

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 16 SEPTEMBER 1890**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, 16 September, 1890.

New Member.—Proclamation Validating Return of Writ  
—New Members.—Members Sworn.—Appropriation  
Bill, 1890-91, No. 1—assent of Governor.—Chinese  
Immigration Restriction Act, 1888, Amendment  
Bill—message from His Excellency the Governor.—  
Petition—dredge for Port Douglas.—Leadership of  
the Opposition.—Ministerial Statement.—Motion  
Without Notice.—New Gold Fields Bill of 1890—first  
reading—second reading—committee—third read-  
ing.—Adjournment—charges against the late Gov-  
ernment.

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

## NEW MEMBER.

The SPEAKER said: I have to report that, pursuant to the resolution of the House, passed on the 24th day of June last, declaring the seat of Ernest Hunter for the electoral district of Burke to have become vacant, I issued my writ for the election of a member to fill the same, and that such writ was returned with a certificate endorsed thereon of the election of John Hoolan as a member for such electoral district.

PROCLAMATION VALIDATING RE-  
TURN OF WRIT.

The SPEAKER said: I have to inform the House that in the *Gazette* of the 4th of September instant there appeared a proclamation validating the election of John Hoolan as a member for the electoral district of Burke, notwithstanding that the writ for the said election was not returned to me within the period prescribed therein for such return

## NEW MEMBERS.

The SPEAKER said: I have further to report that, pursuant to resolutions of the House, passed on the 12th day of August last, I issued my writs for the election of two members for the electoral district of Brisbane North, and of a member for each of the following districts:—Burke, Toowong, Herbert, and Wide Bay; and that such writs have been duly returned, certifying to the election of the following members:—

The Hon. Sir Samuel Walker Griffith, K.C.M.G., and the Hon. Sir Thomas McIlwraith, K.C.M.G., for the electoral district of Brisbane North.

The Hon. William Oswald Hodgkinson, for the electoral district of Burke.

The Hon. Theodore Oscar Unmack, for the electoral district of Toowong.

The Hon. Alfred Sandlings Cowley, for the electoral district of Herbert.

The Hon. Horace Tozer, for the electoral district of Wide Bay.

## MEMBERS SWORN

The following members were sworn in for the electorates for which they were returned:—

The Hon. Sir Samuel Walker Griffith, K.C.M.G.

The Hon. Sir Thomas McIlwraith, K.C.M.G.

The Hon. William Oswald Hodgkinson.

The Hon. Theodore Oscar Unmack.

The Hon. Alfred Sandlings Cowley.

The Hon. Horace Tozer.

Mr. John Hoolan,

## APPROPRIATION BILL, 1890-91, No. 1.

## ASSENT OF GOVERNOR.

The SPEAKER said: I have to report to the House that I presented to the Governor the Appropriation Bill, 1890-1, No. 1, for the Royal assent, and that His Excellency was pleased, in my presence, to subscribe his assent thereto in the name and on behalf of Her Majesty.

## CHINESE IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION ACT, 1888, AMENDMENT BILL.

## MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of a message from His Excellency the Governor, intimating that His Excellency would, in conformity with the Royal instructions, reserve this Bill for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure thereon.

## PETITION.

## DREDGE FOR PORT DOUGLAS.

Mr. LITTLE presented a petition from 215 residents of Port Douglas, praying the House to cause a dredge to be sent to dredge the harbour of Port Douglas; and moved that it be read.

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

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

## LEADERSHIP OF THE OPPOSITION.

Mr. DONALDSON said: Mr. Speaker,—It is with considerable regret that I have to inform the House that my hon. friend, Mr. Morehead, has resigned the leadership of the Opposition. I, Sir, have been appointed to that position as his successor, and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I feel the responsibility of the position very much. I am keenly alive to the importance of the duties of that high office, and though I cannot claim that I am new to politics, having been a member of this House for several years, I feel that I have not been so close a student of parliamentary practice as I should have been, and for that reason I am not so competent to undertake the position as one who has paid more attention to the duties which usually devolve upon members of this House. But I can say this without fear, that whilst I have the honour of holding the position I shall certainly do my best to assist in carrying on the legislation of the country.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. DONALDSON: As far as the Government are concerned they shall have a fair trial at the hands of the Opposition. Further than that I cannot say at present. They shall be judged entirely by their acts in the future, not by their acts in the past.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. DONALDSON: As I have said before, I have accepted the position with very great reluctance, and I trust that during the time I am here I shall always continue to occupy the same favourable position in the estimation of hon. members which I believe I have hitherto done ever since I have occupied a seat in this House.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir S. W. Griffith) said: Mr. Speaker,—I crave the indulgence of the House for a few minutes while I make some observations respecting the programme of the Government for the present session. It is usual, I believe, when a Government come into office in the middle of a session, without having

the opportunity of formally announcing their intentions in the Governor's Opening Speech to Parliament, for the gentleman leading the Government to take the earliest opportunity of making such a statement to the House. I desire in the first place to congratulate my hon. friend, Mr. Donaldson, on the honourable position to which he has been elected by his friends and the members of his party in this House. I am sure that we shall be able to work together. I can assure him that he may rely upon any assistance I can give him in the discharge of his duties, and I am sure that I may look to him for that assistance which the leader of an Opposition may fairly give to the Government.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker,—When I was sent for by His Excellency the Governor, when the House was last sitting, and I had undertaken the responsibility of forming an Administration, I naturally put myself in communication first of all with Sir Thomas McIlwraith, my colleague in the representation of North Brisbane.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Naturally!

The PREMIER: The circumstances which led to the resignation of the late Government were such that I am sure every man in the country expected that I should do so, and I believe I should have been guilty of conduct not very creditable to myself—at all events I should not have satisfied my own conscience—if I had not done so. I am glad to say, Sir, that after a few words of preliminary discussion we found that there were no matters of difference between us which would prevent us from acting in concert for the furtherance of what we believe to be the best interests of the colony; and I believe the whole colony received with satisfaction the announcement that we had come to that conclusion.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I put myself in communication shortly afterwards with the hon. member for Herbert, Mr. Cowley. I mention him because I have seen some surprise expressed at finding him in alliance with the present Government, not that I think the surprise was justified. I do not mention my other colleagues, because everybody naturally expected to see them allied with me, but I have reasons for mentioning my hon. friend Mr. Cowley. The party which lately occupied the other side of the House always said, and they honestly meant what they said, that they recognised the very great importance of the sugar industry in the Northern portion of the colony. They were aware that these statements were sometimes received with incredulity; but they were nevertheless sincere, and knowing the hon. member for Herbert to be one of those who is really sincere in his desire to do the best for the colony by assisting that industry as far as possible on the lines that have now been universally accepted by the colony, I asked him to accept the position he holds, believing that the Government would better be able to assist the development of the industry which he so especially represents, if working in alliance with him and his friends, than if working under circumstances where their efforts would be likely to be received with distrust and suspicion. I feel very glad to have secured the assistance of an hon. gentleman who has shown his ability so conspicuously as my hon. friend the Minister for Lands has done since he has been a member of this House; and I think his presence in the Government is an assurance that they, at any rate, mean well by the North, as well as by other parts of the colony. That is, I think, enough to say with respect to the *personnel*

of the Government. As to the programme for the present session: The principal business of the present session must necessarily be finance. That was understood when we last met, and I think it is quite clear that it must be so. The financial policy of the Government will be announced by my hon. colleague the Colonial Treasurer, I hope, on Thursday evening, the earliest possible day. The Estimates could not be brought down to-day, but they will be brought down to-morrow, and I may inform the House that they will contain not only an estimate of the expenditure during the current year out of the ordinary revenue, but also a statement of the estimated expenditure from the funds provided by way of loan, for the present financial year. So that hon. members will be able to see at a glance to what amount of expenditure the country is actually committed during the current financial year, and I am sure it will give them satisfaction to see it. A Bill will be brought in at once, and notice of it will be given this afternoon, to provide for complete control in future over the loan expenditure. There is one important matter to which reference may be expected, and that is the social questions at present agitating the public mind. The Government, while fully recognising the importance of these questions, do not think the present time, when men are so excited on both sides, an opportune one to deal with the subject by legislation. They therefore do not propose to deal with it by legislation during the present session. They will therefore not proceed with the Factories and Shops Bill now on the paper, nor with any Bill of the kind. Moreover, they are of opinion that the discussion which has so far taken place on that Bill showed a considerable want of information on the part of the House of the real nature of the problem they were called upon to deal with, and the Government, therefore, propose to issue a commission to make inquiries into the matter, so that Parliament may be in a better position to deal with the subject.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: To kill time.

Mr. MOREHEAD: No, to give billets to supporters.

The PREMIER: There are one or two Government measures of a non-contentious character on the paper which the present Government intend to go on with, and two I may refer to in particular, the Married Women's Property Bill and the Prisons Bill. Both those Bills have been passed by the Legislative Council twice, and one I think three times. They are really wanted, and the present Government propose to take them up.

Mr. MOREHEAD: What about the Elementary Property Bill?

The PREMIER: The hon. member will allow me to deal with one thing at a time. There are also some other Bills of a non-contentious character, such as the Larceny Bill and the Police Act Amendment Bill, and several other matters to which I need not particularly refer. The Government have in preparation, and hope to be able to introduce during the session, a Bill to provide for the endowment of agricultural colleges, by setting apart areas of land for the purpose, in accordance with the opinions expressed by the House during a debate of last session. They have also in preparation a Bill dealing with the subject of irrigation trusts. Another matter I may refer to at this point is that the Government propose to issue a commission, such as was asked for by myself last session, to inquire into the best constitution for a university for Queensland, and I believe much valuable information may be collected upon the subject

with the assistance of the commissioners when they are appointed. Hon. members are all aware that there must be a Loan Bill brought in this session. The Government have not yet had time to consider it, but it will be brought in as early as possible. Another matter which is not on the paper, but which was mentioned when the House last adjourned, is the necessity for a Bill dealing with new goldfields, and especially to deal with the case of the Russell River Gold Field, which becomes open to Chinese, I think, next Sunday. The House will be asked to deal with that matter during the present week, and will be asked to suspend the Standing Orders to allow the matter to be dealt with to-day. The Bill has been published in the Press, in order that hon. members might know the nature of the proposal of the Government. There is another matter on the paper to which I have no doubt hon. members expect me to make some reference, as it is of very great importance, and that is the Decentralisation Bill. I have some observations to make upon that subject. Without going into the ancient history of it, as far back as 1872, I may say that the Decentralisation Bill was introduced in 1887 by myself, though not quite in its present form. It was then avowedly not anything like a complete measure to deal with the wants of the various portions of the colony, but it was introduced as laying a foundation upon which further legislation might be based. Other proposals were made at the same time, but for various reasons no progress was made with any of them except the Act to establish local registries under the Real Property Act in different districts. Two years ago I intended, if circumstances had permitted, to make a further proposal with respect to what may be called decentralisation. The idea I and my then colleagues had was to propose the establishment of legislative bodies in the different districts of the colony invested with considerable powers—not plenary powers, but tolerably complete powers of managing their own local affairs. However, before the time had arrived for working out the details of that scheme we were relieved of the responsibility of making any proposals, and I did not then further prosecute the matter. The necessity for dealing with the decentralisation of the administration of Government has, however, been more and more apparent to every member of the House from that time to the present, and it has been continually present to my mind. It has been especially accentuated by the discussion which has taken place with regard to the federation of Australia. I have never hesitated to say, and I have said many times, that when federation is accomplished, I think the colony of Queensland should be divided, as it is too large for efficient administration.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: I never heard you say so.

The PREMIER: I have said so in this House several times. I have, also, in speaking lately on the subject, said this: That if the black labour question was out of the way my objections to Northern separation would be very greatly removed. I have often said that. There is no doubt that the present position of affairs is unsatisfactory, and I fully and freely recognise that. It is particularly unsatisfactory in this respect, that none of us have a really present sense of our responsibility when dealing with large sums of money to be expended in parts of the colony with which we are not immediately concerned. I am certain that many of the demands made upon this Parliament for the expenditure of money in outside districts of the colony would not be made upon a local Parliament feeling the immediate responsibility of providing for the

interest upon that expenditure. This condition of affairs has fixed itself upon the attention of members of the House. And many other things have happened. There has arisen—somewhat to my surprise I confess, for I do not quite understand it—an agitation for separation in the Central district. I can quite understand why there should be a desire for a complete administration of local affairs, but why they should want to start an absolutely new and full-blown colony at present I do not quite understand. No doubt reasons can be given on the subject. The great difficulties which stood in the way, as I stated in a report on the question some years ago, are, first, want of unanimity on the part of the people themselves; secondly, the labour question, and, thirdly, the question of the public debt, which is a burden on the whole colony and cannot be divided. I am satisfied that in neither division is there a feeling of unanimity at the present time, and perhaps there never can be. With respect to the labour question I am willing to accept the assurance of the leaders in the Northern part of the colony that they believe it to be settled.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Does the hon. member mean that he is individually willing to accept that assurance?

The PREMIER: I am speaking for myself and my colleagues; I am not speaking for the hon. member for Balonne. I say I am willing to accept their assurance, and meet them on that ground. There is this observation, however, to make with respect to the labour question—the labour question is never settled until something is substituted for that which is taken away. The lands must be tilled, and the question can never be settled until it is determined how that is to be done. I freely admit that the people in this part of the colony are not so well able to deal with the question as the people more immediately concerned, whose prosperity more immediately depends on the manner in which the question is dealt with. I recognise the fact that the black labour question is settled in the North as well as in the South. I have already said, here and elsewhere, that in the event of Australian federation, this colony ought to be divided into at least three parts, and possibly more. But I have also said that I objected to the colony being divided at the present time, because it would be placing additional difficulties in the way of federation. But I believe it would be of advantage to this colony even now that it should be divided for many purposes into three parts. That the colony should be divided into provinces, or colonies, or whatever they may be called, not with absolute and plenary autonomous powers, but powers of autonomy little short of those proposed to be given to them under a scheme of Australian federation. There should, however, still be a Central Parliament—a Central Government—to perform the duties which it is admitted belong to a Central Government—amongst which would be included the dealing with the debt of the colony of Queensland. This Central Government would be superseded by the Australian Federal Government when constituted. Then if we could not get a complete Australian federation we should have the nucleus of it in the shape of a Queensland federation. This is not the time to indicate the details of such a scheme; but the matter is one that will have to be faced by the people of Queensland. It is a question which is in no sense of a party character; I believe that opinions of members on both sides differ materially, but I believe that both sides can, if they desire to come to the best conclusion, bring about a result that will give satisfaction to the whole colony as well as to the several parts. My own opinion is that the several colonies into

which Queensland may be divided might have their own tariffs so far as seaborne commerce is concerned; but I think there should be free interchange of the natural productions of what is now Queensland, and no border Customs. I believe that such a scheme can be worked out, and that if hon. gentlemen on both sides will give their careful attention to the matter we shall be able to arrive at a solution which will be satisfactory to everybody, as nearly as any solution of a great and difficult question can be satisfactory. I do not think it possible to deal with the matter during the present session; but the federation convention will, I hope, meet early next year, and the two subjects may, so far as Queensland is concerned, usefully be considered together. After what I have said, hon. members will not be surprised to hear that it is not proposed by the Government to go on with the Decentralisation Bill during the present session. That was at best only a foundation; but I think it is desirable to provide at the earliest date for the appointment of a commission either named by Parliament or appointed on the nomination of some person in whom Parliament has confidence to whom it should be referred to authoritatively fix and adjust the accounts between the different divisions of the colony, so as to provide a definite basis for future action. These are the opinions of the Government as to the proper mode of dealing with the agitation that is going on at present; and as it is not a party question I ask that they may receive dispassionate consideration from hon. members on both sides. I have nothing further to say on the present occasion. I may, however, be allowed to express the hope that, considering the time of the year, the session may not be prolonged. The House will not be asked by the Government to legislate on many matters; and I ask for the Government only what the leader of the Opposition has been good enough to promise—a fair trial and nothing more.

Mr. DONALDSON said: Mr. Speaker,—There is no question before the House, but I should like to speak with the permission of the House. If that is accorded I will go on.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. DONALDSON: I have listened with the greatest interest to the remarks of the Chief Secretary; and I must say that I never felt more astonished in listening to any speech I ever heard him make in this House. It appears as if he has completely changed his opinions in crossing from one side of the House to the other. With regard to his observations in connection with Northern separation, I could not have believed it was the hon. member if I had only heard his voice, because they were so different from anything I ever heard him say before. If ever there was any strenuous opposition offered to Northern separation, or any belief expressed that any strong feeling in favour of separation in the North did not exist, it was by that hon. gentleman. Only a short time ago I expressed the opinion that a large number of people in the North—in some places large majorities of the people—were in favour of separation; and I remember the look of surprise and the interjection of astonishment from the hon. gentleman at the time. In fact, it was looked upon as quite incredible; and when I referred to Charters Towers as a place where there was a considerable feeling in favour of separation, I was at once disbelieved.

The PREMIER: Do you intend to move a motion?

Mr. DONALDSON: I am speaking with the consent of the House.

The PREMIER: It is very irregular.

Mr. DONALDSON: I do not wish to take advantage of the forms of the House or to say anything personal to the hon. gentleman; but I think, after the statement made by the hon. gentleman, who expressed his views at very great length in making a formal statement, that perhaps I have some right to express an opinion on that statement. Of course if I am out of order I shall certainly not go on, but it is with the consent of the House that I am now speaking.

The PREMIER: It is not a question of order; it is a breach of good taste.

Mr. MOREHEAD: It is no breach of good faith.

Mr. DONALDSON: With regard to the remarks made by the hon. gentleman regarding Northern separation, I am not going to say anything more, nor do I think that it is my part to criticise his action in regard to his choice of colleagues. At the same time, I think that the hon. gentleman will pardon me if I express slight astonishment at his action. He said just now that naturally he communicated with Sir Thomas McIlwraith. It was natural for him to do so, for they were in communication for some time before, and laid all their plans for the defeat of the Government. It was natural, then, that he should communicate with the hon. gentleman from whom he expected to get a large number of supporters from this side of the House to assist him in forming a strong Government. Now, if anything is due to party—and I contend that there is—it is allegiance to party, and their faithfulness ought always to be recognised, and I certainly sympathise as much as any member of this House with the Premier at the present time in having gone out of his way to form what they choose to call a coalition. But this side of the House, and I personally, refuse to recognise it as a coalition. A coalition is a blending of parties, and if the hon. gentleman had made some attempt to get up what I call a proper coalition he would have received every assistance from myself, notwithstanding that I should myself be outside that coalition, because I have not the slightest desire to occupy a position on that bench. I am speaking my mind on this point. I am not in the habit of expressing as my opinions what I do not believe in. If the hon. gentleman had kept to his own party he would certainly have had my sympathy, and every assistance I could possibly give him, to carry on the government of the country; but when I saw the supporters who had served him faithfully for years passed over in forming his new Government, I thought, although perhaps I have no right to speak for them, that their claims had not been recognised as they ought to have been. The hon. gentleman laughs. I do not wish to cast any reflection upon any hon. member now occupying that bench—I believe I am on the most friendly terms with each of them—and I hope I shall continue so with one exception; but the hon. gentleman went out of his way to state his excuse for appointing the hon. member for Herbert as Minister for Lands. He certainly had a very lame excuse to offer. Is it an excuse to this side of the House or to his supporters? That is what I would like to know; because if it is an excuse to this side of the House we do not require it, and if it is one to his own side it did not satisfy them. If there is one thing more than another that the hon. gentleman has been consistent in since he has been a member of this House it is in his opposition to black labour, and yet he has appointed the Minister for Lands as one of his colleagues. I do not say this against the Minister for Lands, because I honour him for having his opinions, although they may differ from my own; but he has been the strongest advocate for black labour in this House, and for some months last

year he kept up a long debate upon the question. He is the strongest advocate for black labour who has ever been in the House, and made the strongest speeches against the two leaders of that party. I am sure no one expressed himself so much and so strongly as the Minister for Lands. And yet the hon. gentleman has been appointed to his present position because he happens to be a Northern representative. I may perhaps have gone a little out of my way in expressing my opinions upon this question, but I do not wish to take advantage of the forms of the House, nor of the permission that has been given to me, and I shall repeat my assurance to the Premier that he will be entirely judged in the future by the measures he brings before the House, and not by any of his past actions.

#### MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—With the permission of this House I beg to move that so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as will admit of the immediate introduction of a Bill and passing it through all its stages in one day.

Motion, by permission of the House, put and passed.

#### NEW GOLD FIELDS BILL OF 1890.

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. W. O. Hodgkinson) moved for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Goldfields Act Amendment Act of 1878.

Question put and passed.

#### FIRST READING.

The MINISTER FOR MINES presented the Bill and moved that it be read a first time.

Question put and passed.

#### SECOND READING.

The MINISTER FOR MINES said: Mr. Speaker,—In moving that the Bill be now read a second time, I feel quite certain that the House will not expect a long discussion upon this subject. It is a measure which claimed the consideration of my predecessor in office, and there is no doubt that the Bill will pass.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Wait until we get the Bill.

After a pause,

The MINISTER FOR MINES said: Mr. Speaker,—In moving that the Bill be now read a second time I feel sure—

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. gentleman has already spoken, I think.

The SPEAKER said: I do not think the hon. gentleman can be considered to have already spoken. He sat down only in response to a call that hon. members were not yet in possession of the Bill.

The MINISTER FOR MINES said: Mr. Speaker,—I am very sorry if I have inadvertently committed any breach of form, but am still more surprised that an hon. gentleman having such a long experience in this House and such a knowledge of its forms should have thought it worth his while to call the attention of the House to it. This is the first time that I have ever had the honour of bringing any Bill into the House. This Bill is being brought in for the purpose of dealing with the Chinese on the Russell River Gold Field. Some time before 1884 gold was discovered on one of the feeders of the Russell River, and in July, 1884, it was reported by the Chinese to Mr. Donoghue, then filling the position of Clerk of Petty Sessions at Geraldton. No further steps were taken for

some time, until the discovery proved of more importance than had at first been anticipated, and in consequence of friction taking place between the Chinese and the Europeans, the field was inspected by Mr. Warden Mowbray, and in 1887, in pursuance of orders which he had received from my predecessor in office—the hon. member for Townsville—I find the Chinese were restricted to a small area of ground at the head of the Russell River, below the junction of Cave Creek with the Russell River. Subsequent to that action the gold deposit was found to extend over a larger area, and there was a unanimous desire on the part of the residents and public bodies of the district that the goldfield should be proclaimed. In accordance with that desire a goldfield was proclaimed on an area of land defined on the maps attached to the warden's report of the 22nd of September, 1887. That proclamation expires on Sunday next, the 21st of this month, and the Chinese are reported to me as waiting in large numbers to cross the boundary line of the area to which they have been confined, with the view of mining on this new goldfield. But in addition to the deposits discovered on the goldfield then proclaimed, gold was found on other land, and a further extension of the boundary was proclaimed in 1889. It is not proposed to deal with that portion of the goldfield in this measure, because it is protected under the present Act till 1892. The object of this Bill is to preserve the first proclaimed goldfield on the Russell River from Chinese invasion. The Bill, however, is so framed that it will not only do that, but will place the Government of the day in a position to prevent the Chinese attempting to mine upon any new goldfield until in the opinion of the Government of the day they may be allowed to do so without causing any public loss or inconvenience. I need not mention to members of this House what a grand thing it would have been for the colony, more especially at this present juncture, if this Bill had been in operation when the Palmer Gold Fields were discovered. Instead of there being an outcry for employment, that field would have given employment to a large population for at least half a century; instead of being now practically a deserted goldfield, miners would have been earning fair wages getting alluvial gold, and keeping their mates in tucker while they developed the reefs in the neighbourhood. The formation of the Russell River Gold Field is peculiar, and there is a probability of alluvial deposits being discovered there of enormous value. I have in my hand a report on this field by the Government Geologist, perhaps the highest authority in Australia, and his opinion of the prospects of the field is extremely favourable. I shall not trouble the House with the whole of the report, but only a short extract. After describing the geological features of the place the report states that:—

“The average yield from washdirt reported in Victoria for 1883 was 1 dwt. 29·32 grs.; for 1884, 3 dwts.; and for 1885 1 dwt. 10·59 grs. per ton. I am certain that the terraces of the Russell River will give a much higher yield than this. The limited workings now opened up are likely to prove only the beginning of an industry which for many years to come will employ the energies of thousands of workmen. The basalt left on the top of the ridge between Coopoooroo and Wairambar Creeks is a narrow tongue, on both sides of which the auriferous drifts which it has preserved from denudation are easily accessible. But an immense area of the basalt stretches from the Mulgrave to the heads of the Johnstone and westwards to near Herberton, and under this the auriferous drifts probably remain intact.”

Hon. members can form a very good idea of the situation of the goldfield. The basin of the Russell River at one time was something like the basin of this Chamber. It was an enormous lake, and the pressure of the accumulated water

gradually broke away one portion of the wall, and formed the outlet by which the Russell River now seeks the sea. In so doing it left basalt cliffs, and it is underneath these, in the tongue which has been formed, that the miners are now getting alluvial gold. The object of this Bill is to give the Government power to confine the Chinese to such portions of the colony as they are now allowed to work in as miners, and to prevent them working on the Russell River Gold Field or any future goldfield that may be discovered and brought under the operation of the Bill. The measure is very short and simple, and will entail no cost on the Government for administration. It will simply require a proclamation to bring it into force. I might have discussed the matter at greater length, and have referred to the action of my predecessor, which would no doubt have been continued had he remained in office, but hon. members are so well acquainted with the circumstances that that is unnecessary.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: To what action of your predecessor?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: To what action! To the action taken by the hon. gentleman to prevent Chinese mining on the portion of the goldfield to which I have referred.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: When, and how?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not want to rake up all the papers I have seen on the subject. The hon. gentleman asks me “when and how?” His instructions, as given to me by the Acting Under Secretary for Mines, were to confine the Chinese to as small an area as practicable, and to give them definite and clear directions as to the boundaries of that area. We know what the Chinese are, and that they are not satisfied to confine themselves to the area defined. The object of this Bill is to prevent them trespassing, and to enable the warden to deal with them in the event of their doing so. When this Bill is passed a Chinese miner will not be able to get a miner's right to work on this ground, but until it is passed he cannot be debarred from entering on the goldfield on and after the 21st of this month. If, however, the Bill is passed, his miner's right cannot be made available for this goldfield, nor can he take out a fresh miner's right which will give him the privilege of entering on the field. The Bill, in short, is framed with the object of keeping the field intact for Europeans, and simply crystallises the feeling of the community that the Chinese must go. I move that the Bill be now read a second time

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said: Mr. Speaker,—This seems to me to be an extraordinary piece of legislation, and I think the hon. gentleman made a very serious mistake when he alluded to the action of his predecessor. He seemed to be annoyed when I asked for particulars, but I think I was perfectly right in asking for particulars when the hon. gentleman was making an incorrect statement. Probably he meant my predecessor, and not his own predecessor. He must have meant my predecessor, who was in office at the time the line was drawn across the Russell River confining the Chinese to a certain area. That was a perfectly illegal act, and was done by my predecessor, not by me. I shall not support the Government in passing this Bill. I shall not oppose it, but shall leave the responsibility of passing it entirely on their heads. There is no man in this Chamber who has taken a stronger stand against Chinese immigration into this colony than I have done, but at the same time I would not be guilty of an act of injustice to a Chinaman any more than to any other man,

and this Bill I say is an act of injustice to the Chinaman. If the Government desire to carry out what has been the policy of the country, and prevent Chinese going on goldfields at all, I will assist them. I will give them every assistance to prevent Chinese having miners' rights, or any other Asiatic or African alien besides Chinese; but to prevent Chinese by proclamation from working on a goldfield, after the law has been fulfilled by the expiry of the three years, and a goldfield which they themselves discovered, is, I say, an act of downright injustice which should not be perpetrated by any member of this House. We have now in existence certain laws which, if carried out, will prevent any influx—I will not say any undue influx, but any influx—of Chinese into this colony. The Chinese here are decreasing day by day. Every ship that leaves our ports for China takes a certain number of Chinese away. None are brought back, so that in a very short period, by mere effluxion of time and by the operation of the laws we now have, the Chinese will go—through that and the deaths that take place. I am astounded at the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, Sir Samuel Griffith, being guilty of an act of this kind, which he must know is immoral and criminal, as far as the Chinese are concerned. Why not boldly take the bull by the horns and say, "We shall issue no more miners' rights to Chinese"? That has been done already, as far as the tinfields are concerned. I had a Bill before the House the year before last, but unfortunately I was not able to pass it, which contained a clause to that effect. It would have prevented Chinese from receiving miners' rights in future to work on any goldfield in the colony; but this is simply a Bill dealing with one little corner of the colony.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: No, no!

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: It is intended to deal with the Russell River Gold Field, and that alone; and I say that if the Chinese have a right to be on any goldfield in the colony, they have a right to be on the Russell River Gold Field, simply because the law has been fulfilled by the expiration of the three years, and because they themselves discovered that field. I shall take no responsibility as far as this Bill is concerned. I am certain there is no member of this House who misunderstands the position I have taken up in reference to the Chinese. No stronger opponent of the Chinese ever existed in this House than myself. I stood alone against them in this House in 1874 and 1875.

The HON. P. PERKINS: More shame for you.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: More shame for those who are now guilty of injustice against the Chinese. I shall not particularise, but I say those very men are responsible for the number of Chinese now in the colony. If my advice had been taken, instead of there being thousands of Chinese in the colony there would be only hundreds. I say no member of this House misunderstands the position I have taken up. I am opposed to Chinese going upon any of our goldfields. Mining for gold is a privilege which is granted only in certain countries, and we have a perfect right to deprive Chinese or any other aliens of that privilege by passing an Act to that effect, as we did in 1882 as far as the tinfields are concerned. I shall not vote for the second reading of the Bill.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. gentleman has really answered his own argument—completely, absolutely answered it. He says we should not do injustice to the Chinese. I fully admit that. I would

not be a party to doing an injustice to a Chinaman or any other man. But the hon. member says the proper thing to do is to deprive the Chinese of all rights, to absolutely exclude them from our goldfields. We are, of course, dealing with the Chinese now in the colony. While he says it is only just and proper to exclude the Chinese from all goldfields, yet to give the right to exclude them from a particular goldfield a little longer he says is grossly unjust.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: They discovered it.

The PREMIER: If the Chinese discovered the goldfield they are entitled to be there. The Bill will not alter their rights in that respect in the slightest degree.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Who will fight their battles?

The PREMIER: I say if they discovered the goldfield they have the right to be there.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: They did discover it.

The PREMIER: If they did not discover it they will have the right to go there after this week, and surely Parliament has the right to say that the time within which they shall be excluded from going there shall be extended until next week or next year, or for two years. What injustice is there in that? The reason the original Act was first introduced in its present form was this: Goldfields are seldom discovered by Chinese. I do not believe they did discover this field. They discovered a bit of gold somewhere near this field, but outside of it.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: Ask the Mines Department.

The PREMIER: The information we have is that they discovered no gold within the area of this goldfield. It was well known that the Chinese seldom discover a goldfield; it was also known that, so far as Europeans are concerned, alluvial fields are usually worked out in three years, and it was thought not unfair to exclude the Chinese from new goldfields for three years, so as to allow the alluvial deposits to be worked out, and then they could come in and fossick afterwards. That was the theory upon which the law was introduced. But on this particular goldfield the difficulties of working are so great that instead of being worked out in three years, it is only beginning to be worked. It is to all intents and purposes a new goldfield at the present moment, just as much a new field as if it had been only six months discovered. We therefore propose to extend the period within which Chinese shall be excluded from going upon the field until it has been thoroughly developed by Europeans. Under the circumstances I think the House will see that there is really nothing objectionable in the Bill. It will not in the slightest degree affect any rights now existing.

Mr. MOREHEAD said: Mr. Speaker,—I shall not detain the House more than a few moments. I cordially agree with all that has fallen from the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Macrossan; but I should like to hear from the Minister for Lands his views of the matter. He is a Northern member, and has always been an ardent defender of the coloured classes; therefore I should like to hear his opinion with regard to the treatment of the Chinese on this particular occasion. I myself, from what I hear and have read, think the Chinese are very badly treated; and as the hon. gentleman has always posed as the champion of the coloured race, as has also the Colonial Secretary when it suited him, I should like him, especially as he is a Northern member, and this

Bill applies particularly to a Northern goldfield, to explain his reasons for supporting it and saying that the Chinese should be excluded from a field which, as far as I can discover, was discovered by them and worked by them, until it suits the white man to say they must go. When a Chinaman discovers anything, as soon as it is found to be payable, the white man steps in and says he must go. I am sure the Minister for Lands, with that sense of justice for which he is so renowned, will explain to the House his reasons for supporting this measure. They may be good and sufficient reasons which might have some influence; but at present I agree with the hon. member for Townsville, and do not see my way to support the measure.

Mr. LITTLE said: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill happens to apply to a portion of the country that I represent, and while I have not the impertinence to contradict the hon. member for Townsville, I will say that the Government, in 1882, by their action, secured to thousands of European miners the work of the tinfields, which was the greatest boon ever conferred on our race by the hon. member for Townsville. I ask, Mr. Speaker, why cannot the same action be taken with regard to the Russell River Gold Field? I can give the history of that field. The Minister for Mines says the Chinese discovered the field. He is probably correct.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Nothing of the kind.

Mr. LITTLE: I will not dispute that. I want no interjections, please. I say this because I feel compelled to say it. The Minister for Lands at the time, the Hon. C. B. Dutton, was acting as Minister for Mines, and he drew a line, and said, "You shall not work beyond there." I am not an advocate of repudiation, but I say the land was given to these men to work. Somewhere about five years ago George Edward Clark, a prospector of Charters Towers, Alec Munro, Colin Douglas, and some others with myself went out there. I was not a young man, but I had 100 lb. on my back besides my tools, and we went there in the height of the wet season, and we proved there was gold there for thirty miles across. Previous to going to the Russell River we went down 140 miles south, and there to-day there are between 400 and 500 men working, and that is above the line drawn by the Hon. C. B. Dutton when acting as Minister for Mines. I am simply giving history. We were there in an unfortunate season, and though your humble servant was not as young as he used to be, he kept up pretty well with the "boys," and where they camped to-night I was there to-morrow night. We could not make a success of it because of the season; but things have altered there now. As hon. members know, a trunk line has been cut from Geraldton to Herberton, which gives the storekeepers a chance to convey supplies to men working out there. Things were different when I was there within a few miles of the foot of Bellenden-Ker. I had my Christmas dinner there on oatmeal without sugar. That was the first of the rush and I carried my swag there. I have not the remotest doubt that the Russell River Gold Field will employ not 450 men but thousands of men when they have this trunk line cut through and will not need to carry everything on their backs. The hostile blacks have not to be consulted now. There are plenty of them there, but they are more civilised and only kill a man now and again just to keep their hands in. We were 140 miles south of there, but the gold we found was not payable under the conditions. If it had been within 20, 50, or 100 miles of Brisbane, I could have made £3 or

£3 10s. a week, but when we had to carry everything out on our backs it was not payable. I am going to support the Minister for Mines in the exclusion of the Chinese from the Russell River Gold Field, because it is the birthright of the European miners.

The HON. A. RUTLEDGE said: Mr. Speaker,—I was somewhat surprised at the warmth with which the hon. member for Townsville expressed himself with regard to this Bill, because I understood that the hon. gentleman's sympathies tended in the other direction. Shortly before the House adjourned a few weeks ago, my hon. colleague, Mr. Sayers, asked a question of the hon. gentleman who was then Minister for Mines, with respect to the expiration of the period during which the Russell River should remain a new goldfield. The hon. member drew the Minister's attention to the fact that an influx of Chinese on to the field was anticipated. Some days after that the hon. member for Cook asked a question on the same subject, but I did not understand from the replies made by the hon. member for Townsville that he in the least degree objected to any measure being adopted for the purpose of accomplishing the object those hon. members desired being secured as early as possible. If I understood the hon. gentleman's answers to the questions correctly, he said it was not a matter for departmental regulation, and could only be accomplished by means of legislation, and he did not on either occasion, so far as I was able to hear, let fall a single word to the effect that to take any legislative steps would be an act of injustice to the Chinese. I am sure the hon. gentleman did not on those occasions feel the same warmth which he has exhibited with regard to this measure. I cannot understand how it can be looked upon as an act of injustice to the Chinese to keep them off this goldfield, or any other goldfield in a similar position. It would be a gross act of repudiation to say that Chinese, who have now under the law in force acquired the right to go upon goldfields, and who are now on those fields, should be expelled from those fields. That would be a rank act of injustice, but I cannot see that Chinese who have not yet acquired the right to go upon a goldfield can claim that they are unjustly treated if they are kept off for a further period. Surely no man can complain of being defrauded of that which he never had. It is perfectly competent for the legislature to make laws or amend laws already in existence if the making or amending of them does not interfere with any rights already acquired by any member of the community; but persons who hoped to acquire rights cannot complain because those hopes do not happen to be realised. I rose more for the purpose of expressing the hope that the Government will, as early as possible next session, take measures to give relief to the residents of the goldfields of the colony in other ways. One matter in particular has engrossed the attention of residents on goldfields more than any other, and that is the difficulty experienced in connection with the winding-up of mining companies, under the liquidation clauses of the present Companies Act. That is a very serious matter for the residents of goldfields, and they all urge attention to the injustice many of the shareholders in mines—most of which never paid anything—are now suffering by the inadequacy of the present laws to meet the cases to which I have referred. I hope that such relief as is desiderated by the residents on the different goldfields will be afforded next session by a comprehensive amendment of the Gold Fields Act, which will include this and other matters to which I need not now refer. While this Bill will have the effect of preventing an influx of Chinese to the Russell River, it does not deal exclusively with

the Russell River. If it did there might be something in the objections urged against it; but seeing that it is a general enactment, I do not see that there is any ground for opposition.

Mr. HAMILTON said: Mr. Speaker,—On a previous occasion, when I advocated the exclusion of Chinese from the Russell River, I stated as my reason that it had been discovered by white men. That was in 1887, when Mr. Dutton was Minister for Works. I called attention to the fact that the largest portion of the Russell River was being surrendered to the Chinese, and that the white miners were sending a petition requesting that the matter should be remedied. The Government at that time, of which the leader was the present Premier, did not consider the matter worth discussion. Subsequently, in November, 1887, the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Macrossan, and myself and others again brought the matter under the notice of the Government; but Mr. Dutton answered that he considered it was not worth the time and trouble necessary to shift the Chinese, and that the petition was probably got up by two or three white people who had a particular down upon the Chinese; and no action was taken. Though I approve of this Bill, and will support it, still I consider that it would be far better if some other measure were introduced—something like that introduced by the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Macrossan, when he was Minister for Mines. According to this Bill, it strikes me that the field can be proclaimed a new field at any time. If that is the case a Chinaman may discover payable gold after the three years have expired; then the field may subsequently be proclaimed a new field, and the Chinaman will have to leave the claim he has developed. It would be far better not to allow Chinamen to have miners' rights under any circumstances.

Mr. PALMER said: Mr. Speaker,—The great outcry against the Chinese comes from the miners, and it is in deference to their wishes that most of the restrictive legislation against Chinese has been passed. If we can pass a Bill to apply to one goldfield, I do not see why we should not pass one to apply to the whole of Queensland. I cannot see why it has not been specially enacted that no miners' rights shall be issued to Asiatic or African aliens; that would settle the matter at once, because the numbers of Chinese in the colony are dwindling year by year, in consequence of the legislation that has already taken place. I agree with the Minister for Mines that the gold found in the gullies round Palmerville would have been a source of income to many white men for a good many—though I will not go so far as to say fifty—years but for the presence of Chinese there. The Chinese at that place get some surprising nuggets even now, and if no miners' rights had been issued to Chinese this field would have been worked by Europeans only. I think that if we pass this Bill it will be more in deference to the miners than to any sense of justice, and that the less we boast about our Chinese legislation the better.

Mr. POWERS said: Mr. Speaker,—The great objection I have to the Bill is its indefiniteness, and because the same difficulty may arise in three or four years. There may be crowds of Chinamen wanting to go on a field, and waiting till the period mentioned in the proclamation expires. Then, just before the termination of the period, in comes the Minister with another proclamation, and the Chinamen are told they must wait until the next period expires. It would be much fairer to do as was suggested by the hon. member for Townsville—if we are not to have them on our

goldfields, to tell them so. But this is of a piece with the legislation we may expect from the present Government. Here is a body of men with opposite opinions on everything. With regard to this question, the Colonial Treasurer will say, "Let the Chinamen go altogether;" and the Premier will say that the policy he put forward was that he would make the Chinamen go home, but tax them first. Then comes the Minister for Lands. There is no doubt that no hon. member has stood up for the just rights of the Chinaman more than that hon. gentleman has done. This is one of the principles that the present Government are going to pocket but not sacrifice. According to the address of the Premier, they are not going to sacrifice any principles, but they will pocket them; and that is why we are not legislating to the whole extent, I suppose. I remember when the hon. member for Charters Towers, Mr. Sayers, brought up the question about kanakas on goldfields, the present Colonial Secretary insisted that the kanaka was more reliable for the roasting process on goldfields than white labour.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. H. Tozer): Never.

Mr. POWERS: I shall quote what the hon. gentleman did say:—

"With regard to the employment of kanakas on goldfields, I think the hon. member for Charters Towers, Mr. Sayers, has got all he wants by simply bringing the matter before the Government and the House. Norton and Ravenswood are the only two goldfields, so far as I know, where coloured labour is employed, and until we can substitute some mechanical furnace which will admit of the ore being roasted by white labour, I do not see how we can avoid using kanakas, or other coloured labour. That will be the solution of the question. But at the present time, with the old reverberatory furnace, white labour is unsuitable. I think it necessary to mention that, because any restrictive measures that may be taken by the Government may have the effect of shutting up at a moment's notice those goldfields without the necessary provision being made for carrying them on in future.

"Mr. SAYERS, in reply, said: Mr. Speaker,—It seems to me there is no industry in this colony, according to some hon. members, that can carry on without black labour. I remember the time when a great number of the stations were worked by black labourers, but now they have been done away with. The hon. member for Wide Bay says the roasting process cannot be done with white labour, and by that contends that the kanaka is superior to the white man.

"Mr. TOZER: More reliable, I said."

That shows that the hon. gentleman did say that for the roasting process the kanaka was more reliable than the white man; so that we can understand the legislation we may expect so far as black labour is concerned. We are not likely to get from a House constituted as this House is anything else but this sort of thing, and I would really ask the Government to provide that the proclamation shall be for a definite period—say one year or two years—so that the Chinese may know how long they are to be kept off. I am not now taking back anything I have previously said, because I began by saying that the only objection I had to the Bill was that it did not tell the Chinese how long they would be kept off the field; and I hope an amendment to that effect will be accepted by the Government; but I do not like to see it passed merely for an indefinite period.

Mr. HOOLAN said: Mr. Speaker,—I am only a stranger here, and if I digress from the ordinary rules of debate I trust to your leniency and consideration. When I was introduced into this House I was cautioned as to my conduct therein, but I must say that there has been a very bad example set me this afternoon by hon. members of this House. They know very well that their undivided attention should be

given to the state of the colony and to the wretched state of its finances, which have been brought about by their misruling. And yet they sit here the very first day, when the whole country is waiting to know what action they will take relative to our finances, and quibble over a lot of wretched Chinese whom some of them call men, but whom the majority of the public term mongrels. This is a question as to whether the Chinese shall be on the Russell River Gold Field or not.

Mr. LITTLE: Yes it is.

Mr. HOOLAN: It is a question as to whether a lot of people who have no right to Australia or Australian soil shall enter upon a goldfield discovered by white men, after years of travelling and trailing through the scrub—after years of hardship and endurance. It is a question whether these Chinese shall be excluded from this goldfield, which is one of the last alluvial fields in the North. These Chinese are of no assistance to the colony as a whole, or to the North. We know that a number of miners in the North are in very straightened circumstances—men who have to pay into the revenue of this country, and help to keep others in good positions, and enable them to be well dressed and live in comfortable houses. These miners should be our first consideration, and not the Chinese; and it seems strange and rather alarming to me, and certainly emboldens me to open my mouth for the first time in the House, when I would have held back from modesty and taken a back seat. Were it not for a circumstance which came under my notice this morning, I should have been very much surprised at the sentiment of some hon. members of this House. In the *Courier* of this morning, amongst the fashionable news, I saw that the lady of Chick Tong, a Chinese gentleman, has been confined of a son, and then I found that the wife of Mr. Montague Daveney has brought into the world a charming young daughter. Well, it is rather startling intelligence to me. I do not know whether Chick Tong is not a member of this Assembly, but it seems that the Chinese are certainly taking a very high place, and that there are a number of our legislators who have pledged themselves on public platforms not only to exclude the Chinese from a little goldfield like the Russell River, but to exclude them from the whole of Australia, who are now objecting to a simple but effective measure such as this. The Bill is certainly one which will meet the exigencies of the case. We want the gold of the North reserved for the white people upon whom depends the prosperity of the North. They deserve consideration at our hands, whilst the Chinese deserve none, as they never found a goldfield and never will, although they are always ready to creep in. In other cases they have crept in when the white men have been ready to leave, but in this case the white men not only want the Russell River Gold Field, but the commerce of Queensland requires it. We want every bit of gold for ourselves, and our own people are entitled to it. The whole of the people of the North are decidedly opposed to the Chinese being introduced into our land and into our commerce, and more particularly into our goldfields. I hope that every sensible and honourable man will consider this, and pass this measure. Let us get to business that more immediately concerns the House and the country at large.

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

COMMITTEE.

On the motion of the MINISTER FOR MINES, the Speaker left the chair, and the House went into Committee to consider the Bill in detail.

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

On clause 2, as follows:—

"The Governor in Council may, by proclamation, declare that any goldfield named therein shall be deemed to be and to continue to be a new goldfield within the meaning of the principal Act notwithstanding the lapse of three years from the first proclamation of such goldfield."

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he supposed the Minister for Mines was well aware that the portion of the field to which the Chinese were confined was the lower part of the river, and that the mines which were principally worked by Europeans were on the plateau of which the hon. gentleman spoke, near the heads of the river. To prevent the injustice which that particular Bill would do to the Chinese who were the actual discoverers of the field, he (Hon. J. M. Macrossan) thought a line should be drawn above the line drawn at the mouth of Cave Creek by Mr. Dutton, when he was Minister for Lands, and the Chinese confined below that line. He understood that the portion of the field below Cave Creek was at present worked up or almost worked up by the Chinese, and they were waiting for the expiry of the three years so as to be able to go above the place where they were now allowed to work. Even if they were allowed to go as high as where the European miners were working at present they would not do so, as they would be afraid. The Europeans would not allow them to go there; that was a matter well known to the hon. gentleman and every member of the Committee. If it were provided that a line should be drawn above Cave Creek so as to permit Chinese to work above the present line less injustice would be done, and it would, he believed, satisfy Europeans, and probably satisfy the Chinese as well. In the meantime they could introduce a new clause or a separate Bill forbidding the issue of miners' rights to Chinese or any Asiatic or African aliens after a certain period. Would the hon. gentleman agree to that? If he would, that would certainly satisfy the instinct of justice, which every member of that Committee had as regarded Chinese as well as Europeans, and would satisfy Chinese miners also that rights acquired retrospectively would not be interfered with.

The MINISTER FOR MINES said he wished he could take the hon. gentleman's proposal, which was an eminently just one, into consideration, but he was debarred from doing so by circumstances which he would explain to the Committee. He did not endorse the hon. gentleman's information, or the official information, respecting the discovery of gold on that field by Chinese. He believed there were white men working on the ground, and they found it too poor—it was very poor originally—to satisfy them; but in order to secure a reward they took Chinese and put them on the ground. That, he believed, was the true history of the matter, and there was no occasion to feel any compunction in turning the Chinese off the ground, for the reason that though the Chinese were perfectly acquainted with the Goldfields Regulations, they had been working on the field for months before they reported the discovery of it to the Clerk of Petty Sessions at Geraldton. They simply reported the discovery when it was found by Europeans that the deposit of gold was rich enough to render it worth their while to quarrel with the Chinese for the working of the ground. The hon. member for Townsville, Hon. J. M. Macrossan, gave instructions that the Chinese should be confined to the smallest possible area, and in carrying out those instructions a line of demarcation was made a little below Cave

Creek. Then the goldfield was proclaimed which was marked pink on the map, and that was the goldfield that was open to the incursion of Chinese on the 21st of the present month, and in respect of which the Bill was framed. After that goldfield was proclaimed, very important discoveries were made on the left of the part marked pink—what was called the Russell River Extended Gold Field. That was proclaimed a goldfield since the proclamation of the Russell Gold Field, but the proclamation would not expire till 1892. But by someone's action—he did not know whose—there was a part marked yellow on the map which absolutely included the original triangular piece on which the Chinese were reported to have discovered gold, though, as he had said he did not endorse the official records of that discovery. Therefore he was unable to accept the hon. gentleman's suggestion, because the yellow portion of the field would not be open to the Chinese until 1892. Therefore he could not meddle with it. Whatever grievances might exist with regard to the Chinese, or however sensitive hon. members might be to see that justice was done, he really trusted that the passage of the Bill would not be attempted to be delayed by such amendments as had been suggested. The late Postmaster-General had suggested that the date of the proclamation should be fixed, but that was impossible, because the proclamation must be guided by the Minister's ideas of the fitness of things. On a goldfield like the Palmer, where they had dry, arid workings, and where they knew exactly when the deposits were worked out, it was a fair thing to let the Chinese go on it after the specified time—if it was a fair thing at all, which he did not admit. But in the case of the Russell River Gold Field the circumstances were altogether different. It was situated in dense scrub; the formation was volcanic, and it would take years to develop the riches which Mr. Jack confidently predicted existed there. Therefore the question of forbidding the intrusion of the Chinese was a question that must be left to the discretion of the Minister. To fix the date would lay down a hard and fast line which might be applicable to the Russell River Gold Field, but to no other portion of the colony. He would prefer to see the Bill thrown out rather than see it delayed by the specious arguments that had been adduced.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the portion of the field he was referring to was that which would be thrown open next Sunday, and he contended that a line could be drawn by the proclamation which would prevent the Chinese from encroaching upon the area that the Europeans regarded as their ground. If that were done he would be satisfied, provided that a promise was also given by the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government that he would bring in a Bill dealing with the question of granting miners' rights to Chinamen in its entirety. They should endeavour to carry out their national policy as far as the Chinese were concerned, and he believed that if the hon. gentleman introduced a Bill dealing with the issue of miners' rights to Chinese there would be no difficulty in passing it, because when a Bill dealing with the question was before the House in 1888, not a single member spoke in opposition to the clause which prevented the issue of a miner's right to any Asiatic or African alien. He believed it would not delay the business of the Government half an hour.

The PREMIER said as far as bringing in a Bill dealing with the subject of the working of Asiatic or African aliens on our goldfields was concerned, he could undertake that the Government would do so, but he was not prepared to say that the measure would absolutely prevent the

issue of miners' rights to Chinese, because that would prevent Chinese market gardeners from going on goldfields. The whole question would have to be considered.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: I refer to working for gold.

The PREMIER said that promise he could give. With respect to the other point, the Bill would enable the Government to do what the hon. gentleman had suggested, if on inquiry it proved a proper and desirable thing to do. Of course on that he could not now express any opinion. The reason why the Bill was brought in in its present form was because to be of any use at all it must become law this week, and it was thought that if any controversial matter was introduced it might not be passed in time, nor would it be fair to either House to ask them to pass it without due consideration. It merely proposed to give power to extend the time during which Chinese could be excluded from the field.

The MINISTER FOR MINES said he had no hesitation in saying that he would endeavour as far as possible to give effect to the suggestions of the hon. gentleman opposite.

Mr. SALKELD said the hon. member for Carpentaria had pointed out that the principal objection to Chinese came from the gold miners in the North, and he had suggested that a Bill should be introduced to exclude them altogether instead of dealing with the subject piecemeal, as in the Bill before the Committee. He (Mr. Salkeld) looked upon the Bill as a measure to meet a special case, and he would point out that a large proportion of the population of the North besides gold miners objected to Chinese because they came into competition with them in various ways and flooded the markets. The only real solution of the difficulty was to get the Chinese out of the country as soon as possible. He would support the Bill, because it was only carrying a little further what was already the law by which Chinese were excluded from new goldfields.

Clause put and passed.

On clause 3, as follows:—

“When any such proclamation has been made with respect to a goldfield, such goldfield shall be deemed to be a new goldfield within the meaning of the principal Act for such further period beyond three years as is specified in the proclamation; and any miner's right which by the principal Act is declared to be of no force or validity upon a new goldfield shall not be available for such goldfield.

“And no miner's right issued to an Asiatic or African alien shall be or be made available, or be of any force or validity for or upon any such goldfield during the period specified in the proclamation.”

Mr. POWERS said he would ask the Minister for Mines what term the Government proposed now to fix by the proclamation? Had they decided on any term.

The MINISTER FOR MINES said the Government had not yet decided what the precise term should be, as other matters required to be taken into consideration besides the case of that particular goldfield.

Clause passed as printed.

The House resumed; and the CHAIRMAN reported the Bill without amendment.

#### THIRD READING.

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

## ADJOURNMENT.

## CHARGES AGAINST THE LATE GOVERNMENT.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that this House do now adjourn. The first business to-morrow will be the Bills I have referred to to-day—The Larceny Act of 1865 Amendment Bill, the Married Women's Property Bill, and the Prisons Bill.

Mr. POWERS said: Mr. Speaker,—Before the House adjourns there is a matter I wish to refer to. Before I joined the late Government, of which I became a member, I thought it right to go to the leader of the party whom I was elected to support, to ask him whether there was any reason why I should not join the Ministry. The hon. gentleman said there was no reason why I should not join it, and that he, the present Colonial Treasurer, intended to support that party. Well, when we last met here I heard this extraordinary speech, and I think that now is the time when the statements made in it should either be withdrawn or proved. The hon. gentleman said:—

"The Colonial Secretary, whom I do not see in his place at present, informed the House during this debate—I think it was during this debate—that I had left the Ministry in a temper, and he used rather stronger language on two other different occasions, when I had not an opportunity of replying. I did not leave the Ministry in a temper. I have told the House pretty well why I did leave them, and I do not think anybody who understands me would think that I left them through an act of temper, and have stuck to it ever since. It was a much stronger influence than temper that caused me to do what I did. I have told the House before what took place at that time, but I did not tell them the additional fact that in the very manner of the Cabinet there was demonstrated a strong influence—not political, not for the good of the party, and not for the good of the country—that was dominating the Cabinet."

If that was so, I say that I as a young man had a right to be told it when I asked the hon. gentleman whether there was any reason why I should not join the Cabinet. The hon. gentleman went on to say:—

"That is what I saw. It was standing out as unmistakably and as plainly as the sun in daylight. That is what decided me to do what I did. That I did not leave in a passion is proved by the fact that I went about a good deal of the work that devolved upon me as a Minister in connection with Bills before the House, and had the matters finished and signed by the various Ministers before I left the Cabinet. You can understand what this influence was. You may call it what name you like. It was an influence quite outside the Cabinet, and should not have been there. The Colonial Secretary has talked about Vogelism and about Griffithism, and I will coin another word—I will follow his style of nomenclature, and call it Mount Morganism. That is what was dominating the Cabinet; and that I was not wrong, all the other circumstances that happened afterwards proved it. I sat in the House during the whole of the session. When the session was over and I went to another colony; when I was several hundreds of miles away, one of the Ministers took advantage of being in Rockhampton to call a meeting of his debtors, and there he denounced me in the strongest possible language. That was Morganism. When the other Ministers were still; when my friends at the banquet sat still, men who had often heaped adulation upon me until I squirmed under it sometimes—when they all sat still, and never said one single word in defence of an absent colleague—that was Morganism. I have seen it since, and it was that that forced me from the Cabinet. I had determined that I could not by any means be responsible for a Cabinet that was dominated by an influence quite outside myself, and which was not for the good of the party or of the country."

I think the time has come when the hon. gentleman ought to show how it was the Mount Morgan influence came in that was not for the good of the country or of the party. The cry has gone on long enough, and it was repeated until it disrupted the party, and now is the time to let the country know in what way the Mount Morgan influence was used to dominate the Cabinet.

I know that from the time I was in the Ministry I saw nothing of it, and I think the hon. member should have told the House what it was, or else withdrawn the charge. These are not old women's tales about the expression of the countenance. The hon. member should not have made the charge unless he is prepared to prove it, and let us know the people who sink all the interests of party and country. The country wants to know who they are from the man who made the charge. But I intend to disprove the charge, and I will do so from the hon. member's own words and actions.

The SPEAKER said: I must call the attention of the House to the fact that an hon. member is out of order in alluding to a previous debate of this session. There are circumstances under which the House, and the House of Commons also, allows reference to previous debates on subjects not at the time before the House; and when a question of this kind is raised, which appears to be a matter of dispute between members of the House, I think the House itself must decide whether the debate ought to be allowed on the question the hon. member has brought forward. If the hon. member desires to discuss the question he has referred to, he can do so without quoting from the previous debates, but as a previous debate has been quoted from, I feel bound to call the attention of the House to it, because if I do not do so now, and do so on some future occasion, I may be blamed for not calling attention to the fact on one occasion and calling attention to it on another. I do so for my own protection, and I think the House will understand that I do not wish to stifle discussion. It is one of the well-recognised rules of the House which ought not to be transgressed without attention being called to the fact.

The COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. Sir T. McIlwraith) said: Mr. Speaker,—Speaking to the point of order, I wish to let the hon. member understand that I have not the slightest desire in any way to avoid discussion on the subject to which he has referred by any party in the House. I am not afraid of anything either he or any other hon. member may bring forward at any time; so that if the matter is not discussed now I hope it will not be from any sympathy with me—I hope they do not take that into consideration. I have my work to do this week; but I am perfectly prepared to meet any charge the hon. member may bring against me.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said: Mr. Speaker,—I admit that you are justified in saying what you have said; but it is a well-known fact that the rule to which you have referred has been frequently broken. In fact it is one that is honoured more in the breach than in the observance.

The PREMIER: It is kept in the spirit.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: It has been broken by the hon. gentleman himself.

The PREMIER: In the letter.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: And in the spirit.

The PREMIER: Never in the spirit.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: I do not care to draw the fine distinctions the hon. member draws. This is something more than a dispute between members of the House; it is a dispute as to whether the late Ministry is to stand under the slur of having acted dishonourably or not through a period of its existence; and I say that the discussion will not be stifled as far as I am concerned.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Nor as far as I am concerned either.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: So that the hon. gentleman need not stand up and say in such a plausible and generous way that he is not going to interpose any obstacle. He cannot do so; and we mean to see whether the statements made by the hon. gentleman on the last occasion the matter was mentioned are correct or not. It is not going to be a question as to whether a rule is to be broken in the spirit or in the letter, but a question as to the truthfulness of the statements made by the hon. gentleman or the honesty of the late Ministry.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Nobody put it as a matter of dispute between members. I say I am ready for a debate on the subject introduced by the hon. member for Burrum as soon as he likes to bring it forward.

Mr. PATTISON: And that is now.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I am astounded that the hon. member for Rockhampton did not do it a great deal sooner, because he made a false statement about me.

Mr. CALLAN: Why do you say that?

Mr. MOREHEAD said: Mr. Speaker,—I insist on the hon. member withdrawing those words. They are unparliamentary, and must be withdrawn. The hon. member has charged the hon. member for Rockhampton with having made a false statement.

The Hon. P. PERKINS: The statement should have been taken exception to at the time. The hon. member—

The SPEAKER said: I must ask the hon. member to sit down while I speak. Objection having been taken to certain words used by the Colonial Treasurer, I must point out that if the hon. member, in saying that another hon. member made a false statement, referred to a statement made in this House, according to the rules I must require him to withdraw the remark. If they applied to a statement made outside the House—and I am not in a position to say which—it is not quite clear, according to Mr. Speaker Brand, that I can call upon him to withdraw his words.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said: Mr. Speaker,—The statement I characterised as false was made in this House; and in accordance with your ruling I will withdraw the words. I will take the much easier course, whenever I am given the opportunity, of proving that it was.

Mr. PATTISON said: Mr. Speaker,—The statement I made in this House I am prepared to prove by the hon. gentleman's own handwriting and then abide by the result. If I do not prove it to the hilt, I will walk out of the Chamber and never come in again.

The SPEAKER said: I wish to draw attention to the fact that the hon. member for Burrum was in possession of the House when I pointed out that he was referring to a previous debate of the same session. I did so to ascertain whether he should be allowed to continue his remarks or not.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—Before you put the question I wish to say one word with reference to an interjection I made just now. The hon. member for Townsville said this rule was often broken; and I said, "In the letter, not in the spirit." The intention of the rule was to prevent debates being interminable—to prevent a debate that has taken place on one occasion from being repeated on other occasions. Life is not long enough for that; and when an attempt is made to violate the rule for that purpose, the House ought not to allow it to be broken. When

it is done to bring up a matter that ought to be discussed, it is the practice of the House not to insist on the rule.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said: Mr. Speaker,—I wish to say that the statement made by the Colonial Treasurer was made at a time when he could not be answered. It was on the last evening of the financial debate, when everybody was tired and wearied out; and the member for Burrum has taken the first opportunity of bringing the matter forward, not for the purpose of interminable debate, but to finish what might have been finished before had there been time to do it.

The Hon. P. PERKINS: Washing up!

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: The statement was made just as the financial debate was closing. I had no opportunity of speaking after the hon. gentleman had spoken, because I had spoken before; so that I could not then have answered the charge he made against the Ministry. And I do not think a single member of the Ministry had the right to speak then.

The SPEAKER said: In order that the House may proceed regularly, I would like to know whether the House consents to the debate being continued. If so, I have nothing further to say.

Mr. POWERS: When the point of order was raised I was referring to the remarks made by the Colonial Treasurer, that his reason for leaving the Ministry was that Mount Morgan was influencing Parliament and the Cabinet against the interests of the country. I said that the House and the country were entitled to a complete withdrawal of those remarks, or else to a confirmation of them. That confirmation can only be given by showing by actual facts that legislation was influenced by Mount Morgan influence. I will turn to what the hon. gentleman said when he left the Ministry. What did he tell the House was the cause why he left the Ministry? I will read from *Hansard* what he said, and it does not at all agree with that. On the 16th September, 1889, the hon. gentleman said:—

"I think the Chief Secretary has possibly, from his point of view, put the case perfectly fairly. I differ from him with regard to some of the facts, and I will mention them in the course of the short speech I have to make. I have nothing to complain of as to the way in which he has put the case before the House. As a matter of fact, however, there is one point to which I will refer first, and that is his statement that the Cabinet was agreed that the amount in dispute should be placed on the Loan Estimates, but not spent just now, while I thought the work ought to be gone on with immediately. I never heard that phase of the question at all. The question was whether it should be put on the Estimates, or whether it should be put on the next Estimates, which would be brought forward in the course of two years."

Further on he says:—

"I told my colleagues this—and I agree with it still—that it was a matter of indifference to me what their opinion was, that as Vice-President of the Executive Council, I submitted this matter to them. I considered my opinion ought to be quite enough justification for them to put this item on the Estimates, and I never knew such an item being discussed till it was brought before Parliament. Nevertheless, the majority of my colleagues went against me, and I retired."

Then he says—and it was an extraordinary statement to make if Mount Morgan influence was what caused him to leave the Ministry:—

"I need not say I leave them with a great deal of sorrow; but I have left them with a great deal more indignation. However, my indignation will not prevent my doing justice to them, and being as faithful a supporter of the present Government as I have been all through. I do not think they require that I should give them any promise of that sort."

I think we had a right to expect something from that promise, but now he says he left the Ministry on account of Mount Morgan influence. Turning back to August we find on page 984 of *Hansard* that the hon. gentleman said:—

"I congratulate the Treasurer on having given a fair and honest statement of the financial position of the colony, and in having grappled with all the difficulties that he required to grapple with at the present time."

Then on page 1931 he gives his reasons again:—

"The morning on which I left the Cabinet, the Brisbane railway station was not the only point in dispute between myself and my colleagues. There was another, and that was the form in which they should bring in their Loan Estimates."

Mount Morgan was not the second reason he gave to this House and the country, for later on he says:—

"The question was only whether we should ask for a lump sum for railways or not. I broke off the discussion short, and said, 'What is the use of arguing that? Let us commence with the details.' The details were commenced with, and one of the first was the construction of the Brisbane railway station, and then the matter ended, so far as I was concerned. That was the position in which the Government were left, so that they have not had the benefit of my advice, and the hon. member is not right in saying that the matter was discussed in Cabinet, or that any such scheme was sanctioned by me."

The first reason was the £40,000 for the Brisbane railway station, and the second reason was that the Loan Estimates were not made up in proper form. We have here nothing yet about Mount Morgan. Then on page 2202 he says:—

"Up to the present time the Government have done perfectly right under the obligations imposed upon them. They worked along just as a man will do when he has a heavy burden upon his shoulders. The Government should have the sympathy of the country, having that burden, which they did not impose upon themselves, but which they are in duty bound to carry."

Then we have another extraordinary statement on page 2602, considering it was Mount Morgan influence that drove him from the Cabinet. He says:—

"The Treasurer said he had good cause of complaint against me, because I did not give him that assistance which I had promised to give him with his financial statement. I would have been pleased to have replied at the time, and to have removed what seems to be a very great misunderstanding. What the hon. gentleman said was perfectly right. I asked him to join the Ministry as Treasurer, and he did it with great reluctance."

Well, it is most extraordinary that he should have pressed the late Colonial Treasurer, Mr. Pattison, to join the Ministry. He asked him to join it, and he joined "with great reluctance." Then the next reason we have from the hon. gentleman for leaving the Cabinet was in reference to the Address in Reply. The hon. gentleman says that members of the late Ministry had no right to be connected with Northern separation. That was given as the third reason, and yet the first member of the new Ministry to issue his address says he has an open hand so far as separation is concerned. Then we come to the fourth reason—the Mount Morgan influence. Personally speaking, I want this thing cleared off the boards. I do not intend to refer to it again, but I think it is time it was referred to. As far as the late Ministry are concerned, and the members of this party, we are perfectly satisfied, and have no objection to going to the country on the question of the £40,000 vote for a railway station. We are perfectly satisfied that the hon. gentleman should say that he left the Ministry because the Loan Estimates were not brought forward in the manner in which he thought they should be; and we do not object to the third statement, that he left the Ministry because of two gentlemen in it being connected with the Northern separation question,

and that he could not sit in it in consequence; but what we do object to is being branded throughout the country as being a Ministry who had worked against the interests of the country and party through Mount Morgan influence. I do not intend to say anything harsh about it. I only ask, as one member should ask another, either that the charge should be substantiated or withdrawn. I do not care to have my name attached to a dishonest Ministry, because it is a dishonest Ministry that would allow any influence to act against the interests of both the party and country, and I ask the hon. gentleman now to let the country know what this influence was and explain it to the House. It may not turn out to be such a crime as we have been told, but the charge as it stands is a great crime, and I want to know on what grounds he bases the charge. I think it is only fair that the time of the House should be devoted to this matter, and the country ought to be made aware how we were guilty of improper influence in misdirecting the administration and legislation of this country. That is all I ask. As to the question of the coalition, that can be discussed subsequently. I want this charge proved or disproved. We have been charged with maladministration, but to what extent we know not until the hon. gentleman makes a distinct charge. I ask him to let us know what he bases his charge on, and what are the pieces of maladministration we were guilty of. It cannot be the Mount Morgan railway, because it was introduced by the hon. gentleman himself. He spoke very highly of it, and it was highly approved of by the present Minister for Mines. The fact of that vote being put on the Estimates could not be the Mount Morgan influence to which he refers, because he said himself that it was a good railway. I cannot see where the charges are, and I ask him now as a member of the late Ministry to let us know where and in what manner the Mount Morgan influence came in. As far as I know, the late Colonial Treasurer's resignation was accepted the day after the speech the hon. gentleman referred to, and from that day to the time we were defeated the late Colonial Treasurer, Mr. Pattison, never came inside the Cabinet door. In fact, instead of trying to influence the Cabinet in any way, he entirely held aloof from us, and although I attended every meeting, I never met in Cabinet the former Colonial Treasurer, Mr. Pattison. Yet I am told by my constituents and by the Press in the district I represent, that I ought to be ashamed of myself for sitting in a Ministry, which, according to Sir Thos. McLlwraith, the present Colonial Treasurer, was influenced by Mount Morgan.

Mr. HYNE: What paper was that in? I never read it.

Mr. POWERS: I have seen it and read it.

Mr. ANNEAR: I have never seen a charge made against you.

Mr. POWERS: I do not ask the hon. gentleman to take my word; but any other hon. gentleman who has the respect of the House will take my word for it.

Mr. ANNEAR: I am as much respected in the House as you are.

Mr. POWERS: I care nothing about what the hon. member thinks or believes. It is not of the slightest moment to me; but if the Colonial Treasurer wishes to see the paper I will guarantee to produce it, as it is in the library. The words were to this effect—that it was an insult to the constituency for me to remain in the Ministry after the charge made by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HYNE: Give me the date of the paper and I will look it out.

Mr. POWERS: I do not want the hon. gentleman to do it. I can do my own work. I do not want the assistance of either hon. member for Maryborough.

Mr. ANNEAR: I would not assist anyone to do dirty work.

Mr. POWERS: The junior member for Maryborough offered to do the dirty work, and I do not want it done. I do not want the slightest assistance from the hon. members for Maryborough; but my time is coming to have a bit of fun with them now.

Mr. ANNEAR: I am ready for you.

Mr. MOREHEAD: No one is frightened of you.

Mr. ANNEAR: I am his match at any time.

Mr. POWERS: I am now dealing with a person of more influence in this House than the hon. member, and when I attack the hon. member for Maryborough it will be time for him to talk. It was distinctly stated that I was insulting my constituents in remaining in a Cabinet dominated by Mount Morgan influence, and I wish to clear myself and this party. As far as the Ministry with which I was associated is concerned, I never in the slightest degree saw any influence which was not for the good of the party and of the country.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Now, Mr. Pattison, where is your charge?

Mr. PATTISON: I have no charge, but I am going to have the reply to you.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Mr. Speaker,—What a contemptible mean trick for a young man like the hon. gentleman who has just spoken to give us a lot of garbage relative to my old friends, and now enemies, and to get up and worry me. I have a few words to say to the hon. member—not on the subject which he has brought up, but about himself—because I am not going to reply to it. The hon. member came in as an adherent of mine. I remember well at the time how the Maryborough people laughed that he was contesting the constituency on my behalf, because he was not a McIlwraith man at all.

Mr. POWERS: I always was. I always supported you.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I shall repeat what was told to me. The hon. gentleman was adopted as a McIlwraith candidate, and he got in. He had the approval of the leaders of the party for the action he took when sitting on the back benches, though that approval has, I think, very much diminished since. At all events, he got a high character at that time for a young man. I left the Ministry, and I came into the House, after having given in my resignation, one evening between 8 and 9 o'clock, and the hon. member came and said to me, "I profess myself your follower. I came in here under your leadership," and then he said that he had been looking for me that day, and wanted me to give him my opinion as to whether he should join the Ministry. I said, "Join it, in what capacity?" The hon. gentleman said, "As a member of the Council without portfolio." I gave him my advice point blank against doing so, and told him why. The reason I gave was that that position was usually reserved for some politician of experience who was in the position to stand by, holding a responsible position without the cares and work of office, but that it did not apply to the hon. gentleman at all; and therefore I did not think he ought to take the position. The hon. gentleman went away with that advice.

Mr. POWERS: No. We had a further conversation.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I never had a conversation on that subject with the hon. gentleman after that. The next morning at breakfast I read in the papers that the hon. gentleman had actually been sworn in as a member of the Cabinet at 5 o'clock the previous afternoon.

Mr. POWERS: That is not true.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: The hon. gentleman came to consult me as to whether he should accept office without portfolio or not about 8 or 9 o'clock at night, and the next morning I got the intelligence that he had taken office. When he was consulting me I thought there was something in it, and I gave him a lot of fatherly advice. I told him—and he must remember it quite well—that he went into that position for the purpose of getting a step higher, and making sure of getting the next empty seat in the Ministry, and that was admitted. The hon. member asked my advice, and afterwards I found that he had been asking my advice when he had actually accepted office, and I have looked with great contempt upon the hon. member ever since.

Mr. POWERS: That is wrong. I was not sworn in when I asked the hon. member's advice, and I was not sworn in until the next day at 12 o'clock.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I saw it in the papers the next morning, and I spoke to one of my friends about it, and said, "Imagine this young man asking my opinion after he had actually taken office."

Mr. POWERS: I assure the hon. gentleman that he is wrong, and I refer him to the Minister for Lands, whom I at once referred to, and he said, "Well, I give you exactly the same advice."

The COLONIAL TREASURER: The next morning after the advice was given by me I read in the papers that the hon. member had been sworn in the day before, and as I only came into the House at about 8 o'clock it could not have been before that that I was consulted, and I regarded the hon. gentleman as guilty of duplicity at the time.

Mr. POWERS: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. gentleman is charging me with duplicity. That statement is untrue.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Mr. Speaker,—I ask you to call the hon. member to order.

Mr. POWERS: It is a personal explanation. The statement is untrue.

The SPEAKER said: No hon. member can interrupt another hon. member when speaking unless for the purpose of questioning a statement made, or for the purpose of raising a point of order. I must remind hon. members that when a debate of this personal nature is before the House it is extremely desirable for hon. members not to interrupt. I would point out that it is not in the power of any hon. member, holding the position which I hold, to prevent the use of language not suitable to this House if hon. members will not restrain themselves and respect the Chair. In a discussion of this sort hon. members should be guarded in the language they make use of, and see that they do not apply to others remarks of an offensive nature.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Very good advice, Mr. Speaker, especially on the subject of order, when the whole object of the debate is personal to me and nothing else. What I say is this: At the time the hon. member consulted me he had already accepted office without portfolio. I am perfectly satisfied in my own mind about that, and if the hon. gentleman can prove

that I have made a mistake in any way I shall be glad to come forward in this House and apologise to him for having made a mistake; but up to the present I have believed, and still believe, that he was acting with duplicity towards me in acting as he did. The hon. gentleman will have every opportunity to show that I am wrong, and if I am in the wrong I shall come forward and apologise straightforwardly.

Mr. POWERS: I am sure you will do so.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: With regard to the hon. member for Rockhampton, the hon. member is not a fair and straightforward man, or he would have risen so that I should have had the right to reply. However, I have no doubt that I shall manage to reply to what the hon. member has to say. But I will refer to the objection, which I thought was grossly unfair, against me. The hon. member stated, not only privately but publicly, that I was more indebted to him than any member of the late Ministry.

Mr. PATTISON: Hear, hear!

The COLONIAL TREASURER: He made that statement, and said also in the House that on one transaction he had given me £17,000. When he made that statement I said, "Be honest, man, and state the facts." That is what I wanted him to do, and as he will not state the facts I will do so.

Mr. PATTISON: I will do so.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I shall be only too glad to sit down and allow the hon. member to do it.

Mr. PATTISON: I will do it; if the hon. gentleman sits down, I will do it now.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Very well, I will sit down.

The SPEAKER said: I will point out to the House that this is an unusual procedure. If the ordinary rules of debate are not adhered to, then I do not know what the result will be. It is quite irregular for an hon. member to make a speech and then propose to sit down while another hon. member makes a speech so that he can reply to him. If the Colonial Treasurer concludes his remarks now, and the hon. member for Rockhampton replies, I am quite sure the House will grant the Colonial Treasurer the indulgence of a reply, and that course will prevent any irregularity.

Mr. PATTISON said: Mr. Speaker, —

The SPEAKER said: Before the discussion proceeds any further I should like to know what is the wish of the House. Is it the wish of the House that the Colonial Treasurer should have the right of reply after the hon. member for Rockhampton has finished his speech?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: It is well to understand this, because the debate cannot continue in this irregular manner.

Mr. MOREHEAD said: Mr. Speaker, — I think the Colonial Treasurer has finished his speech.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No, no!

Mr. MOREHEAD: Then I think the hon. gentleman should finish his speech, and after the hon. member for Rockhampton has spoken he should have the right of reply. But it is a pity when listening to the interesting speech of the Colonial Treasurer that its continuity should be broken, because it deals with other things besides those affecting the hon. member for Rockhampton. Let the hon. gentleman finish his present speech and afterwards reply to the hon. member for Rockhampton.

Mr. PATTISON said: Mr. Speaker, — I do not wish to take the Colonial Treasurer at any disadvantage. When this matter was discussed on the last occasion before the adjournment of the House the hon. gentleman challenged me in such a way that I felt impelled to use my best efforts to substantiate every word I then said. This afternoon the hon. member went so far as to charge me with falsehood. Supposing a man said that to me outside the House, we would have our own method of dealing with it.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I was only repeating your own words.

Mr. PATTISON: I will now show the hon. gentleman that he has a generous opponent, and give him the right of reply. When I last addressed the House I referred to this matter very unwillingly, as I do now. Anything the hon. gentleman or any other person can say against me individually I do not care about, but when the honour of a majority of the members of the Assembly was assailed, I thought it was time to rise and give the statements made a mild contradiction, and it was a very mild contradiction. I never said anything inside or outside this Assembly that the hon. gentleman could take exception to. When the hon. member asked me to speak as a man I think he must have altered his opinion of me very materially. From the length of time he has known me he must know how unwillingly I took up the position he forced upon me to defend the honour of people unjustly accused; and I have no doubt that his charge was made in extreme anger. I am sure that in the remarks I made at Rockhampton I said nothing personal about the hon. member. I simply cleared myself to my constituents and explained the altered state of my views, and why I could no longer acknowledge the leadership of the hon. member. Had he dealt with me in that position I could have understood him. But when he travelled beyond that and assailed the Cabinet, when he assailed the colleagues with whom I was associated, after forcing me — I say it advisedly — to take a seat in this Assembly, and accused them of being under obligations to me, of being dominated by Mount Morgan, I felt that it was fair that I should depart from my usual course and reply to his charges. It was with regret that I did so, and it is with regret that I do it now. I do not know what penalty I would not submit to rather than speak as I shall have to do now, and expose what should be private transactions. The hon. member stated that Mount Morgan dominated the Cabinet, and I mildly replied that there was no foundation whatever for that statement. I was very pleased when the late Postmaster-General declared this evening that he had never met me in the Cabinet, except on two or three occasions. I had kept away simply because I thought my attendance might appear to give some colour to the charge. When I asserted that no member of the Assembly was under any obligation to me but the hon. member for North Brisbane, Sir Thos. McIlwraith, I stated what was substantially true. The hon. member thought fit to couple the name of his successor in the Premiership, the hon. member for Balonne, with mine as twins. There was a time when the Colonial Treasurer deemed it almost fitting and almost an honour to be friends, close friends, if not twins, with my hon. friend the member for Balonne.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I was never a twin.

Mr. PATTISON: That is a matter of quantity; perhaps appearances would not justify it. I have been very close friends with the hon. member for Balonne, and I am proud to acknowledge the friendship of my respected friend. I

think I may say that there is no member of this Assembly but would do the same thing. There is no man who knows the hon. member but would be willing to think it an honour almost to be coupled with him as a twin. At any rate, speaking for myself, I am proud to acknowledge the hon. member for Balonne as a friend. There is no transaction between him and myself that I could not expose to the world. At any rate, I may say that there has never been those close monetary relations between us that there have been between the Colonial Treasurer and myself. With reference to the transactions which the hon. gentleman wishes me to disclose, I do not think I can do better than place the original documents before the House. They are in the handwriting of the hon. gentleman's private secretary, Mr. Robertson, and signed by himself, Mr. Stevenson, the hon. member for Clermont, being a witness to the transaction. The hon. gentleman has admitted, I think, in rather a mild way, that he had gained a profit, on one-half of a transaction, of £17,000. Does the hon. gentleman admit that?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: You speak.

Mr. PATTISON: Very well, I shall prove it. The hon. member, lawyer like, admits nothing. Possibly, Mr. Speaker, it will take some little time to travel through these documents, but I think it will be just as well that the whole of these matters should be cleared up to show how far I am justified in being accused on the floor of this House with telling falsehoods or not. One of the statements I made was that no member of the Ministry, no member of this Assembly, was under the same obligation to me as the hon. member, Sir Thomas McLlwraith, was. I do not say that the obligation was more than an ordinary business one; but for that hon. member to say that other members of the Ministry were under obligations to me—

HONOURABLE MEMBERS on the Government side: Oh! oh!

The HON. P. PERKINS: You are getting away from it.

Mr. PATTISON: I get away from nothing that is fair, straightforward, and honest. If hon. members want the facts, I have got them here. If they do not want them, all I can say is that no member of the Ministry was ever under the same obligation to me as the hon. member. I have the letters with me, and it was not a very unfortunate transaction as far as the hon. member is concerned. I have not seen the letters for three or four months, but as far as my memory goes those are exactly the words contained in them. I shall now read the contract.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: No, don't.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Why not?

Mr. PATTISON: This is not a matter to be laughed out of court. It is too serious. As far as I am concerned myself, whatever may be said or thought, I can fight my own way through; but when the characters of our public men are assailed I think it is time that the implication should be removed, especially that last charge made by the hon. member with regard to Mount Morgan influence. I shall have a word or two to say upon that by-and-by. He said Mount Morgan influence was so strong that he resigned from the Cabinet. As far as I remember, he left the Cabinet in September. The speech I delivered in Rockhampton was, I think, on the 18th November. The hon. member complained that none of his late colleagues endeavoured to defend him against the charges made; but there was nothing to defend. They knew that they had my

1890—2 M

resignation in their hands, which they accepted the day after that speech was delivered. I do not know what more defence the hon. member could expect from his late colleagues than that they accepted my resignation as a Minister the day after that speech was delivered.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: No; you were in the Ministry until you were put out the other day.

Mr. PATTISON: But I never attended a meeting of the Cabinet. I think that has been stated very clearly for the reasons given, or rather disclosed, by the late Postmaster-General. It is a well-known fact that although I was a member of the Executive Council I never took any part in their proceedings, for the very reason that I would not lay my colleagues under the suspicion that they were in any way under my influence.

The PREMIER: You ought to have resigned.

Mr. PATTISON: My colleagues would not let me.

The PREMIER: You cannot get over it that way.

Mr. PATTISON: As a matter of fact I wished to resign, and if I had I should be far away to-day; but they would not accept my resignation, and then came my Rockhampton trip and that unfortunate letter of the hon. member.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: The unfortunate speech of the late Treasurer.

Mr. PATTISON: I shall say no more about that just now, but will come to the contract. I am sorry to have to occupy the time of the House with these matters. It is a pity our time is not better occupied, but this is forced upon me. A challenge has been thrown out, and if I cannot prove every assertion I have made I shall walk out of this House and never come back to it again. It is not necessary that I should waste time by going into all the details that led up to this transaction. I hold in my hand a document signed by myself and the Colonial Treasurer. It is with regret, with extreme regret, that I read this document. It is dated "Rockhampton, 30th March, 1888," and reads as follows:—

"I have this day sold to Sir Thomas McLlwraith five thousand (5,000) shares in the Mount Moran Gold-Mining Company, Limited, at and for the sum of nine pounds (£9) per share, payable by purchaser's promissory notes—half at six (6) months' and half at twelve (12) months' date, with interest at seven pounds (£7) per cent. per annum added, the purchaser to have the option of cancelling the sale should he think fit to do so at any time within six (6) months from this date, the purchaser to have the right of retiring the promissory notes at any time under rebate of interest; scrip to be attached to promissory notes, purchaser to receive all coming dividends.

"WILLIAM PATTISON.

"I agree to purchase on terms and conditions as above.

"THOMAS McILLWRAITH."

If the hon. member can produce any contract made with any hon. member of this Assembly, or any member of the Ministry, containing the liberal terms contained in the four corners—

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is your opinion.

Mr. PATTISON: The hon. member knows very well the conversation we had as to what he would do before the end of the year. The hon. member had six months from the 30th March to carry out this purchase or to cancel it. Within six weeks of the maturing of these bills, as the hon. member will no doubt recollect, he had handed to him account sales of portion of those shares with my cheque for £17,003 5s.—not as it appeared in *Hansard*, that I had let him off the transaction. That was within six weeks of the date mentioned, and he was allowed the rebate.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: According to contract.

Mr. PATTISON: According to contract, Sir, I sold the shares, but I will not say who had to bear the burden. Certainly the hon. gentleman did not, because he got cash, and I have some of the bills yet. I repeat that no member of the Ministry, no member of this Assembly, was ever under the same accommodation to me as the hon. gentleman was, if it was an accommodation. I have other documents here to prove what I have asserted. Perhaps the hon. member will deny his own signature.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Oh, no; I admit that.

Mr. PATTISON: Then I ask the hon. member to withdraw his charges against members of the late Ministry and members of this Assembly, or to substantiate them. I say again that no member of this Assembly is under any accommodation to me beyond that of ordinary business transactions. I look the matter straight in the face, and I say that between the hon. member and myself there is only an ordinary business transaction that ought never to have been exposed either within the walls of this Chamber, or, possibly, outside, except occasion had arisen to do so. The hon. member has given that occasion. He has stated that I acquired my position in the Ministry not by either experience or ability, but by Mount Morgan influence. Mount Morgan has suffered under that calumny long enough, and the sooner it is cleared up the better. I know that during the last seven or eight months I never took part in the Cabinet meetings at all. It was only during the closing days of the Ministry's term of office that I attended, and then only after pressure, and if my advice had been followed then, the Ministry would be sitting where the hon. gentlemen opposite are now sitting, because we never yet sustained a defeat in the House, and the country was with us, and I believe is with us now. However, that is a matter outside of this question, and I think I have said enough, unless the hon. gentleman wishes for more.

The PREMIER: Why, you have said nothing yet.

Mr. PATTISON: If the hon. gentleman wants more he can certainly have it, but I think it is far better to keep such matters out of the debate, and I am very sorry I have had to mention them.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. PATTISON: Hon. members may say "hear, hear!" but these charges have been made.

The HON. P. PERKINS: It is very awkward for you.

Mr. PATTISON: I will make it very awkward for that hon. member who has just spoken, yet. I need not further detain hon. members, but I am very sorry the leader of the Government should treat this matter in the frivolous way in which he is treating it. It is no frivolous matter when the honour of public men is assailed. Although those men are opposed to the hon. gentleman I suppose he has some respect for them, and their honour has been assailed by the statement that as members of the Cabinet they have been bribed and dominated by Mount Morgan influence. The hon. gentleman who made the charge has paid me a compliment to which I am not entitled, and one that is very insulting to those hon. gentlemen with whom I have been associated. If the hon. gentleman can point to one instance during the time he was a member of the Cabinet in which a whisper about Mount Morgan was heard, or its influence exerted in any way, I will do what I said I would do. I am only one among the large shareholders of

Mount Morgan, and what is Mount Morgan influence to me? I was just as happy a man before I got into Mount Morgan, and I would not be one bit less happy nor would I think a bit the worse of myself if I lost the whole of it. I am very sorry I should have had to detain the House to-night, but I have been obliged to do so in justice to myself and the colleagues with whom I have been associated. I have given the hon. gentleman an opportunity to prove the statements he has made as to the reasons that induced him to leave us. I say that the reasons he has given are not the real reasons, and though, of course, I do not know what was in the hon. member's mind, the only thing I understood to induce the hon. member to leave us was the vote of £40,000 for a central railway station in Brisbane. I think I can claim credit for believing that, because it was on a Friday the hon. gentleman resigned, and on the Saturday I thought I was on such terms with the hon. gentleman that I could get him to withdraw his resignation, and I visited him for the purpose. I had not the slightest idea that he had any other reason for leaving us; but I found he had not calmed down and my visit was fruitless, and I came back and reported the matter to the late Premier and others. If the hon. gentleman had at that time made the charge that Mount Morgan was dominating the Cabinet, I would have sent in my resignation. I regret exceedingly I have had to make this explanation personal to myself and a gentleman whom I have respected for many years, a man with whom I have stood on terms of close intimacy in the past, and with whom I have worked. I regret that anything should have occurred to destroy the good feeling between Sir Thomas McLlwraith and myself; but whatever my feelings may be privately, I am now, politically, as wide apart from the hon. member as the poles, and, as I said in Rockhampton, I would sooner serve under the leadership of Sir Samuel Griffith than under Sir T. McLlwraith. I need not go into my reasons for that now, but I gave my reasons for the statement when I made it, and I shall be prepared to give them again should occasion arise. Possibly when the Financial Statement is made I may give them. If I do, I shall endeavour to avoid personalities so far as I can, and to speak of Sir T. McLlwraith with the remembrance of him as a friend I used to know and respect, and the reasons I shall give shall not be private, but political reasons.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said: Mr. Speaker,—I think the hon. gentleman has delivered the most extraordinary statement ever made in the House. What is the charge made by the hon. member against me?

Mr. PATTISON: No charge at all. You made the charge.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: The charge is that I bought 5,000 Mount Morgan shares from him at £9 and paid him for them. I am looking at an hon. member behind the hon. gentleman—whom I shall not name—and I bought some thousands of shares from him too, and I am sorry to say I made a big loss over them. Did that man ever hear a growl out of me because I lost by the shares? This was a different transaction, and the fact of the matter is that I do not know now that I have made £17,000 by the shares, as I hold some now I stand to lose on. I bought 5,000 shares from the hon. gentleman at £9, and paid him for them according to contract. Before one of the bills came due I paid him according to contract for them, with the interest accrued. I hold some shares yet, which I stand to lose by. The hon. gentleman appears to charge me with not being grateful to be under an obligation to him.

Mr. PATTISON: I never said you should be grateful.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: The hon. member's charge against me is that I was under greater obligations to him than any member of the House was. The hon. member must not think I would deny my signature to that contract, or that I would deny that I made £17,000 out of part of a transaction to which he was one party and I the other. There was nothing dishonourable in that transaction to the hon. gentleman, and nothing dishonourable in it to me. So far as the hon. gentleman is concerned I have no doubt he would be glad to enter into a transaction again by which he would get £9 each for 5,000 Mount Morgan shares.

Mr. PATTISON: How do you know that?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I know it judging by the market and by the hon. gentleman's business capacity. I am sure he would not object to buy shares at £6 and sell them at £9. I do not think I am called upon to reply further to the hon. gentleman. As to the speech made by the hon. member for Burrum, I think it unworthy to refer to the hon. member at all. As to what I said about Mount Morganism, it is quite enough if it was palpable to me. I have done and said nothing to insinuate any dishonourable compact between the hon. member for Rockhampton and the members of the last Ministry. I did not have it in my mind that any member of the last Cabinet would be capable of doing anything of the sort. The influence was of a very different character. Hon. members must consider the position I was in, that though I was not the leader of the party, I held a position before the people of the colony that made me most jealous as to how the party was being influenced. Can anyone deny the great influence Mount Morgan had on the Ministers at the time? I saw it to my disgust day after day. When you saw the Premier, Mr. Morehead, coming up these stairs, if you turned round you would see Billy Pattison coming up after him. And you could see them together about town and in their offices day after day. It was not the business of the country that they were doing, but Mount Morgan. I do not say that the transactions between them were dishonourable.

Mr. PATTISON: There were none.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I had none.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I will take the hon. member's word; but I know, from the long and intimate experience I had of him, the effect of Mount Morgan on his mind, because he was never out of it. As I said before, the two hon. members were twins. The hon. member for Balonne always has a twin where his interest lies closely, but I never was one of them.

Mr. STEVENSON: You tried very hard.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I do not think so. It was a matter of notoriety at the time that the Ministry had far too much to do with Mount Morgan. I do not want to bring a charge against any Minister of having acted improperly on that account; but it told against the Ministry to see them devoting so much time to Mount Morgan and having so much interest in it, and devoting so little time to the country. It was sufficient for me, holding the position I did—the nominal leader of the party—to disassociate myself from the Ministry. I saw Mount Morganism in the Cabinet on the morning I left, as I wrote to the late Premier, and it was sufficient to keep myself clear from any responsibility I had before the country, and that was why I left.

Mr. MOREHEAD said: Mr. Speaker,—I am very much pleased and very much shocked at what has fallen from the hon. member. It must be very unpleasant for any man, especially a man like myself, who is not devoid of human sympathies to have to speak on the present occasion. I know the time when the hon. gentleman and myself were very intimate, though he has scouted the idea of being a friend of mine.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Of being a twin.

Mr. MOREHEAD: He has also stated that he had noticed a particular friendship between myself and the hon. member for Rockhampton, which he assumed, rightly or wrongly—I think wrongly—had to do with Mount Morganism. I remember well—I do not know whether he does—that when he left for Japan, he came to me—at that time he was pretty well interested in Mount Morgan—and almost his last words were these: "You will let me know by cable how you get along?" I said, "Certainly." Then he said, "You might put one figure at the end stating how Mount Morgans are." I will not assume that he was inspired by Mount Morganism when he said that. However, I did not do it. I did not consider that State telegrams should be used as a means of conveying private information.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Do I understand the hon. member to say that I asked him to forward State telegrams on private business?

Mr. MOREHEAD: I say that the hon. member asked me to put a figure at the end of a State telegram carrying with it the price and value of Mount Morgans. That is a definite statement; and I say without hesitation that it is absolutely true. The House may believe me or not; the country may believe me or not; but I know it to be true.

The PREMIER: Did you accept the proposal?

Mr. MOREHEAD: I did not.

The PREMIER: What did you say?

Mr. MOREHEAD: The hon. gentleman has the records of the office to search. He can find whether it is so or not. I tell the hon. gentleman that I did not do it; and I am telling to this House what is absolutely true.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Open confession is good for the soul.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I have nothing more to say except to call attention to the fact that at the time of the foundation of our Christianity there was a certain follower of the Saviour who held the bag. There was not much in it. There is not much in it now, and I think his antitype holds the position of Treasurer of this colony at the present moment.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said: Mr. Speaker,—I have very little to say about the dealings of the hon. member for Rockhampton with the present Treasurer, but I have a good deal to say about the Treasurer's accusation that members of the late Government were dominated by Mount Morganism. I may say in passing that I never knew of this transaction which the hon. member for Rockhampton has detailed to this House, so that I think I must be considered to be pretty free from Mount Morganism. But from the statement contained in the contract read by the hon. member it seems to me that the whole of the risk lay on one side, and the whole of the prospective profit on the other. I do not see how any man could have more accommodation in any contract than was given by that contract. It was one in which the Colonial Treasurer incurred no risk,

because he could retire from it whenever he liked. Therefore the hon. member for Rockhampton was perfectly right in saying that nobody in this Assembly ever had more accommodation than the hon. gentleman had.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: He said there was no man under more obligation to him.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: "Accommodation" is what appears in *Hansard*.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: He used the word "obligation" to-night.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: The hon. gentleman on that occasion made a speech which appears on page 518 of the book *Hansard*; and in replying to a statement I made about his having left the Ministry in a temper—which I did say, and which I repeat again—he denied that he left the Ministry in a temper, and said that it was not only on account of the £40,000 for the central station, but also in consequence of Mount Morganism. To prove his case, that he did not leave the Ministry in a temper, he said certain things which I hope he will be able to prove. He said:—

"That I did not leave in a passion is proved by the fact that I went about the actual work that devolved upon me as a Minister in connection with the business before us, and had the papers finished and signed by the various Ministers before I left the Cabinet."

Now, if the hon. gentleman did that, he must have done it very hurriedly. He left the Cabinet meeting at about five or ten minutes past 11 o'clock on a Friday morning, and his resignation was in the hands of the Premier at 11 o'clock on the following morning when I went to see the Premier upon certain business. If he did what he stated he must have been very quick. The records are within his power now, and I challenge him to prove that one single iota of his statement is correct. If he did any official work which he put his name to, and got Ministers to put their signatures to, there is not the slightest doubt but that the dates will show whether that was done between the time he left the Cabinet and sent in his resignation. I challenge him to produce the records.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I accept the challenge.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: I say further that he will not find my signature.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I will refresh the hon. gentleman's memory; the papers were the plans of the Brisbane Waterworks and a lot of papers connected with them. They were all signed before I left office.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: The plans of the Brisbane Waterworks?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I have no doubt the date is there.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: Let the hon. gentleman produce them with the dates. I challenge him to do it. The hon. gentleman states that these papers were signed between 11 o'clock on the Friday morning and 11 o'clock on the following morning.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: The hon. gentleman misunderstands me. To show that I was not devoid of reason when I left the Cabinet I went to my own room at the back and brought back the business that had to be disposed of, and disposed of it before the Cabinet. I remember distinctly part of that business was the plans of the Brisbane Waterworks.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: You never came back again. I say that every member of the Cabinet is quite prepared to take his oath to that effect.

The HON. P. PERKINS: The papers will show it.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: They will not show whether he came back to the Cabinet or not.

The PREMIER: What does it matter?

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: It matters to this extent: whether the hon. gentleman made a true statement when he made that statement. There is no member of the Cabinet who would not be prepared to take an oath that the hon. gentleman never came back from the time he picked up his papers saying, "If I have not influence enough to pass a £40,000 vote of this kind I shall tell my constituents I have lost all influence in the Cabinet." The hon. gentleman was not only very angry, but he was livid with rage when he left the Cabinet. I never said he was devoid of reason, and I do not know how long he remained in a rage. I did not see him for days afterwards. I say that he left the Cabinet in a rage, and I maintain it. There are some more statements made upon the same occasion. He gives Mount Morganism as the last reason why he left the Ministry. He gave several reasons which have been quoted this evening by the hon. member for Burrum. The hon. gentleman gave several reasons. We are being enlightened as we go along. The only reason I ever heard before was this £40,000 vote, and that is the only one I ever knew. The hon. gentleman says:—

"I had determined that I could not be by any means responsible for a Cabinet which was dominated by an influence quite outside my own, and which was not for the good of the party or the country."

It now appears that the influence which dominated the Cabinet outside of the hon. gentleman, and which was not for the good of the party or the country, resolves itself into this: Wherever you see Morehead, there you see Pattison. If that was the only influence, can the hon. gentleman tell us what effect it had upon the party? How was it shown? Was it shown in legislation, in administration, or in what way was this influence shown?

The HON. P. PERKINS: Absence of legislation.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: If it was so palpable, as the hon. gentleman said before, if it was standing out as unmistakably as the sun in daylight, how was it that the innocent Minister for Railways never saw it? If it was as palpable as the sun in daylight, how was it that nobody else saw it but the hon. gentleman himself? It is very strange. The hon. gentleman wanted to dominate the Cabinet. That was where the influence came in. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the only influence in the Cabinet while I was there—the only "ism" was McIlwraithism, and there was too much of that in the Cabinet. The hon. gentleman talks about his responsibility. What responsibility had he? He had no responsibility. From the moment that he resigned his position as Premier and went to Japan on the plea of ill health, the responsibility rested upon the late Premier, and I tell the hon. gentleman now that if he had understood his proper position he would never have remained in the Cabinet. The position which he held in the Cabinet was a most unconstitutional one.

The PREMIER: You never told him that then.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: He was told of it then, but not by me. I wanted the hon. gentleman to remain Premier, and I was the last member of the Cabinet who consented to his resigning his position as Premier, and the hon. gentleman knows well why I then consented to it.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I forget.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: I will tell the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman told me this on the day I consented: That he had not only made up his mind never to take office again, but that he had promised a certain individual who was dearer to him than any other person in the world that he would resign and never take office again.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: That is quite true; but it is abominable for you to bring it forward here.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: Only upon that ground did I consent to the hon. gentleman giving up his position, and upon no other ground. I was opposed to the hon. gentleman giving up his position at all. I did not believe that the hon. gentleman should transfer the leadership of a great party and a Ministry the same as a piece of personal property.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I regret it as much as you do.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: It should not have been done. A party is not a thing to be taken up by any man and given away again, as the hon. gentleman has done several times. That is not the way to hold a party together; but that is what the hon. gentleman has always done. I pointed out to him that he might go to Japan and come back in good health, the same as he came back from London, and that his work would be done in his absence, and he could be Premier again when he came back. But when he made that statement to me I could no longer hold out against him, and I consented then to transfer my allegiance from himself to the Hon. B. D. Morehead, and having transferred my allegiance I was not going to serve two masters after the hon. gentleman came back. I served the hon. gentleman faithfully during many years, but he could not expect me to serve him after transferring his own leadership. I served the gentleman who succeeded him as faithfully and capably as I had served him. Now, I say his position was utterly unconstitutional. He expected to remain in the Ministry, to have no responsibility, and to have the whole power, guiding the Ministry and directing its policy, as if he was the actual leader of the party; and because he did not get everything his own way, he left when he did not get the £40,000. Now, I say that the influence of McIlwraithism was everything in the Ministry up to that morning, and that as far as I am aware there was no such thing as Mount Morgan influence. We all knew, of course, that the Treasurer was a very large shareholder in Mount Morgan. I heard incidentally that other members of the Ministry were shareholders. I heard that the hon. gentleman was a large shareholder. That did not affect the Ministry as far as I was aware, and if the hon. gentleman attempts to deny that McIlwraithism was not a dominant power until the morning he left the Cabinet, I can prove it for him. Then he makes another statement which shows that he gets up and makes rambling, confused statements which he cannot stand upon. He says: "I stuck to the party until the end of the session, and did not leave the Ministry until I found they were too unmanly to defend me in my absence, and that they still retained as a colleague the very man who indulged in such unworthy vituperation." What does he mean? Does he mean that he was a member of the Ministry at the time the hon. member, Mr. Pattison, made that speech in Rockhampton? If he does not I do not know what he means. He says distinctly that he did not leave the Ministry until he found they were too unmanly to defend him. He was no longer our colleague after sending in his resignation, and even if he had been, there was no member of the Ministry there to defend him.

We were not at Rockhampton. Then again, why should any member of the Ministry interfere to defend the hon. gentleman in a private quarrel between himself and the late Treasurer, Mr. Pattison? I have had to defend the hon. gentleman often enough, but not in his private capacity. I have defended many of his rash projects, but I should not attempt to interfere in a private transaction, especially when I did not know anything at all about it. I do not believe if you search *Hansard* through you will find a page with the same amount of rambling and confused statements as are contained in page 518. He says first that he did not leave the Ministry in a passion, and he says he did certain work. Then he says he did not leave them until he found they were too unmanly to defend him. Which is true? Did he send in his resignation from New Zealand? That speech was made at Rockhampton, and he was in New Zealand. Did he send in his resignation from there? Was his resignation not in two months before that? What does the hon. gentleman mean by making such statements? I believe the statement about Mount Morganism is just as intelligent and just as truthful as that statement about the Ministry not defending him in his absence. Now, I challenge the hon. gentleman to bring up one single act of the Ministry, either collectively or individually, showing that they were influenced in their legislative administration, or in any other way by Mount Morgan. He said just now that we were devoted to Mount Morgan, after having said that he did not believe any Minister was guilty of any transaction which he should not have been so far as Mount Morgan was concerned; so that the hon. gentleman actually gets up and makes statements at random. I know he has often done that before. I know the trouble I used to have in keeping him straight when he made his set speeches. I have sat beside him with papers and documents and kept him straight, and I think he will want someone at his elbow if he makes many more such statements. There is another thing I would refer to: this famous letter he wrote. I am extremely sorry for the hon. gentleman's reputation that he ever wrote such a letter. I was under the impression, and am under the impression now, that the position which he occupied in this colony, and in this House, and in the party to which he then belonged, was quite sufficient to allow him to have passed over the speech that Mr. Pattison made in Rockhampton in silence; and I say that if he had had a friend at his elbow when he was penning that letter he would have taken the pen out of his hand. It was a disgraceful letter, and he wantonly, simply on account of his hatred and jealousy of the Premier—he wantonly attacked the Premier in that letter. If he had confined himself simply to Mr. Pattison, it would not have been so bad; but, even then, I say he should have passed it over in silence. There is no doubt the hon. gentleman was jealous of the Premier, Mr. Morehead. I cannot give proof of that, but I give my own belief. I say this, that I believe at the time the hon. gentleman came back from Japan, until he left the Ministry, he was actuated by a smothered hatred and jealousy of the then Premier. I saw it sticking out on many occasions, and I was very sorry to see it. I believe that that actuated him in leaving the Ministry as much as the £40,000 vote. But about this £40,000. I have been told, and I have seen it in the papers, that it was the Northern influence that prevented this vote from passing. But there was not a single member of the Cabinet who believed in the £40,000 vote. If the hon. gentleman had not been in such a rage as he was on that particular morning when that question was discussed

he would have waited and argued the matter out, and I could have shown him, from figures that I had obtained from the Railway Department, that that £10,000 was actually double as much as the Roma street station cost. I believe if the hon. gentleman had remained, I might have been able to convince him that £40,000 was too much to spend upon what was actually a wayside station. But he would not wait to hear any argument because he was in such a rage. He would not listen to anything, therefore he left, and the cause of the hon. gentleman's leaving was so trivial and unimportant, and lowered him so much in the eyes of the colony, that he has ever since been inventing other reasons for leaving the Cabinet, which he thought would have more influence with the country. I believe that to be the cause of the different statements that the hon. gentleman has made, one after the other. He thought that the thing was so small that scarcely anyone would believe that he left the Cabinet for that reason alone, and he has been trying to find other means to satisfy himself, and at the same time to satisfy others that there are greater reasons, and among the rest "Mount Morganism" was the greatest. He saw the term "Mount Morganism" in the columns of the papers, and he very probably thought "That is a good reason," and, as a last reason, he had better state that that was why he left. Now, it was the Premier of the colony who should have dominated the Cabinet, but I was not satisfied with the Premier kow-towing to the hon. gentleman, and putting his position as Premier at his feet. Every member of the Cabinet tried to satisfy and please him, and we did some things that we did not believe in at all. Nothing would satisfy the hon. gentleman unless he got everything his own way. His present colleagues will very likely find, as we found, that if he gets the slightest chance he will try to dominate even the very domineering head of the present Government. It will be a question between them which will dominate the other.

The PREMIER: You do not know what you are talking about.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: I do not understand oil and water coming together and amalgamating.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Oil and vinegar.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: I will not say that, but I do not know which will give in. I believe the one is just as domineering as the other. I have had no personal experience of the one, only from what I have heard; but I have had a long personal experience of the other, and I do not think there is a single man in this Assembly—even the hon. member for Balonne, the late Premier—who knows the hon. gentleman better politically than I do. I feel quite confident about that; and I know that if he gets half a chance he will dominate Sir Samuel Griffith, domineering as he is. At any rate, between them, I am quite certain they will dominate all the rest, and I trust that when they separate they will separate on much more friendly terms than the Colonial Treasurer has separated from this party. I do not think it is a good thing for the colony for public men to quarrel openly and to make charges of the kind which the hon. gentleman made on the last night of the financial debate. He has been the cause of all this discussion, by talking about Mount Morganism, and not a word would have been said to-night by anyone had he not made the charge that the late Ministry was dominated by Mount Morgan. He has withdrawn it in a way, showing that Mount Morganism, so far as the Ministry were concerned, was a perfectly innocuous influence. He has withdrawn it so far as this—that the only Mount Morganism which he could prove was that the

Hon. "Billy" Pattison—as he called the hon. gentleman—was always seen on the same stair as the late Premier.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I did not mean any disrespect to the hon. gentleman, I can assure you.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: I do not suppose the hon. gentleman did, but it was rather a disrespectful term. I do not regard it as disrespectful myself, but these terms get into *Hansard*, and that is where the disrespect comes in. I do not suppose any hon. member objects to titles such as "Billy" Pattison and "Jack" Macrossan, or anything of that sort. I have been called "Jack" Macrossan many a time, and I do not object to it; but it gets into *Hansard*, although I have never been called that in this House. But these disrespectful terms get into *Hansard*, and people outside do not understand. They take it seriously, and think hon. members when talking in that way have no respect for each other. I hope we have now heard the last of Mount Morganism. As far as I am concerned, at any rate, I shall say no more about it. I hope the hon. gentleman will take up the challenge I have given him and produce the documents to show the dates on which his colleagues and himself passed those minutes. I am sure he cannot. He has just simply made a blundering confused statement, and there is not a page in *Hansard* containing a more blundering statement than page 1588. If the hon. gentleman wishes to speak after me I have no objection, and I do not think any other hon. member will object; but I have said nothing that calls for a reply. I have simply pointed out the inaccuracies of the statements in that page, and I think if the hon. member had the same speech to make again he would not say what he then did.

Mr. POWERS said: Mr. Speaker,—I would ask to be allowed to make a personal explanation. The Colonial Treasurer accused me of duplicity, stating that I asked for his opinion after I had been sworn in. I would like to correct that.

The PREMIER: The Colonial Treasurer said that the papers said so.

Mr. POWERS: The Colonial Treasurer said he had always had a contempt for me since, because he believed that I had done so.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Yes.

Mr. POWERS: If the hon. gentleman looks at the paper he will see that in the *Observer* of the 20th September the Hon. Charles Powers was sworn in formally that morning. The present leader of the Opposition knows that that is correct. On the 19th September the Colonial Treasurer was present in the House, but on the 20th he was not present, as the records of this House will show, so that I was sworn in on the 20th September, when the hon. gentleman was not in the House. The records at Government House will show that I was sworn in on 20th September, and it was on the 19th September, when the hon. gentleman was present in the House, that I asked his advice. As a matter of fact, I was not sworn in until 12 o'clock on the day after I asked his advice, and I hope the hon. gentleman will accept the correction.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said: Mr. Speaker,—As I told the hon. gentleman, it was when I read the paper and found that he had been sworn in, that I formed the opinion of him that I have since held. If it is as the hon. gentleman says, I shall withdraw what I said in a minute.

Mr. DONALDSON: That is the case.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I know quite well that after I went home was the first time that I saw it in the papers, or knew of it.

Mr. DONALDSON : The hon. member told me that he had consulted you before he was sworn in.

Mr. BLACK said : Mr. Speaker,—I have no doubt that after this general explanation between members of the Government and the ex-Ministers, we shall probably settle down and do good work. Before the recent recess the present Colonial Treasurer, in a speech which he made, asked for certain information which I take the present opportunity of giving him. The speech I refer to is contained in *Hansard* of 26th June, 1890, and is in reference to the part I took, as Minister for Lands, in connection with the separation question in the North. The hon. gentleman said :—

“ Now, Sir, the Minister for Lands last night made a remark that I want some explanation of. He said, so far as separation was concerned, that he had a free hand. Well if he had, he never got it from the Premier when I was head of the Government. Where did he get the free hand? He had no free hand. He said distinctly last night that he had a free hand to vote as he liked on separation. How could he do that and sit with the Ministry?”

Now, Sir, I most emphatically assert on this occasion that when I consented to join the Ministry of which the hon. gentleman was Premier, I had a free hand, and I had it on an express understanding with the hon. gentleman himself that I was to have a free hand on the separation question, and also on the labour question. I never disguised, as a member of the Ministry, what those opinions were, and I never lost an opportunity when I was asked of expressing them. I never brought prominently before this House the question of separation, because, as a member of the Ministry, I considered I was bound to do my best for the country generally, and not allow this question which was understood to be dormant in the late Ministry to lead me to do anything unnecessarily which might jeopardise the position of the Ministry. The hon. gentleman will perhaps recollect that I told him that one of the conditions under which I would join the Ministry was that my views on the separation question must be respected. At the last general election a batch of elections took place on the same day, some in the Southern constituencies and some north of Mackay. I do not remember the exact date, but about that time I came down to Brisbane. There is no doubt, whatever the hon. gentleman may think about having formed this party, that he owes a great deal more to this side of the House for having formed him. The hon. gentleman had retired from politics for a considerable time before the general election, and there is no doubt that it was the loyalty of the so-called National party that led to the hon. gentleman being in the position he was in at the general election. The support this side of the House gave to the hon. gentleman was given because they thought at the time that he was a politician to be trusted, and that for a series of years he had received very severe treatment from the present Premier. The support that he received from this party was one of which any politician of long standing ought to have been proud, and I regret very much the action he has taken to destroy the confidence we had in him. However, on coming down from Mackay, I visited the hon. gentleman at his office in Queen street, and he then asked me, assuming that the elections were going to result in favour of the party he was leading, whether I was prepared to take office. I pointed out what was my position, that I had never disguised my opinions on the separation question, and stated that I could not take office unless I was allowed a free hand on the separation and black labour questions. That was assented to, and I believe from what I have heard that the hon.

member for Townsville at a subsequent conversation was also allowed on the separation question the same latitude. Yet the hon. gentleman asks how could I be a member of the Ministry if I held those views? I ask how is it that the hon. member for Herbert, Mr. Cowley, who holds the same views as I do on these questions, is a member of the present Ministry? Lest his position should be challenged at any future time, I would ask that hon. gentleman to state to the House whether he has not as a member of the present Ministry a free hand on the question of separation. The hon. gentleman has assured me, and I know he has assured other members of his former party, that he is allowed a perfectly free hand on the separation question.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. A. S. Cowley) : I published it in my address.

Mr. BLACK : Yes, but it will give the House and the country a great deal of satisfaction if the present Premier were to state that in legislation in regard to the sugar industry, and on the separation question, the present Minister for Lands is allowed a perfectly free hand.

The PREMIER : I do not consider it necessary to confirm statements made by my colleagues.

Mr. BLACK : I made a similar statement, but the Colonial Treasurer thought fit to challenge it, and why should I not anticipate that the hon. gentleman may do the same thing with the present Minister for Lands when it suits his purpose to do so?

The PREMIER : You may entertain any insulting idea you like.

Mr. BLACK : The Colonial Treasurer said how could I do that and sit with the Ministry? Have we not a case in point in the present Minister for Lands? Is it not an extraordinary anomaly to see him sitting alongside the Colonial Treasurer? If it is right in the present case, it was right in my case. The hon. gentleman knew very well that on the separation question I had a free hand to exercise my own opinion should the question ever arise. But he went on to say :—

“ I may tell him now publicly, what I have told him often in private, that he has taken an undue advantage of his position in the Ministry to further the interests of separation.”

The hon. gentleman never told me that privately, we never conversed privately on the separation question. And then he said :—

“ I have told him that in Cabinet.”

I challenge him to state when he told me that in the Cabinet, or to name any one of his colleagues who heard it. The hon. gentleman's memory must have failed him in this speech, as also in the speech referred to by the hon. member for Townsville, for he has made the most rambling and outrageous statements—statements which I assure the House are without any foundation in fact, and are a pure invention of the hon. gentleman's imagination. The things he mentions never took place; he never referred to my separation views as being detrimental to the Cabinet, either in the Cabinet or privately. He also said :—

“ His only excuse was that his people did not want to hear about anything else [but separation].”

That conversation is purely imaginary. I never said anything of the sort. Very likely, if a conversation had taken place, I might have said that.

“ Well, if they did not, then he might have refrained from going amongst them; but that was no reason why he should use his position to give an undue bias to the present Ministry.”

I never gave an undue bias to the Ministry. I saw that many people who had before been opposed to separation were gradually becoming convinced of the necessity of it, and was pleased that such was the case. I was glad to hear what

the Premier said this afternoon on the subject, and I am sure it will give the greatest satisfaction in the North when those views are read by the people there. I can assure the hon. gentleman that for him personally I have always entertained the greatest respect, and he has never done anything to forfeit my respect for the high abilities he possesses. I shall always do what I can to further legislation in the direction propounded by the hon. gentleman, but so long as the present Treasurer holds that position I shall feel bound to criticise in the most severe way all his statements. I know what his statements in the past have been; I know how he has overthrown the loyal support received not only from this party but from a previous party, and I will leave him to reap the reward which such conduct inevitably brings about in the course of time. I hope that after this little ebullition of feeling this evening the political atmosphere will be clear, and that we shall do some useful business. What that useful business will be we shall, I hope, hear when the Financial Statement is made on Thursday night. I have no doubt that we shall find that the Colonial Treasurer will use arguments in favour of propositions which he has opposed; that there will be a complete somersault, and that he will swallow everything he stated on the last occasion. I am quite prepared for that. One thing is quite certain: the hon. gentleman's presence on the Treasury benches is not an element of strength to his own party. I would have much preferred to have seen the Liberal party, a strong party as it was, carrying on the Government, as they could have done, with the assistance of this side of the House, than a nondescript Ministry such as the present. It is not a coalition Ministry, as some have said. The Colonial Treasurer, in a spirit of spite and spleen, vowed, as I believe, that he would never rest until he had ousted his former friends. He has to a certain extent succeeded in doing that. I do not regret having retired from those benches. After hon. members opposite have had a few months' experience they will find they are not a bed of roses. There is no particular charm in holding office to those who have had experience of it, and I certainly consider that it is better to retire with honour than to be always smarting under the knowledge that by your own treachery you have destroyed, or for a time attempted to destroy—with what success the future will prove—one of the most loyal parties that any leader ever had in this colony.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said: Mr. Speaker,—Before we adjourn I have a word or two to say with reference to the hon. member for Burrum. I made a statement that he had consulted me with reference to accepting office without portfolio in the late Ministry at a time when he had been actually sworn in as a Minister. The facts are these. I was in the House late on the 19th September, and on the following morning I read this paragraph in the newspaper:—

“The number of Ministers of the Crown was recently reduced by the resignation of Sir T. Mellraith, who held office without portfolio, and it has now been determined to restore the numerical strength of the Cabinet by the appointment of Mr. Charles Powers as a Minister without portfolio.”

I naturally concluded from that, that the hon. gentleman had actually accepted office and been sworn in at the time he spoke to me; but of course when he stated that he was not sworn in until next morning I accepted that statement. But I have been under the impression until I heard that explanation that the hon. gentleman had accepted office when he came to consult me. However, I offered at once to accept his statement.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: You were a long time about it.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: When the hon. gentleman said he had not been appointed until next morning I accepted his statement.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: You did not accept it.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I did. I said: Produce the papers and I will give you my explanation. What more could I do?

Mr. MOREHEAD: You did not accept it until the papers were produced.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I am not going to be bullied by my late colleague. I won't accept it from him. If the hon. member thinks he can do it, he is very much mistaken. I am not to be bullied by him or anybody else. He knows that very well.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I do not.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Yes you do.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I am going to take the privilege of an old member of this House to say a word or two on the discussion that has taken place this evening. I speak simply as an old member of the House, not because I happen to be the leader of the Government at this time. I think, Mr. Speaker, that I express the opinion of a large number of the members of this House and of the people of the country, when I say that the public of Queensland do not care two straws about the greater part of the matters that have been brought forward by members on the other side of the House this evening. They are concerned—not with matters of personal quarrel between members now sitting in opposition and the Colonial Treasurer—they are concerned with matters of general interest to the country. Another observation I should like to make is that if everything that takes place between Ministers in Cabinet or on forming a Government is to be treasured up and disclosed in this House, it will be necessary for every gentleman called upon to undertake the position to carry a note-book in which to make notes of every possible conversation he may have with his colleagues or intended colleagues. For my part I should decline to give any version of any such conversation. I should say that the matters were confidential, and if there was a dispute, that our memories did not agree. I would say no more, and I believe that would be the proper rule in such a case. In this connection I will quote an expression which I think the hon. member for Townsville will recognise: “*Securus judicat orbis terrarum.*” The public will judge, and judge with perfect equanimity, and not under the influence of any angry feelings that may be excited in this House. Another observation I have to make is this: The reputation of the public men of this colony is public property—the property of all Queensland, of all Australia—and it ought not lightly to be depreciated either by their own behaviour or by attacks from their opponents.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Only one other thing I would say, and that is this: That after all, the forces of hatred and animosity, powerful as they may be, are not so powerful as the forces of goodwill and good feeling. A great deal of work has to be done in this House, and much more good will be achieved by mutual forbearance than by maintaining old feelings of animosity which unfortunately we have too often seen exhibited in the House in the past.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Is that the result of this combination?

Question—That this House do now adjourn—put and passed.

The House adjourned at four minutes to 9 o'clock.