. If it changes hands twenty-four times then it has been the means of causing the production of £24 worth of goods, and that £1 still remains in the colony ready to be spent again. This is why under a protective policy we raise our own produce, and bring the balance to the right side, and why money becomes so plentiful. I hope hon. members will carefully consider the lesson to be learned from the Colonial Treasurer's return laid on the table to-day, that we have paid for this service in round figures, £1,500,000, and that freetraders will never brag about freetrade under those conditions again. They ought to hide their heads under a bushel. I hope capitalists will not be so bad as they have been, but that they will open their minds and eyes, and see that nothing but the highest forms of civilisation will pay at the present day.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS said: Mr. Speaker,—I hope the hon. members who have spoken to-night are satisfied. They have occupied the entire sitting up to the time we ought to be going home. I am certain the hon. member for Bundamba feels a little bit ashamed of the part he has filled, from the apologetic tone of the ending of his speech, in which he declared he did not wish in any way to trespass on the time of the House, and, as a salve to his conscience, moved an amendment. The amendment is altogether unnecessary, because, when it comes to the question of freetrade or protection, the Government will be quite prepared to take the matter up. It is quite useless proposing an amendment of this kind which can only have effect until the last day of the session—not further than that. I hope hon. members will allow us to get the Chairman into the chair. We cannot allow any private member to take possession of the Government business and do as he likes with the House. The intention of the Government is to put the Chairman into the chair, and then move him out again and adjourn the House. I hope, therefore, the hon. member for Bundamba will be satisfied that he has had his revenge for what he calls having had the gag put on.

Mr. SAYERS said: Mr. Speaker,—I do not intend to detain the House very long; but if this amendment had not been moved I should have had to move the adjournment of the House in order

to show why I could not have voted for the motion of the hon. member for Herbert; and perhaps I had better say what I have to say now—it will not occupy more than ten or fifteen minutes—in order to save the necessity of bringing it forward on some future occasion. Several hon. members on this side have said they wished to explain why they could not vote for Mr. Cowley's motion as it stood, and I, as representing a mining community, wish to state why I could not vote for it. I can best do so by reading two letters from the *Gladstone Observer* of 1st October. The first is signed "James Yates," and is as follows:—

"SIR,

"You state in your last issue the following words: 'A complaint has been lodged against Conran and Co. employing kanakas on the mine, but as the person complaining was not the holder of a miner's right, the Warden decided to reject it as informal.'

"As I do not know who gave the above information, I take this opportunity to state that it is false, as I made a complaint to the Warden against the Conran Co. employing kanakas; and as I have always been in possession of a miner's right since I have been in the colony, the above statement is a distinct falsehood. I also state that if the executive in Gladstone does not uphold the law and see that it is complied with, by having the kanakas removed from this field, other means will be taken next mail, independent of it, to have them removed,

"(Miner's Right No. 75,557.)

"Yours,

"JAMES YATES."

The next letter, which is anonymous, is as follows:—

"SIR,

"Mr. Dawbarn, secretary of Conran's Gold-mining Company, in his reply to various letters in the *Rockhampton Bulletin*, relating to kanaka labour on this goldfield, has tried to prove that white labour is not so reliable as black at the same price, and quotes the manager's failure in support of his argument.

"Remembering that the manager is young, and not many years since was landed a boy of sixteen on Conran Brothers and Company's run, near Capella, which is known far and wide as employing niggers, Chinamen, and kanakas, in preference to any white labour, it is easy to understand that with such a training he would naturally lean to kanakas, if he has a choice; besides which Mr. Dawbarn himself may be a follower of a section who are desirous of extensively using them in the industries of Queensland. As to the suitability of the kanaka, Mr. Dawbarn must be aware that in the last contract, one given to the kanakas for roasting the ore at 14s. per ton, 200 tons of the ore had to be re-roasted; it appears on the manager's report, though he does not say it was through a failure of black labour, and that there was no remedy against the loss to the company of the double roasting. If white labour had been employed, a heavy guarantee would have been demanded as security for carrying out the contract, and that would have been forfeited, but no concession is too great to the darkey. Does Mr. Dawbarn consider that men cannot be found to cart in their firewood? Of my own personal knowledge, men with drays and horses have been refused work and had to leave the field. If Mr. Dawbarn will call for tenders in a straightforward manner, there are plenty of white men, of sufficiently good standing to insure its being carried out, who will undertake the contract. But it is useless to argue further until Mr. Dawbarn answers this question—What right have they on a goldfield?

"I am, Sir,

"Yours, etc.,

"NORTONITE."

That is one of many reasons why we feel we cannot consent to kanaka labour being any longer allowed to come into this colony. It has been proved conclusively that there are men in the colony who, in order to save a few shillings or pounds per month, will take advantage of kanaka labour. I had intended to read a letter from Mr. Dawbarn in the *Rockhampton Bulletin*—but I will not delay the House with it—wherein he states that kanaka labour is more reliable than white labour. That is the great plea of this gold-mining

company for employing kanakas. But there are other goldfields in the colony, compared with which the Norton Gold Field is a very small place, and where the ores are at least as refractory, where they will not allow the employment of black labour. The best men that can be got for the purpose of reducing those ores are white men, and men of science and attainments have been brought for that purpose from all parts of the world. It is only on the Norton Gold Field, where there is a very small white population, that they must have this reliable black labour. Let us take the Mount Morgan Gold Field, where I suppose the ores are as refractory as those of any goldfield of the colony. We do not hear of them wanting reliable black labour there. In this day's issue of the *Telegraph*, the following paragraph appears:—

"BUNDABERG FARMERS AND THE KANAKAS.

"Bundaberg, October 9.

"Several more charges of illegal employment of kanakas have been heard at the police court here. Peter Boch, a farmer, yesterday, was fined £7, including costs, and to-day Heinrich Golcher was fined £25 11s. for a similar offence. The last named person had sublet a portion of his selection to kanakas, and pleaded that they were not therefore in his employ. The police magistrate said that as the kanakas did not hold exemption tickets they were incapable of leasing land. If they could do so, black labour would be brought into competition with white, which was an abuse the Polynesian Act had been passed to prevent. Several more charges are pending against some of the farmers."

If we allow black labour at all in the colony, the next cry will be that every industry has a right to employ it as well as the planters; and in order to prevent that, we must stop black labour from coming in at any cost. Members on this side are unanimous on the question, and there are enough members on the other side opposed to black labour to prevent any extension in that direction. I hope the matter will not be brought up again. Before sitting down I should like to draw the attention of the Minister for Mines and Works to the fact that there is a warden at Gladstone who visits the Norton Gold Field. I have been informed that this gentleman fined some kanakas £2 each because they had no miner's right, that they have not since taken out miners' rights, but still remain working on the field in defiance of the warden. If they had been white men they would have been arrested, and probably sent to gaol for continuing to work without miners' rights in defiance of the warden; and I call the attention of the Minister for Mines and Works to the fact now, in order that some steps may be taken before that officer's salary comes under consideration to compel him to do his duty. If those kanakas are still there, I hope the warden will be instructed to have them removed, or to fine them in such an amount that their employers will be out of pocket in retaining them. I do not know the warden at Gladstone—Mr. Macarthur. Perhaps he has done his best; but my correspondent tells me that he has not, and I hope that the Minister for Mines and Works will see that the warden does his duty.

Mr. GLASSEY said: Mr. Speaker,—

The SPEAKER: The hon. member has no right to speak in reply.

Mr. GLASSEY: I was about to withdraw my amendment, and explain my reason for doing so.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Spoken!

Mr. GLASSEY: Mr. Speaker,—Without saying anything further, I will, with the permission of the House, withdraw the amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Original question put and passed, and the House went into Committee.

The House resumed, the CHAIRMAN reported no progress, and obtained leave to sit again to-morrow.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

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

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at fourteen minutes to 11 o'clock.