

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

FRIDAY, 18 SEPTEMBER 1891

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Friday, 18 September, 1891.

Railway Rates on Queensland Flour, Bran, and Pollard.
—Bonus for the Manufacture of Cement.—Adjournment.

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

RAILWAY RATES ON QUEENSLAND
FLOUR, BRAN, AND POLLARD.

Mr. MORGAN, in moving—

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable, in the interest of the country, that flour, bran, and pollard manufactured in Queensland from wheat grown in Queensland should be carried by rail at agricultural produce rates, as in Victoria, New South Wales, and South Australia—

said: Mr. Speaker,—I may point out, in case the Secretary for Railways in his reply may say I labour under a slightly erroneous impression, that in Victoria, New South Wales, and South Australia, flour, bran, and pollard are not carried at actual agricultural produce rates. They are carried at a lower rate, and therefore the phraseology of the motion is slightly inaccurate; but as my object is not the discussion of the question whether we should carry our bran, pollard, and flour manufactured in the colony from wheat grown in the colony at exactly the same rates as they are carried in the southern colonies, it is hardly worth while asking the permission of the House to amend the motion. My object in submitting this matter to the House is to endeavour to induce Parliament to give some encouragement of a practical nature to the men in this colony who have been, and still are, in the face of many difficulties, endeavouring to make wheat-growing a success. We have had for twenty years past a body of men in one corner of the colony—pioneers of an industry that may, if properly encouraged, in the space of a few years become of the first importance to the colony. We have had a body of men there carrying on an industry, in spite of the depressing effects of droughts, of disease, and of many other disadvantages. Yet notwithstanding all these drawbacks, they have persevered; and wheat-growing to-day, notwithstanding the unfriendly attitude assumed towards it by the Government and by the Railway Commissioners, has a brighter outlook than it has had for years. I am sanguine, if Parliament will only give it the encouragement that this motion seeks to obtain for it, that in the course of a very few years we shall have a very much larger area of our country lands devoted to wheat-growing than there is at present. It has been, I am sorry to say, rather the fashion to depreciate the efforts that have been made by this small band of pioneers to

make this industry a success in Queensland. I have frequently heard hon. members get up in this House and speak disparagingly of the Darling Downs wheat-grower. Now, I think he is rather deserving of the praise than of the censure of this House; and if Parliament and those who have the charge of our State railways can reasonably give this motion any encouragement, it ought to be done in the interests of the whole country. Up till about three years ago the wheat-grower in Queensland was doubly protected. He was protected by the 6d. duty then imposed upon imported wheat; and he was protected also by the differential rate of railage on the locally-made flour, as compared with the imported article. But, while the tariff of 1888 was going through committee, the Treasurer, when proposing to re-enact the 6d. duty, conveyed to the Committee the impression that he was not at all in love with that duty, and that he was quite prepared to see the proposal negatived. Just at that time a few farmers, carried away by the political excitement of the time, and at the instigation of one or two interested individuals, held meetings in the district, and passed resolutions expressing their willingness to see the 6d. duty go. Some hon. members representing farming constituencies, acting upon those resolutions, and believing it would be in the interests of the farmers, supported the Treasurer in his proposal to abolish the duty. The result was that the proposal to re-enact the duty on imported wheat was negatived. I was not one who voted for or expressed any opinion in favour of the repeal of the duty, because I believed it would be an unfortunate thing for the farmers of the Darling Downs. So it has turned out to be. They had enjoyed the protection which that 6d. duty gave them for seventeen years. They had also enjoyed for the greater part of that period a still more important advantage in having flour manufactured in Queensland from wheat grown in Queensland carried at a much lower rate than that charged upon imported flour. That had been the rule, I think, for the greater part of the seventeen years between 1870 and 1887. But, Sir, the tariff that came into operation on our railways on the first of this year so entirely abolished that advantage which the wheat-growers enjoyed previously that now they have to pay practically the same for the carriage of their flour as the merchant who imports flour manufactured in Adelaide from wheat grown in South Australia, or from Victoria from wheat grown in Victoria. Parliament has frequently affirmed the wisdom of the principle of encouraging our agricultural industries. It has placed duties upon almost every line of agricultural produce other than flour and wheat, and why, I ask, should the Railway Commissioners—and why, I ask, should the Government—take away that measure of protection which the wheat-grower enjoyed up to eight or nine months ago in common with other agriculturists? I think it was an unfortunate thing that the tariff abolished that measure of protection which the wheat-grower enjoyed up to that time, and I am perfectly certain that if that abolition is persisted in wheat-growing in this colony will be retarded to a very considerable extent. Men who have been growing wheat in the past in spite of many disadvantages will now give it up as a branch of agriculture that no longer offers a sufficient guarantee of a fair remuneration for the labour and capital invested in it. I do not think that is a desirable thing. I am not pleading in this matter for the miller. I think the miller is entitled to fair consideration, but not to special consideration. The man we have to encourage is the man who goes upon the soil and makes it yield its wealth. I am pleading in the interests of the grower, and I am

quite sure the abolition of the differential rates of carriage in favour of the locally grown and manufactured article will have a very prejudicial effect upon the industry. It will have an effect to this extent: It will reduce the price of wheat fully 6d. per bushel, and the wheat-growers of Queensland are not in a position to stand that reduction. The reduction of 6d. a bushel for wheat means, really, a loss of 10s. per acre per annum. A twenty-bushel yield per acre is not out of the way, and so 6d. a bushel on the twenty bushels means a loss of 10s. per acre per annum. That is a very serious matter. I will point out now what the difference between the old and new rates of carriage on the locally-manufactured flour amounts to. I take the distance from Warwick to Roma for the purpose of the illustration. Under the old rates in force up to the 31st December last a parcel of flour weighing one ton was carried by rail from Warwick to Roma for the sum of £2 0s. 9d.; under the new rate the charge is £1 1s. The difference is £2 0s. 3d., so that practically the rate has been doubled. On four-ton lots a rebate of 10 per cent. is now allowed. In the case of bran and pollard, which, of course, is marketable almost exclusively in Brisbane, the rate has been increased from 12s. 8d. to £1 4s. 9d., or almost doubled, and yet I have heard it said that the new rates have not appreciably affected the interests of the wheat-grower of the Darling Downs. I want to put before the House the different treatment extended to wheat-growers in the southern colonies as compared with the treatment extended to the wheat-growers in this colony by the Government and the Railway Commissioners here. I may point out before doing so that what I am asking for here in the interests of the farmers is simply what the farmers of the other colonies already enjoy. I am simply asking for the affirmation of a principle which is considered a wise one in New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia, and which, I contend, would be a wise principle for Queensland also to adopt. Now, the railway rates on wheat, flour, bran, and pollard in the four great colonies are as follows, calculated on the basis of a distance of 150 miles:—On wheat, in Queensland the rate for two-ton lots is 17s. 11d., and for one-ton lots £1 4s. 3d. In New South Wales the rate for truck loads of six tons is on the up transit 10s. to 11s. per ton, according to the season; ton lots and upwards on the up transit are charged 12s. per ton; down transit, two-ton lots 13s. 7d. per ton, and ton lots £1 4s. 8d. In Victoria the charge is 12s. 4d. per ton. In South Australia the charge for three-tons lots is 14s. 7d., and for smaller lots 19s. 10d. Now take flour: In Queensland the rate is £2 10s. 10d per ton, nearly three times the rate on wheat, though the class of freight is practically the same. In New South Wales the charge is exactly the same as on wheat—that is, 10s. to 11s. per ton at certain seasons of the year, and at other seasons from 10s. to £1 4s. per ton. In Victoria the rates on wheat and flour are the same—12s. 4d. per ton as against £2 10s. 10d. per ton in Queensland. In South Australia the same rule is observed, and wheat and flour are charged similar rates—14s. 7d. to 19s. 10d. per ton, according to the size of the parcels. Then for bran and pollard we have in Queensland a third rate—£1 4s. 3d. per ton for ton lots, and £2 10s. 10d. per ton for smaller quantities.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS
(Hon. T. O. Unmack): £1 16s. 4d.

Mr. MORGAN: Bran and pollard, one-ton lots, £1 4s. 3d.; smaller lots, £2 10s. 10d., whereas in New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia those articles are charged at precisely

the same rate as wheat and flour. Now, why should we be so singular in Queensland in our attitude towards the wheat-growing industry? If these rates are desirable there, then surely they are desirable here also. There they have farmers already settled upon the soil and growing wheat in large quantities, and I take it that this House will not deny for a moment that it is desirable we should have here a very much larger number of men engaged in wheat-farming, and is it not more likely that we shall get a larger number of wheat farmers by giving them encouragement, even to the same extent as they get in the southern colonies, than if we persist in this policy of levying rates upon their produce which render the profitable occupation of the soil for the production of breadstuffs almost impossible? Perhaps, Sir, the explanation of the difference between the rates existing in the four colonies is to be found in the fact that down South the farmer is a force to be reckoned with, and that here in Queensland he is not sufficiently numerous to be taken into political calculation. But he is going to be. I want again to point out to the House some of the anomalies that arise under this tariff which came into force on the 1st of January of this year—and they are very serious anomalies—and I would like to hear the Secretary for Railways endeavour to justify them. We had a very excellent speech from him the other night; a speech which was highly admirable as a defence of departmental administration; but as the speech of a statesman I do not think it justifies the same encomium. I would like to hear the Minister speak of the tariff from the point of view of the effect it is having on the agricultural development of the colony, as to whether it is likely to induce people to settle on the soil and become cultivators, and not as to whether it is desirable merely in the interests of the Railway Department. Why, we do not want a board of commissioners to make our railways pay. Anybody by putting up the tariff to a sufficiently high rate can show a profit on the year's work; but we have to look to the future, Mr. Speaker, and I very much incline to the opinion that if the hon. gentleman insists on the tariff he has placed on agricultural produce, and particularly on flour, bran, and pollard, he will find his receipts from that source next year very much less than they have been this year. Now, I want to point out some of the anomalies which exist under the present tariff. I pointed them out before, but I will do so again. Six tons of wheat can be sent by rail from Warwick to Roma for £7 19s., but if those six tons are manufactured into flour, bran, and pollard in Warwick, and then consigned in the manufactured state to Roma, the railway charges amount to £19 7s. 11d. I want the Minister to explain why that should be so; why the fact of the process of manufacture being gone through in Warwick should make the manufactured article three times more costly to carry than it was in its raw state, when the character of the freight is practically the same? Take another example: The charge for six tons of wheat from Warwick to Brisbane is £5 9s. 6d., but if that quantity of wheat is gristed in a Warwick mill and forwarded to Brisbane, the railrage is £12 11s. 9d., or more than double the wheat rate. I could send this six tons of wheat from Warwick to Brisbane for less than half the amount it would cost me to send six tons of flour. I could understand this, Mr. Speaker, if it were the desire of the Government or the Commissioners to compel wheat-growers all over the colony to send their wheat to Brisbane to be gristed, but surely that cannot be contemplated. Surely it is desirable to encourage the establishment of mills in the provincial districts. The

tariff certainly conveys the opposite impression, and I cannot help again referring to a statement made to the Warwick farmers by the Secretary for Lands, that if they could not get their flour down to Brisbane at a price that paid them they should send the wheat down to be gristed here.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MORGAN: Hon. members say "hear, hear." That simply means that you have got to send wheat to Brisbane to be gristed, and, having had it gristed, we will have to send it back to the country districts to supply the people who grew it. Now, there is a great waste of labour and waste of capital in that.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: They will not do it.

Mr. MORGAN: They will let their land go back to fallow rather than do it. I want to hear the Secretary for Railways justify that. He may be able to justify it to the House, but I do not think he can justify it to the men more immediately affected. They cannot see the wisdom of it, and I do not think he can explain it as a wise policy to pursue. Now, I would like just to point out the possibilities for the extension of wheat farming in this colony, and what we have to hope for if a policy of encouragement is adopted towards the wheat-growing industry. Last year we imported 326,484 bushels of wheat, to the value of £60,651, and 41,122 tons of flour, of the value of £410,191, making a total of the importations under this head of £470,842—or nearly half a million. Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is to the advantage of Queensland to encourage men to go upon the soil and produce articles, the production of which will have the effect of keeping that amount of money in the colony? Why, Sir, by wise measures, by the framing of tariffs which would have the effect of encouraging that industry, we could produce all the breadstuffs we require here; we would have a population of farmers ten times as great as we have at present; and those men would give employment to double the number of people there are in Queensland at the present time; to tens of thousands of artisans, who would be employed in making machinery for the farmers, who in turn would help to support a very much larger number of business men than we have at present. Surely it is wise to endeavour to attain that end; and if, Sir, without subjecting the country to any serious strain, by not asking for any undue advantage for that particular industry, we can achieve that end, why should we not endeavour to achieve it? We are not asking for anything new; we are simply asking for the restoration of a measure of protection which we have enjoyed for nearly twenty years up to the 31st of last December. How are the wheat farmers, the producers of breadstuffs, treated in other countries of the world? Are they treated as they are treated in Queensland? No. In almost every country of the world, the exceptions being those one or two countries where they are apparently wedded to freetrade, direct encouragement is given to the wheat producer. While the tariff of 1888 was under consideration, the subject being the duty on wheat, the present Chief Secretary referred to the duties on wheat and flour in different countries of the world, and I think it is worth while to quote a passage from the hon. gentleman's speech on that occasion. It will show the policy adopted in other countries as well as the colonies.

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. Sir S. W. Griffith): Where is that?

Mr. MORGAN: In *Hansard* for 1888, vol. lv., page 497. The hon. gentleman said—

"He had before him a list of the tariffs on wheat and flour of various countries in the world. In the case of Turkey and Egypt the duty on flour and wheat was the same; in Turkey there was an *ad valorem* of 8 per cent., and in Egypt 7 per cent. In New South Wales both were free; but in every other case the manufactured article paid more than the raw article. In Russia wheat was admitted free, while flour paid a duty of 1s. 2½d. per cwt.; in Norway wheat paid 1½d. per cwt., flour 8½d.; in Germany, wheat 1s. 6½d., flour 3s. 9½d.; in France, wheat 2s. 0½d., flour 3s. 3d.; in Portugal, wheat 2s. 3½d., flour 3s. 8½d.; in Spain, wheat 1s. 8½d., flour 3s. 8½d.; in Italy, wheat 6½d., flour 1s. 1½d.; in Austria, wheat 6d., flour 1s. 6½d.; in Switzerland, wheat 1½d., flour 6d.; in Greece, wheat £1 18s. 4½d., flour £3 16s. 9½d.; in Turkey both wheat and flour paid an *ad valorem* of 8 per cent.; in Egypt there was an *ad valorem* of 7 per cent. on both; in Roumania, wheat was admitted free, while flour paid a duty of 4s. 10½d. per cwt.; in the United States, wheat 6s. 10½d. per qr., flour 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; in Cuba, wheat 6s. 8½d., flour 9s. 11½d.; in Porto Rica, wheat 1s. 8½d., flour 5s. 2½d.; in Mexico, wheat, 10s. 7d., flour £1 3s. 3d.; in Brazil wheat was admitted free, flour 1s. 1½d.; in New South Wales, wheat free, flour free; in Victoria, wheat 2s. per 100 lb., flour 2s. per 100 lb.; in South Australia both were the same as in Victoria; in Western Australia, wheat 4d. per 60 lb., flour £1 per 2,000 lb.; in Tasmania, wheat 10d. per 100 lb., flour 1s. per 100 lb.; in New Zealand, wheat 9d. per 100 lb., flour 1s. per 100 lb.; in Queensland alone there was the anomaly—wheat 6d. per 60 lb., flour free; in Cape of Good Hope, wheat 1s. per 100 lb., flour 3s. 6d. per 100 lb.; in Canada, wheat 7½d. per 60 lb., flour 2s. 1d. per 200 lb."

So that a duty on wheat and a duty on flour is found in most countries of the world. It is imposed, I take it, for the purpose of protecting the local producer of those commodities, and if it is found by them a wise policy to pursue, why should it be different here? Have we so many producers of wheat and flour that we do not want to encourage more? I do not know any country in the world where so large a proportion of flour per head of the population is imported as we import in Queensland. Now, Sir, though I do not anticipate it will have very much weight with hon. members here, I would point out that this is a very burning question on the Darling Downs, to which district wheat-growing is almost at present confined. For myself, if a policy of reasonable protection is pursued, I look forward to the day not very far distant when we shall have wheat-growing extended all over the south-western districts, and possibly a portion of the Central district. I see no reason why wheat should not be grown successfully below the range. It is grown in countries with a climate very similar to the climate below the range, and as for the fertility of our soils there can be no question about that. It is simply a question of getting the right variety of wheat, and I feel sure that having got that we shall be able to make wheat-growing pay all over the Southern part of the colony, and possibly a portion of Central Queensland. But at present it is confined almost exclusively to the Darling Downs; and I take it that it ought to be the object of Parliament to make a serious effort to encourage others to follow the example of the men who are now engaged in that industry, and in that way do an incalculable amount of good to the whole of Queensland. Naturally this question is regarded with very deep interest on the Darling Downs. It means a reduction of 6d. per bushel in the price which will be paid to the men growing wheat, and that is too serious an item to be submitted to without protest. The farmers on the Darling Downs are uniting in a protest to endeavour to reach the ear of the hon. gentleman who presides over the Railway Department, and those very hard-headed men who under him manage the railways. I hope they will be successful. If they are not successful

before, they will make a strong bid for success when an appeal is made to the constituencies in the course of the next twelve or eighteen months. A conference of farmers was held during the present week at Clifton, one of the agricultural centres of the Darling Downs, not simply for the purpose of discussing the railway tariff, but for the consideration of matters generally affecting the interests of the agriculturists. And this is one of the resolutions adopted at that conference:—

“Moved by Mr. Hagenbach, seconded by Mr. Wilson, [both wheat farmers], and carried:—‘That this meeting is of opinion that it is absolutely necessary to carry flour, bran, and pollard made from Queensland-grown wheat at agricultural rates similar to those in operation up to 1st January, 1891. Also, that it is the opinion of this meeting that the Government shall place a protective duty at once on all agricultural produce that can be grown in the colony, as it is impossible to carry on farming profitably as long as the present railway rates are maintained. That the foregoing resolution be sent to the members for the Downs to lay before Parliament, and if no redress is given to the farmers, that we ask the members to withdraw their support from the Government before we are perished.’”

That may be taken as fairly expressing the sentiments of the whole of the farmers engaged in wheat-growing in Queensland. I have had quite a number of letters and telegrams on this subject, and I propose to read two or three of them to the House. The mayor of Warwick, Mr. Healy, wired me, under date the 17th instant, as follows:—

“Warwick residents and farmers indignant at Roma telegram which is selfish and misleading. Wheat carried Warwick to Roma £1 6s. 6d. ton whilst flour pays £4 1s. less 10 per cent. on large parcels leaving a profit in favour of intended Roma miller of £2 6s. 6d. Trust you will succeed. People will strengthen your hands if necessary.”

I hope they will. The secretary of the Eastern Downs Horticultural and Agricultural Association wires me as follows:—

“Requested by large number of members of association to assure you of their fullest approval of your action. Trust you will succeed in having railway freight on Queensland flour reduced. Non success will materially cripple the wheat-growing industry in this district.”

That is a statement which I thoroughly believe from my own knowledge of the conditions under which wheat-growing is carried on in that part of the colony. We have a crop—the largest, I think, that has ever been laid down in Queensland—now coming on on the Darling Downs, with every prospect of an unusually heavy yield, but with the prospect also of lower prices than have prevailed at any time during the history of wheat-growing in Queensland. Nature is apparently inclined to be good to us. The Secretary for Railways is inclined to be the opposite; and he, by his action, is going to undo the good which Nature is seemingly prepared to do for us. Reference is made in one of these telegrams to the feeling in the Roma district with regard to this motion, and I noticed in a Brisbane paper a day or two ago a telegram from Roma to this effect:—

“Indignation is expressed at the attempt of the Warwick millers to get reduced rates of wheat and products on the railways. If it is adopted it is believed the agricultural industry in the West will be ruined. It is hoped that Mr. Morgan’s motion will be stoutly opposed.”

I do not understand the phrasology of that telegram. I make no reference in my motion to “wheat and products.” My motion deals exclusively with flour, bran, and pollard. I say nothing with regard to wheat. We have no complaint to make with regard to the carriage of wheat. We simply ask that flour, bran, and pollard shall be carried at agricultural produce rates; and we are not asking that that shall only apply to mills at Warwick, Allora, and Toowoomba. A mill, we are told, is being established

at Roma. That mill, of course, would have the flour manufactured in it from locally-grown wheat carried at agricultural produce rates, exactly the same as the mills in other towns of the colony. That is a perfectly fair thing. I cannot see for a moment how the passage of the motion that I have submitted to the House would prejudicially affect the interests of the Roma district in any way. Certainly I have no intention of doing anything of the kind. I look with pleasure to the establishment of a flour mill at Roma, and I sincerely hope that sufficient wheat will be grown there to make that venture a real success, and to induce the establishment of other mills in that district and in districts further west. I look to the success of wheat-growing in Queensland as one of the brightest hopes we have for the future. I feel sure—although I do not take my opinion from Mr. White, who recently visited that district—that wheat-growing will be more successful on the lighter soils to be found in certain portions of the Western districts than it has been on the heavy black soils of the Darling Downs. We are not in any way jealous of the establishment of mills at Roma or any other provincial town. I would like to see every town have its flour mill, and I, at any rate, would not be a party to do anything that would have the effect of arresting the progress of wheat farming in Queensland. I have again to point out that the motion does not touch the question of wheat, and that any advantage that would accrue to the wheat farmer, if this motion were passed by the House, would be shared equally by Roma, Allora, Toowoomba, and Warwick. I do not think the people of Roma can ask for any more than equal rights with other wheat-growing districts. I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. Kates, the gentleman who is establishing a flour mill at Roma. He writes to me as follows, under date Roma, 15th September, 1891:—

“I think if you would confine your motion for freight reduction on flour, bran, and pollard to down the line towards the port, to stop foreign importations, you would greatly help all wheat-growers in Queensland. But to make it applicable to up-country lines would set class against class, and considerably injure a number of your less favourably positioned fellow taxpayers. I am quite sure you will never back up such a grievous injustice.”

I am not fighting this battle in the interests of the millers, but in the interests of the wheat-growers.

The COLONIAL TREASURER (Sir T. McIlwraith): It seems to me that you are fighting in the interests of the millers.

Mr. MORGAN: Certainly not; and I will point out to the hon. gentleman how. The Secretary for Railways on a recent occasion, to which I am not perhaps permitted to refer more particularly, pointed out to an admiring House that this tariff did not affect the Downs wheat-growers at all, for the reason that they were not able to produce sufficient for their own requirements; and he said that until the local farmers were able to show that they could do that, they had no claim to be placed in a position for competing with outlying markets. Now, if you compel the Downs miller to restrict his operations to his own market, one of two things must happen. The miller must buy up, as he does now, the wheat as quickly as it comes from the threshing machine. He must continue to do that, but with this drawback before him: that a portion of that wheat cannot be gristed and converted into money for perhaps twelve months to come; and he has got to run the risk of weevil; he has to go to the expense of storage; and he has to sink his capital. Who is going to pay for that? Is it the miller? No, Sir; it is the farmer who has got to pay for it, by being compelled to accept

a lower price for his grain. You give the miller, what you have given hitherto, command of the Western market, and he will buy grain as quickly as it can be brought in from the fields; he will convert it into flour; he does not keep it perhaps a week in his mill, but ships it off and he gets his return quickly.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: What does Mr. Kates say to that?

Mr. MORGAN: The gentleman who writes this letter will have command of the market east of Roma as far as Dalby, at any rate, and the whole of the market in the Western districts. Now, the Western market beyond Roma—Charleville, Cunnamulla, Thargomindah, and down to the south-western border of the colony—will, I undertake to say, consume more flour in twelve months than the Roma district will grow in the next ten years. I shall be glad to know that our Roma friends will be able to produce sufficient to meet that demand, because they would be doing good, not only to themselves, but to the whole colony, to keep out of our markets the very large quantity of flour that now comes in by way of Bourke from Victoria and South Australia. But, Sir, why should we confine the operation of this proposed differential rate in favour of locally-produced flour to parcels sent down the line? Suppose wheat-growing is made a success below the Range, why should we not give the producer of that wheat the same advantage that we are now asking for ourselves? Why should they not be allowed to send their produce up the line at the lower rate of carriage?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: They are now.

Mr. MORGAN: They are not.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Then wheat.

Mr. MORGAN: I am speaking of wheat grown and gristed here and sent up the line in the form of flour, and I say why should not they be allowed to get it carried at the lower rate, the same as we are asking in the case of wheat grown on the Darling Downs?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: There is some confusion between wheat and flour. Wheat is taken everywhere as agricultural produce.

Mr. MORGAN: We are perfectly well aware of that. We are asking that flour, bran, and pollard, the produce of our wheat, shall be carried at the lower rate, which we consider is a perfectly reasonable request; but we refuse—at any rate I refuse—to ask that our flour shall be carried down the line towards the ports at the lower rate, and that wheat grown and gristed into flour down here shall not be carried up the line at the low rate, as asked for in this letter.

Mr. MURPHY: Say that again.

Mr. MORGAN: It is suggested that this motion should be confined to parcels of flour, bran, and pollard, the produce of wheat grown on the Darling Downs and sent towards the port, but that it should not apply to parcels grown down here and sent up the line from the port. I say that would be unfair, because if wheat can be produced below the Range, and converted into flour, bran, and pollard, in Brisbane or elsewhere, that produce should be allowed to be sent up the line at the same low rate as we are now asking in regard to flour manufactured from wheat grown on the Darling Downs. I think there should be no favouritism in that respect. I do not suppose that if I talked for an hour to come that I should alter the opinion of the Secretary for Railways upon this matter; but I do think, Sir, that it is a question that claims the support of every hon. gentleman who favours

giving encouragement to native industries. I consider that every man who is in favour of that policy, and every hon. member of this House who professes himself to be a protectionist, should help to give effect to this motion. I may be told that the amount of flour we produce is very small. If that is so, then I say the amount of money at issue is a very small matter to the Railway Department; but it is a very big matter—a very big matter indeed—to the wheat farmer. In many cases it may be the difference between profit and loss. I hope, therefore, that in the debate upon this motion hon. members will, at any rate, if they cannot go all the way with me, indicate to what extent they think the Government of the colony ought to go in giving encouragement to the production of breadstuffs within our own borders. I appeal to hon. members to take the case of the Queensland wheat-grower into their consideration. I ask them whether they consider the wheat-grower of Queensland is entitled to encouragement—if he is a man who ought to be encouraged in his calling? And if they answer "yes" to that, then I ask them to what extent they would be prepared to help the Government in that direction. I appeal not to the politics of hon. gentlemen; I appeal to their patriotism. I am perfectly sure that we are all anxious to see Queensland made prosperous, and I see no direction in which the chance of success is more hopeful than in the direction of expanding the wheat-growing industry. We have a market which is only partially supplied by our own products at the present time. There is £500,000 per annum to come and go upon yet, and if we can only find the means of producing sufficient breadstuffs to meet the demand within the colony it will give employment to thousands of farmers, who in turn will give employment to thousands of mechanics, and they in their turn will give a livelihood to hundreds of storekeepers and business men. Surely it is desirable to achieve that if we possibly can. I am not asking the Government to do a thing that is unjust to any other interest. I am merely asking them to extend to the wheat-grower the same measure of protection that we extend to farmers engaged in other lines of agriculture, which we extend to manufacturers, and which it is admitted in this colony and in all the other colonies is a wise thing to do. That is all I am asking, and I hope the Secretary for Railways will, at any rate, be able to hold out some encouragement to the Darling Downs wheat-growers that this policy of insisting that they shall be placed on the same footing as the foreign producer will not be continued. I am not appealing to him solely in the interests of the Warwick district, because I have pointed out that the advantages of this policy, if adopted, would be shared in by not only Roma and the Western districts, but by the Central districts the moment they establish mills there, and in fact everywhere throughout the colony where wheat-growing can be made to pay. I would also point out to the Secretary for Railways that in the carriage of goods the miller is placed at a disadvantage as compared with other consignors, because whereas a full ton is allowed to other consignors, flour is calculated at per ton of 2,000 lb. That I do not think is quite a fair thing. I think full weight should be allowed to millers the same as to other consignors. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that if we do not get any present advantage from this motion, that we shall do so in the future. I am quite sure that the farmers engaged in wheat-growing are looking forward with the greatest interest to the decision of the Minister in this matter, and I hope that the decision, if not wholly favourable, will at any rate be favourable in part. I move the motion.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS said: Mr. Speaker,—I was under the impression that a few weeks ago, when a motion for adjournment was before the House, in which the railway tariff was discussed, I had on that occasion given clear reasons, and proved satisfactorily to the House, why the rates on flour especially should not be reduced. The hon. member has, however, taken it upon himself to reopen the subject. I have followed him as closely as possible, and I must say that, in my opinion, he has entirely failed to make out any case which will entitle him to consideration under the terms of his motion. The mere fact that other colonies charge a low rate for flour and bran, is no argument whatever. Every country has its own necessities and its own requirements; and every country fixes its own tariff. Whilst we are charging a higher rate than other colonies for flour, we are charging a lower rate for some other goods. I admit at once that our freight on flour is very high, but the rate for flour in this colony has been high, as against the other colonies, ever since we have had any railways.*

Mr. MORGAN: On imported flour.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Yes. The rates on imported flour have been high ever since we have had railways. The hon. gentleman complains of the unfriendly attitude of the Government towards the farmers.

Mr. MORGAN: The wheat-growers.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I fail to see the unfriendly attitude, inasmuch as this tariff, which was inaugurated on the 1st January last, has actually given a concession on previous rates, except in the case of locally-made flour; otherwise a concession on four-ton lots of 10 per cent. has been given.

Mr. MORGAN: That is on imported flour.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: On all flour.

Mr. MORGAN: There are full rates on the local flour.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: A concession has been given on all flour, whilst the differential rate which had been in existence upon the Darling Downs flour for many years past has been abolished. What the hon. gentleman ought to have proved, which he did not attempt to do, was that an injustice was being suffered by the producer, and that he was unable to sell his wheat owing to the high railway carriage which has been imposed. He has not shown us at all that an injustice is being imposed upon farmers, or upon the millers, through excessive railway carriage, and that in consequence they are unable to find a market. Although the hon. gentleman has throughout protested and asserted that he was arguing this matter in the interests of the farmers, I think that hon. members who have listened to him must admit that the whole of his speech was in favour of the miller, inasmuch as the miller could not get as much for his flour as he was getting before. That has been the whole of the hon. gentleman's argument. Therefore it appears to me that he is making a violent effort to get protection for the miller exclusively.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Not for the miller, but for the Warwick miller.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I will show presently that he is not only asking protection for the miller, but asking protection and monopoly for the Warwick miller.

Mr. MORFHEAD: As against the consumer.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: As against other millers and against the consumer also. Let us first look at the farmer, who

has his raw product—wheat—for sale. It is admitted—whether it is admitted or not, I say it is a fact—that the raw product—wheat—is carried at the lowest rate at which we are carrying any goods in the colony. He is favourably situated on the Downs in so far that during last season he has averaged 6d. a bushel more for his wheat than his neighbours on the New South Wales border have been getting. He is, furthermore, favourably situated in being able to send his wheat—I am not speaking of the miller who wants to send flour—to the metropolis, which is considered to be the best market, at the lowest rate, which will enable him to compete with the imported article. To bring a ton of wheat from Adelaide—that being the only usable imported wheat—costs £1.

Mr. ALAND: No.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I have the rates supplied by the shipping firms.

Mr. ALAND: You cannot trust them.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: If I am to be told that I cannot trust anybody except the hon. member who interrupts me, that is a different thing. I am only giving the facts supplied to me by authority. The information I am giving is supplied by the shipping firms trading from Adelaide to this port. The freight on wheat from Adelaide to Brisbane is 17s. 6d. a ton and the wharfage is 2s. 6d. a ton. That is £1 a ton. And the freight on wheat from the Downs to Brisbane—from Warwick to Brisbane—is 18s. 3d. a ton. Therefore the Downs farmer has a market open for his wheat, and I cannot see what reason he has to complain.

Mr. ALAND: A benefit of 1s. 9d. per ton.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: He is enabled to compete with the only place where we can get wheat which is usable in this colony. Of course if a protective duty is wanted, that is another thing; but we cannot have a protective duty at the expense of the railways. If we are to have a protective duty it must be put on straightforwardly, and not at the expense of the railways, which would compel taxpayers in every part of the colony who derived no benefit from the railways over which the wheat was carried, to contribute towards it. I have shown that the farmer with his raw product has a market, and we are now forced to fall back on the miller. I say that this demand is made wholly and solely in the interests of the miller.

Mr. MORGAN: That is not so.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Will the reduction asked for benefit the miller? Certainly not. Has it benefited the Downs miller in the past? The Warwick miller and the Allora miller had this differential rate for ten or eleven years until the 1st January last. Has it had the effect of encouraging the industry in the way it ought to have done? Are they able to supply the districts within their reach, or even their own district? I have recently shown that they are unable to supply their own district. But in order that my reply on this occasion may take a more concrete form, I will travel over the ground again. The only competition with which the Downs miller has to contend is that of imported flour, which will be sent from Brisbane. We must, therefore, find a point at which the freights are equal. That is to say, where the freight from Brisbane is equal to the freight from Warwick. Murphy's Creek is that centre, and to that point the Warwick miller has the whole district open to him. Now, as regards the Toowoomba market, the Warwick miller has 10s. 8d. in his favour, as against Brisbane. What has been the result up to last year?

Mr. MORGAN: We are talking about freights.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Yes; we will now talk about freights. At Toowoomba, therefore, the Warwick miller has an advantage over the Brisbane miller of 10s. 8d. per ton, which advantage, of course, is being increased the nearer we get to Warwick and the further we get out West. But what has been the result? There were two mills at work last year, one at Warwick and one at Allora, and between them 1,560 tons was all that was sent to Toowoomba and out West. And what has Brisbane supplied at the same time to these places? Brisbane has supplied by rail 2,674 tons in addition. Therefore we have this result: That until such time as the Warwick mills manufacture and supply at least three times their present output, they have a monopoly in those districts and have no cause of complaint. They must supply at least three times as much before they are shut out of the market. I am quite satisfied that if the Warwick millers would only produce a good article the result would be that their flour would be just as readily taken as the Brisbane flour.

Mr. ALLAN: You mean that they do not produce a good article?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I am coming to that presently. They are certainly not producing an article equal to the imported article.

Mr. MORGAN: That is not fair.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It is quite fair. I shall state facts which will be borne out by many hon. members in this House. I want to ask this question: Have the consumers in the districts adjacent to Warwick availed themselves of the extraordinary low rates at which they might have purchased the local flour? This is the answer to that inquiry: They certainly have not availed themselves of them. Let us take Charleville first, which any one in his senses would imagine would naturally draw its flour from the nearest point to it, which is Warwick. During last year the Charleville people could land flour from Warwick cheaper by £3 5s. 5d. per ton than from Brisbane; that was the differential rate. Naturally any business man would think that when a saving of £3 5s. 5d. per ton was to be made, Brisbane would not have been able to step in; but what was the fact? Warwick supplied 111 tons, and Brisbane supplied 332 tons. That flour might have been supplied by Warwick had the millers chosen. Now we come to Mitchell, in regard to which Warwick had an advantage over Brisbane to the extent of £2 13s. 9d. per ton, yet Warwick only supplied five tons while Brisbane supplied seventy-one tons. In regard to Yeulba, Warwick supplied twenty-three tons there against ninety-six tons from Brisbane, yet it had an advantage of £2 4s. 5d. per ton in freight. At Miles the advantage given to Warwick in railway freights was £1 19s. 2d., yet Warwick only supplied twenty tons, while Brisbane supplied forty-seven tons at the higher rate. At Dalby there was a freight difference in favour of Warwick of £1 11s. 3d., yet Warwick could only wedge in twenty-four tons while Brisbane supplied 230 tons. At Jondaryan, Warwick had an advantage of £1 8s. 9d. per ton, yet Brisbane supplied thirty-seven tons and Warwick only twenty-four tons. When I see facts like these, especially the fact that there is such a large market open to Warwick that the Warwick millers could supply three times what they do at present before they are shut out of any market, I certainly fail to see that there is the smallest justification for asking for this concession. Bran stands on a

different footing. The hon. member included it in his motion; but did not say anything about it. Bran is already being carried at agricultural rates.

Mr. MORGAN: £1 4s. 9d. per ton.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It is being carried at the agricultural rate, which is £1 4s. 9d. per ton from Warwick. We have two agricultural rates, the A class and the B class. Bran is carried at £1 4s. 9d. per ton, whilst flour is carried at £2 11s. Therefore, bran is already being carried at a reduced rate. We all know that Brisbane is the chief market for bran; but, unfortunately for the Warwick millers, they have to stand a little local competition in Brisbane, and that is exactly where the shoe pinches. Of course, there is not an unlimited market for an article like bran; and there is not the slightest doubt that the starting of fresh mills has the effect of reducing the price. But, at the same time, although they have to compete with the local miller in Brisbane they have the advantage of having the wheat delivered at their doors, while the Brisbane miller has to bring it down by rail at 18s. 3d. per ton, or from South Australia at £1 per ton. It is impossible to land bran from Adelaide under £3 0s. 4d. per ton besides the original cost of the article, and the Warwick millers can send it down here for £1 4s. 9d. I think that £3 0s. 4d. is a sufficient protection; at any rate, it is such protection as anyone has a right to ask upon an article which is ordinarily sold at from £4 10s. to £5 per ton. Now, I must next consider the extreme and utter selfishness of the demands of the Warwick millers. They ask for concessions which I shall show to be absolutely selfish. First they make an unfair demand to obtain an advantage over the Brisbane millers; and, secondly, they are making a strong attempt to crush a rising rivalry in the Roma district. There is not the least doubt about that. The demand really means that Warwick and Allora flour only shall be carried at the reduced rates.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why not Roma flour?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: No flour has yet been manufactured there. It is well known by those who are acquainted with the article and with the trade; and it is clearly proved to my mind by the fact that people at a distance prefer to pay £3 5s. 5d. per ton more for their flour than get it from Warwick—that whilst Warwick flour is a very fair article, yet it is a flour which will not keep.

Mr. ALLAN: That is not a fact.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It will not keep for any length of time. That is a statement which is perfectly correct, and which I challenge any hon. gentleman to contradict.

Mr. ALLAN: I contradict it.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Anyone can contradict it, but I have heard numerous complaints. I am not going to run the flour down, but I say it is a flour that will not keep.

Mr. ALLAN: Have you tried it?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Yes many times, and I have had it sent back to me many a time.

Mr. ALLAN: Well, I have tried it, and have not had to send it back.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Well, I am not going to argue about that at the present time; but I am going to try and prove that the hon. member for Warwick is asking for an unfair advantage over the Brisbane mills. It is a fact that the Warwick flour will not keep, and that is well known and thoroughly recognised by the

Brisbane millers. The consequence is that they do not make their flour entirely from wheat grown in Queensland. They may mix wheat from Warwick with South Australian wheat, and grind half Queensland and half South Australian wheat, or else they grind the imported article only. Therefore, I say this attempt is not a good one, as it would shut out the Brisbane mills from competition in this case; because if the Brisbane millers mixed the wheat as they are now doing, they would be shut out from the benefit of this motion, for, under no consideration—if they conducted their business honestly—could they forward their flour as flour made from Queensland wheat. The same remarks apply to bran; and we must come to the conclusion that what the Warwick miller asks us to do is to shut out the Brisbane miller from getting this concession, and sending his flour up the line to compete with the Warwick flour, whilst the Warwick miller would be able to bring his flour down here to compete with the Brisbane article. Then there is another difficulty in connection with this matter, and that is the identification of flour or bran which is said to be ground from Queensland wheat. Of course we can very easily have harassing precautions and safeguards in order to compel people to make declarations and one thing and another; but we know from our past experience of the differential tariff that the Railway Department was considerably imposed upon in that direction. A great deal of flour was forwarded as Queensland-made flour when it was not Queensland flour at all. We know that; and it is very hard to guard against such misrepresentation. As regards the attempt to crush out Roma, the hon. gentleman has challenged me to treat upon the effect which the new tariff will have upon wheat cultivation. Well, I am very glad to accept his challenge, and I am very glad to answer him by giving him the actual results. From the first day that this tariff came into existence, on the 1st of January, it was decided in consequence of the tariff to start a mill at Roma. That was settled. That is wholly and solely in consequence of that tariff giving the Roma people a fair chance of securing the trade within their own district. About 20,000 acres have already been taken up in the Roma district for wheat-growing.

Mr. ALAND: What does Mr. White say about the railway tariff?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Mr. White has made no complaint about the railway tariff. In fact, the thing speaks for itself. People know this railway tariff, and they have taken up all this land in view of that tariff, which they prefer, as it shuts out in a measure the Warwick competition. We are not here in this colony to benefit Warwick alone at the expense of everyone else. We are not protecting Roma any more either; but when we find this tariff has been the means of getting 20,000 acres of land taken up for wheat-growing purposes, then I say it is a grand thing for the whole colony. Only to-day I have received information that within the last week applications have been received for 7,000 acres more for wheat-growing in the Roma district. I say advisedly, and knowing the facts full well, that those men who have taken up this land and Mr. Kates, who has erected the mill in the Roma district, have made their calculations upon the basis that they will be enabled to supply not only their own district, but the district far out West.

Mr. MORGAN: How can the motion interfere with it?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The motion will interfere very much.

Mr. MORGAN: How?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: They do not want the Warwick competition. They want to have it all to themselves.

Mr. ALLAN: The railway rates between the two places should be sufficient for them.

Mr. MORGAN: They would be in the same position as we are, even if this motion is carried.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The fact of the matter is this: Warwick is beginning to be afraid of losing the Roma trade, because Roma has been the best customer the Warwick millers have had for their flour. Last year Roma took 250 tons from Warwick, whilst only 100 tons were sent from Brisbane. That is the reverse of what we found in other places; and of course the Warwick people are afraid they will lose all that, and they will be very glad if something is done to shut out the extra production in the Roma district. To show the selfishness and the utter absurdity of the demands of the Warwick people, a most amusing paragraph appeared in this morning's *Courier*, which I really cannot allow to pass unnoticed. What do they really ask? The hon. gentleman quoted a portion of this in the letter which he received from the mayor, and this is what the *Courier* says—

"Great indignation is felt here among the farmers at the telegram appearing in Wednesday's *Courier* from Roma, which is selfish and misleading, as wheat purchased in Warwick can be forwarded to Roma for £1 6s. 6d. per ton, while flour manufactured in Warwick costs £1 1s. per ton, less 10 per cent. on large parcels. The profit in favour of the Roma miller would be £2 6s. 6d."

Now, what does this mean? Virtually they say, "We know that a mill is being erected at Roma, and we know when it commences work it will enable men to grow wheat to supply the mill. If they will only let us send our wheat, it will only cost them £1 6s. 6d a ton, in order to get rid of the Roma wheat." But the Roma people want to save that £1 6s. 6d. a ton, and they will save it. They will make a good thing out of it, the country will make a good thing out of it, and the railway will make a good thing out of it, because we shall be enabled to secure a great deal of the trade of the country west of Charleville. At present the rate from Warwick to Charleville is £5 17s. 11d.; but the moment the Roma mill is in full swing they will be able to supply Charleville at £2 14s. 7d.—or a difference of about £3 3s. a ton. Well, that in itself will be sufficient to enable us to secure the Western trade. Now, if these people continue to get their wheat from Warwick we lose all this, and I therefore say it is a good thing for the country that this railway tariff has been started, because it has been the means of promoting settlement and cultivation. As I have said already, some 25,000 acres have been taken up or applied for for wheat-growing purposes, and I am sure if the tariff were to be altered, and Warwick were to get the pull again over Roma in this way, that many of those selections which have been taken up would not be put under cultivation.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Did the hon. gentleman say, "Give Warwick again the pull?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Yes.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Quite true.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I have not so far touched upon this question from the financial or monetary point of view at all; but I am in duty bound to give the House the result of the loss that would accrue to the department, or rather to the country.

Mr. MOREHEAD: To the taxpayers.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Yes. I am duty bound to give the result of the financial loss that would accrue to the general taxpayers throughout the North, Central and Southern portions of the colony if this proposal

is adopted. The calculations I have made on this phase of the subject are based upon last year's operations. One thousand five hundred and sixty tons of flour were sent last year, and brought us in a revenue of £3,075 at the present rates; but if the rate proposed by the hon. member had been charged, we should only have got £972, and we should have suffered a loss on that item alone of £2,103.

Mr. MOREHEAD: That is a complete answer.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: On bran and pollard taken from Warwick and Hendon we should have lost £337 if this proposal had been in force. On flour from Brisbane to stations commencing at Toowoomba, to which we took 2,674 tons last year, we should have lost £5,407.

Mr. MORGAN: No; that was made from Adelaide wheat.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Why should it not be made from Adelaide wheat? It is better than Warwick wheat.

Mr. MORGAN: It would not have come within this motion at all.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I am presuming, of course, that the cultivation of wheat would be extended, and that the Darling Downs farmer would send his wheat down here and it would go back in the form of flour up country. We would have lost £5,407 on that item. If we go further, and assume the supply to be sufficiently elastic to supply districts lower down, we would lose another £1,871. So that altogether—without speaking of Queensland-made flour that would be taken on the railways of the Northern parts of the colony, and which would, of course, have to be treated in the same way—we would lose very nearly £10,000 if this motion is carried. I do not think we are in a position to suffer any loss of this kind; especially as I have clearly shown that the Warwick and Allora mills are not able to supply the wants of the people in the districts in which they have an absolute monopoly at the present time. As I have said, we know that at Toowoomba, where the Warwick people have an advantage of 10s. 8d. a ton over the Brisbane millers, they are unable to supply the demand. I have shown that they could not supply their own districts by as much as 2,674 tons last year, and therefore I say it would be suicidal in the interests of the general taxpayer to give the Warwick people the advantage sought for them in this motion. There is another principle involved in this motion. If it is to be laid down as a principle that the manufactured article is to be carried at the same rate as the raw product, we must go further than the hon. member proposes to go. If that is to be adopted as a principle, why should not Ipswich tweeds be carried at the agricultural rate?

Mr. ALLAN: Wool is not carried at agricultural rates.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: No, but if this principle is adopted, why should not wool be carried at agricultural rates? We carry agricultural produce over 100 miles at 13s. 9d. per ton, and we charge £2 10s. per ton on wool. Over 150 miles we take agricultural produce for 17s. 10d. per ton, and we charge £3 12s. per ton for wool.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: How much for tweeds?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: A great deal more than that. We charge £5 4s. 2d. for tweeds. Over 200 miles we charge £1 2s. per ton for produce and £4 8s. per ton for wool. If this principle is affirmed, why should not wool-growers have the same benefit? They do not ask that their manufactured articles should be carried

at these low rates, but they are just as much entitled to ask that they should be. I will say one word more. The hon. gentleman quoted very largely different statistics of protective duties of various countries. All I can say is that we had a discussion on a protective policy the other night, and it appears to me that this is protection brought up again in another form. If protection is required and desired, by all means let us go straight for it, but do not make the railways give it in a roundabout way. Do not expect to get from the railways, in a roundabout way, what you do not expect to get direct. If the majority of the people of this country are asking for a heavy protective duty on flour, that is a matter fairly open for discussion; but surely hon. members should not ask from the railways, in an indirect form, what would not be got through the Customs. The benefit in this case would be entirely for a small section located in a particular district, whilst the charge would have to be borne by the whole of the colonists, whether they resided in the extreme North, West, Centre, or South. That is neither fair nor reasonable. I think I need not delay the House any longer, as I have conclusively shown that there is no justification for this demand. I hope the House will not grant it.

The HON. P. PERKINS said: Mr. Speaker, —I am very unwilling to take a hand in this business, though I think I really know more about farming than many of those who talk so much about it. I have farmed myself, cultivated the soil, and done an honest day's work. That is more than can be said of some who speak upon the subject. I will preface my remarks by saying that I think the Secretary for Railways might have given the explanation he has made to the House in about half the time he occupied. If we are to be afflicted here by the Darling Downs and the Fortitude Valley—

Mr. McMASTER: That is past.

The HON. P. PERKINS: I think this is the third or fourth time that these matters have been before the House this session, according to the statement of the Secretary for Railways. The amount in dispute on this occasion is a trifle, and any man who went into farming properly would pay more than all these freights himself. If farming is such a poor business as some of these people make it out to be, they ought to give it up, or else they should ask the Government, at once, to carry their produce free. That is really what they want them to do, but why should that be done? Why should the rest of the community be saddled with the cost of carrying stuff from Warwick, or Toowoomba, or any other place? I know all about it, and I know that if they only put their shoulders to the wheel and do a little more work—if, instead of working four hours a day, they will work five or six or even eight hours—the results will be very different. We cannot have this subject trotted out before the House from time to time. The hon. member who brought this motion forward is only talking to his constituents. I understand the subject perfectly, and I know that any man in Warwick who desires to do an honest day's work can live and be happy and comfortable, without getting the State to cart his stuff free for him. The fact is they cannot half support themselves at present. The Secretary for Railways has shown that breadstuff is sent up to them from Brisbane, and where would they be if it was not? They talk about all they can produce, and all they do produce. But we know what might be produced, if they were inclined to do it. What are they doing? Well, I will not say. I will leave the answer to you, Mr. Speaker, or someone else. I think it is a great shame the way in which the time of this

House has been used on four or five occasions to talk about Warwick and the Darling Downs. The hon. member for Toowoomba, Mr. Groom, has done his share, but as he is not here I will say nothing about him. I am sorry that the Secretary for Railways should have taken up so much time in explaining the matter.

Mr. ALAND: He is very conscientious.

The Hon. P. PERKINS: He may be; but I think the arguments he has used should simply shut up the hon. gentleman who brought forward this motion.

Mr. ALLAN said: Mr. Speaker,—I have listened with a great deal of attention to the reply of the Secretary for Railways to the speech of the hon. member for Warwick, and it seems to me that the whole of his argument went to show that it was the business of his department to crush out as far as possible the manufacture of flour in Warwick. That was the gist of it. He began his speech by saying that the tariffs differed in the different colonies; that in the other colonies the tariff was higher on some things, and in this colony lower on others. Now, looking at the tariffs of the three colonies referred to, excepting in a few insignificant items, the tariff of Queensland is higher in almost every particular.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: No.

Mr. ALLAN: Particularly on those items that the producers of the colony have to pay. The Minister has said that the hon. member for Warwick has not shown that any injustice is done to Warwick by this tariff; and when I speak of Warwick I speak of it as almost the centre of the electorate I represent. Well, it is in the recollection of this House that during the £10,000,000 loan scheme £500,000 was voted for a railway.

The Hon. P. PERKINS: What has that got to do with it?

Mr. ALLAN: For a railway to make a shorter route to Sydney from Brisbane. That line would have opened up a large amount of country between Ipswich and Warwick, and shortened the distance between Warwick and Brisbane by about sixty miles.

The Hon. P. PERKINS said: Mr. Speaker,—I rise to a point of order. The hon. member is wandering away from the subject altogether.

The SPEAKER: I am not aware yet what the hon. member's argument tends to.

Mr. ALLAN: I will come to that immediately, Mr. Speaker. I repeat that the Minister said that no injustice had been done to Warwick by the alteration of the tariff. I say that there has been great injustice done to the whole of the Darling Downs by the alteration of the tariff, and the reason I give for that is simply that the landholders, the selectors, and homesteaders were led to believe that they would have their produce brought to town by a much shorter route than they have to use at present by the construction of a railway which was included in the £10,000,000 loan, and for which £500,000 was voted. Of that sum £492,000 is still—well, I don't know where; in the Treasury or elsewhere. In consequence of that line being postponed from time to time and the injustice of not constructing it touching the conscience of the Ministry for the time being, they allowed the products of that part of the country to be carried down at a reduced rate. Instead of charging them for carriage on 160 miles, they charged for 100 miles, and for the time being the people were satisfied, and took up land and cultivated it on the strength of that concession. But the tariff has now been

raised without the railway to which I have alluded being constructed. I think that, at all events, is one great injustice that has been done to that part of the country. Talking of the carriage of this flour down to the Southern parts, so much has the miller been handicapped that now, from the town of Allora, they carry their flour by teams along the road to Toowoomba and elsewhere, because it does not pay to send it by rail. That only shows that the tariff is not only injuring the people, but injuring the railway as well. The Minister said that the hon. member for Warwick had argued simply in favour of the miller and not of the farmer, but I fail to see if the miller cannot get rid of his flour, how that will not directly react on the farmer. If the miller cannot get rid of the flour, he will not buy the wheat from the farmer, and the farmer will suffer. The Minister also quoted the small amount of flour sent under the old tariff from Warwick out to the Western districts—to Charleville, Dalby, Miles, and Yeulba—as an argument that the Warwick flour was not used, and that therefore the Warwick flour under the lower rate competed very little with other flour. I think that is a very good argument for lowering the rate, and not for raising it. The hon. gentleman also made the remark that it was well known that Warwick flour was bad flour, and would not keep. Well, I heard that argument some six or seven years ago, and had a great deal of correspondence about it, which I published in the paper; that correspondence is held now by Mr. Charles Hayes, of Overend and Co., at the flour-mill in this city. I sent some flour to a place of my own on the lower Culgoa—flour made from Warwick wheat at Mr. Hayes's mill. Through some error a lot of the Adelaide flour was put on top, and some of the Warwick flour was left underneath for over two years. When the Adelaide flour had been used they found at the bottom some of the old Warwick flour; they expected it to be utterly useless, but found to their surprise that it was quite as good as on the day it was obtained. I was so astonished to make that discovery, that in justice to Mr. Hayes I at once wrote to him about it. That is my own personal experience. Well, a great deal has been said about the Warwick black soil flour, but there is a great deal of wheat that comes from other parts of the Downs besides Warwick. I know of one farmer living in the Dalby district who sent down for gristing something like 3,000 bags of wheat last year. The Minister also stated that there would be a great deal of difficulty in ascertaining what was flour manufactured from locally-grown wheat if a differential rate was adopted, as millers found it necessary to mix Adelaide flour with flour made from wheat grown in Queensland. I may remark that it has been found, even in Warwick, that if you can get wheat grown on black soil and wheat grown on red soil, the two will grist together. You require to mix a thin-skinned with a thick-skinned wheat. That millers have sometimes to mix Adelaide wheat with black soil wheat, I admit. But, if a differential railway rate were adopted, the difficulty of finding out whether the wheat was grown in the colony could be got over by a simple declaration. I take it that wheat-growers are fairly honourable men, and that no hon. member of this House believes that they or the millers would make a false declaration.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The millers are not the only persons who ship the flour.

Mr. ALLAN: That may be, but I do not think there would be any difficulty in the matter. I thoroughly endorse all that has been said by

the hon. member for Warwick in connection with this subject. I will not go into exhaustive particulars, as there are other hon. members who wish to speak on the matter, but I must point out that our district has been heavily handicapped by the railway tariff that was introduced at the beginning of this year. Every day I receive letters or telegrams on the subject; the people feel very strongly on the matter, and are holding meetings all over the district to protest against the tariff. As the hon. member for Warwick has said, this tariff makes all the difference between profit and loss to the farmers. It seems to me that it is an anomaly and an utter absurdity that wheat should be carried for something like one-third of what is charged for the manufactured article; it is simply handicapping the manufactured article, and subsidising flour imported from other countries. If we charge 18s. 6d. per ton for wheat, and £2 11s. 4d. per ton for flour for the same distance, we are simply handicapping the millers in the district, and thereby handicapping the farmers in the district, and subsidising flour imported from other countries. I do not think that at a time like this, when we are trying all we can to sell land and settle people on the soil, it is a good thing to handicap settlers by raising the railway tariff. I think it was the business of the Ministry before they raised this tariff to put a sufficiently protective duty on the goods on which so much railway freight is charged, and in the production of which the people near the border are making their living at the present time. Having had a concession granted to them, that concession should not be taken away without some *quid pro quo* being given them. Not only have the people in my district been treated badly in regard to the *via recta*, but they have also been badly treated in regard to the proposed railway from Hendon to Allora. The people offered to construct that line at their own cost, but the Government thought it was better that it should be built by the Government, and promised to do the work, which, however, has not been done up to the present time. Then a contract was let for sinking an artesian well in the district, and the plant was on the ground, but the whole thing fell through. The only persons who got any advantage from the business were the Government, who fined the contractor £1,000. These things have given rise to considerable dissatisfaction among the people in the districts concerned, and the increase in the railway freight on produce has naturally added to their annoyance. I do not wish to detain the House at any length, but before I sit down I will read a letter I have received from Mr. Thos. H. Affleck. It is as follows:—

“Westhall, 16th September, 1891.

“Win. Allan, Esq.

“DEAR SIR,

“Herein please find a copy of the resolutions passed at the farmers' meeting held at Freestone on the 10th instant, which I have the honour to forward to you, according to instructions from the chairman.

“I remain, dear sir,

“Yours sincerely,

“THOS. H. AFFLECK.

“1. Proposed by Mr. James Wilson, seconded by Mr. J. A. C. Kirkigaarde—“That, in the opinion of this meeting, it is only fair and just that a reduction of freights be made on all produce carried on the Southern and Western Railway from Warwick and surrounding stations to Brisbane until such time as the railway from Warwick to Brisbane direct is built, on the following grounds—namely, that the money required for a direct line from Warwick to Brisbane has been borrowed and spent on works in other parts of the colony; therefore the people of this part of the colony have to pay freight for sixty miles more than they would have to pay had the money so borrowed been spent in making the *via recta*, the direct line from Warwick to Brisbane.”

1891—4 A

“2. Proposed by Mr. T. Phelan, seconded by Mr. King—“That this meeting is of opinion that if the Government want to encourage wheat-growing in this district that it is absolutely necessary to carry our flour, bran, and pollard made from Queensland-grown wheat at agricultural produce rates.”

That touches on the question raised by the motion of the hon. member for Warwick.

“3. Proposed by Mr. Thos. Ryan, seconded by Mr. P. Canavan—“That, in the opinion of this meeting, it is highly desirable that the Government should put a protective duty on all agricultural produce that can be grown in the colony, in order that farming can be made profitable in Queensland.”

“4. Proposed by Mr. M. N. Jensen, seconded by Mr. H. Larsen—“That the for-going resolutions be forwarded to the members for Warwick and Cunningham for them to bring before Parliament, and, if no redress is granted, that this meeting ask our members to withdraw their support from the Government.”

To show how the railway tariff bears on the farmers, I have here a letter from Mr. Hanley, a farmer, in the electorate of the hon. member for Cambooya. Mr. Hanley states that in sending chaff from Clifton he had to pay the following charges—namely, freight 17s. 6d. per ton, bales 16s., cutting 10s., cartage 10s., commission 3s., and Brisbane cartage 3s., or a total of £2 19s. 6d. All these charges have to be met before anything goes to the producer. I have a list of differential rates charged on various articles for the same distances in New South Wales and Queensland, but I will not read them, as I do not want to take up the time of the House any further. I think, as I said before, that if we wish to settle a good yeoman class on the land—a class of the most useful people we can have in the colony—and enable them to make the land return something, we should do everything in our power to assist them. I trust the House will treat this question with the seriousness its importance deserves. I am quite certain the people in my part of the country will not be satisfied until they get some redress. They are not able to live under the present tariff; and I greatly fear that if the grievances of the farmers are not taken into consideration and met in some way, we shall have a very different class of men sent here to represent farming constituencies than we have at present. The hon. members for Carnarvon and Warwick and myself are fair and moderate men, but the men who may be sent afterwards will, I imagine, be of a different stamp, who will perhaps retard legislation instead of assisting it, until they get their own wrongs righted.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said: Mr. Speaker,—If the speech of the hon. member who has just sat down is to be a sample of the speeches made on this motion, it would seem that hon. members are going to air little local grievances rather than argue the question at issue. The hon. member said that all the evils to which he referred had been brought about by the tariff. The great evil is the intense selfishness of interests, and the fact that hon. members advocate a particular interest to the neglect of the interests of other people in the colony. A better illustration of that could not have been given than was given by the hon. member for Warwick. The hon. member commenced by saying that it was rather a disastrous thing for the farmers in his district that the 6d. import duty on wheat was taken off in 1888. I can only assure the hon. member that I got my information, on which we decided that that duty should be taken off, not from the millers but from the farmers. It was the farmers in the Warwick district who satisfied me that to take off that duty would help the farmers; and now we have the representatives of the farmers telling us that that was a bad thing for the colony.

Mr. MORGAN: You got your information from a lot of farmers who never grew a bushel of wheat.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I do not think the hon. member is justified in making a statement of that kind, because I do not think he knows the farmers who gave me the information, and which I gave to the House at the time. It was represented to me, not only by farmers but by millers, that if we introduced the raw article duty free it would be the best thing for both the millers and the farmers. Now it seems the farmers have come to a different opinion on the matter. For whatever the hon. member said—and he insisted over and over again that he was not pleading for the millers of Warwick but for the farmers—his speech was simply a speech for the millers right through. At the present time who can be better off than the farmers, as far as the carriage of the raw product—wheat—is concerned. The rate all over the colony is as low as it can possibly be made, and if you have given the farmer the lowest possible rates to carry his produce to a market, what more can you do? Beyond that, you go in for a new industry altogether—namely, the milling industry, and so far all the arguments that have been adduced have been adduced on behalf of the miller, and apply to a subject in which the farmer has no interest, or rather his interest would be quite the other way, and to let things remain as they are. It strikes me that increasing the tariff on flour would have the opposite effect to what the hon. member says. I fancy it would limit the market which the farmer has at the present time. He has an unlimited market for his wheat, with the lowest possible rates in all parts of the colony, and you cannot possibly increase that market by making flour dearer. But it may have the effect—and there are a great number of people who argue it very strongly—of limiting the market of the farmers in the Warwick district to the Warwick millers. I know a great many people argue that; and it is a very likely thing to happen. This motion of the hon. member's is a hit-out straight at the Brisbane millers with one hand, and with the other hand it is a hit-out straight at the Western farmers. Neither, I think, is justified. The tariff we passed in 1888 had the effect of starting certain new industries in the colony. Amongst other things, flour-mills have been established in Brisbane. What the hon. member asks now is that, having gone so far that a legitimate trade has been started in Brisbane on the strength of the tariff of 1888, that trade is to be starved as much as possible by giving non-paying rates to bring down by-products, which are the only profit made out of the milling business in Brisbane. We are asked deliberately to make the Railway Department assist, with the capital of the railway, in lowering the legitimate profits that have been made by the Brisbane millers in by-products. Why should we assist in that? Why should we adopt non-paying rates to injure an industry that has been legitimately started? The next point to which I will refer is that touching the Western farmers. Let me say at once that I consider it a matter of far greater importance to the colony that farming should be encouraged out West than that it should be encouraged in the southern part of the Darling Downs. I think it will be of far greater benefit to the colony if we can start farming, and it proves a success, say, out Roma or Charleville way. We have all seen, with a good deal of disgust, that a great deal of the trade which we think ought to come to the eastern seaboard of Queensland, is going down into New South Wales. Why has it gone that way? It has gone that way simply because farming has got pretty well up to the border in New South Wales, and they have forced their way into Queensland trade through cheap flour. How are we to get cheap flour out

West? Not by making the Government carry it, at no expense to the Warwick farmers, to Roma and Charleville, but by encouraging farmers at Roma and Charleville to grow wheat themselves. This motion is just the very last thing to do that. The Roma people do not come here and say, "We want protection." Surely they have a right to come here and say, "We protest against the Government working a non-paying business to make ours a bad-paying business. Why should not we be entitled to that protection which ought to be given us? And that protection is the protection of a fair and legitimate railway tariff that pays the railway to carry the goods. That is all we ask for." In getting that they have got the encouragement to which they are entitled, and they are not asking for protection. The Warwick farmers are deliberately asking to be protected at the expense of the West. There could be nothing more disastrous happen to the colony at the present time than to cause any drawback whatever to the wheat industry out West, which I believe will be a great success. I believe that that will be a great wheat-growing district, and we cannot do anything to make it a wheat-growing country better than by giving it the encouragement that it is naturally entitled to. The outside districts do not ask for protection in the ordinary sense of the word, but only for the natural protection which the railways give. They simply claim that the Government shall not carry flour or wheat at the expense of the country, but that it should be carried at fair rates that will pay the railway, and they are entitled to that protection at least. Of course the hon. gentleman did not apply the argument in the way I am using it, but, looking at it in that way, he will see the force of the arguments in Mr. Kates's letter. The arguments show the selfishness of different districts, and where that selfishness prevails we should try and be as fair as we possibly can. It would be a very unfair thing if we went to the expense of adopting non-paying rates for the purpose of encouraging a certain industry in Warwick that can just as well be carried on here. Of course it is an anomaly, as the hon. member has pointed out, that wheat should be carried for one-third the price of flour; but I think he must see that in his desire to help his own district he wants to do so at the expense of others.

Mr. MORGAN: No; I don't.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I put it wrongly in saying the hon. member "wants" to do so, because I believe he is too fair for that; but I think I am quite justified in saying that the effect of what he is trying to accomplish is to get a benefit for his own district at the expense of others.

Mr. MOREHEAD said: Mr. Speaker,—In regard to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, I think there are anomalies in the present tariff. There may be anomalies in the speech made by the hon. member for Warwick; I think there are also anomalies shown in the speech delivered by the Treasurer himself. He told us just now, what I believe is an actual fact, that probably our great wheat lands are outside the Darling Downs. But, Sir, if I am not misinformed, I have reason to think—as other hon. members have reason to think—that the Darling Downs is evidently thought by the present Government to be the best theatre for farming operations, as there is a Bill on the table of the House which proposes that we should re-buy estates on the Darling Downs.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: No; I have not seen it or heard of it.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Is there not a Bill on the table providing that offers made to the Government for the repurchase of lands on the Darling Downs may, at all events, be dealt with?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Not on the Darling Downs.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Does the hon. gentleman think we are so blind as not to read between the lines?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: That is your own construction of it. There is no Bill on the table to buy back lands on the Darling Downs.

Mr. MOREHEAD: That is the construction I put upon it, and it is the construction put upon it by many people outside this Chamber. The only estates of any size in the colony which can be resold are on the Darling Downs or about Mount Abundance; there may be some Northern estates which the hon. gentleman knows more about than I do.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: There are plenty there.

Mr. MOREHEAD: At any rate the Government have expressed their intention by a Bill on the table to buy back lands for the State. But now we hear from the Treasurer a statement, with which I entirely agree, that our great wheat lands are still in the possession of the State, and can be utilised for the benefit of the State, without any buying back. To come now to the motion of the hon. member for Warwick. It appears to me that Warwick is taking up all the time allotted to the business of private members. Last night we had a very interesting debate about the Warwick racecourse.

Mr. MURPHY: You wasted time last night.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I do not know what the hon. gentleman calls waste of time. I consider that a great deal of good was done by the discussion. At any rate it did this much good, that we got a statement from the Chief Secretary that, in his opinion, in future lands should not be given away in the lavish, and, to my mind, somewhat improper manner they have been for racing purposes.

Mr. MURPHY: We got that very early in the evening. You wasted the rest of the time.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Yet hon. members were not satisfied; they would not withdraw the Bill. I think the two Jeremiahs, the hon. member for Cunningham and the hon. member for Warwick, who have gone about wailing the woes of this distressed district, have got very little to complain of. I think myself, and I believe the opinion is shared by a great many people, that the farmers of the Warwick district have been very liberally treated by the Railway Department and by the taxpayers of the colony. They have their produce carried at a rate that appears to me unduly low. The hon. member for Warwick says that they are prevented by the present rates from sending their flour to Brisbane, but how much flour was sent from Warwick and Hendon to Brisbane during the year? Six tons altogether. That shows, at any rate, that the people of Brisbane have not that inordinate affection for Warwick flour which appears to be possessed by the hon. member for Cunningham and his station. If it could be proved that this Warwick flour was something superlatively good, there might be some justification for the hon. member's plea, but I may state that Warwick flour has been supplied to a station I am connected with, and it has been condemned. It will not keep. With regard to the statement of the hon. member for Cunningham, that two bags of Warwick flour were kept for two years on his station below several tons

of Adelaide flour, and was then found to be perfectly good, I can only come to the conclusion that it was inoculated by the Adelaide flour, otherwise it would have been ropy, and eaten by maggots long before. That is my experience of Warwick flour; and I think we have a perfect right to consider the consumer as well as the producer in a matter of this sort. I do not see why the consumer should be induced, by a lower rate of carriage, which enables the article to be sold at a lower price, to consume an inferior article. I quite agree with the Treasurer in respect to the great injustice that would be done to an industry which has been created in Brisbane by the passing of this motion. I refer to the two large flour-mills that have been established here since the tariff of 1888 was passed. I know this: That in a weak moment the hon. members for Warwick and Toowoomba did not see what the effect of taking the duty off wheat would be.

Mr. MORGAN: I did.

Mr. MOREHEAD: If they did, then why did they not take proper steps to stop it? They are feeling the trouble now. The hon. member for Warwick has to my mind made out no case of suffering at all on the part of the farmers through the present tariff; and I am inclined to agree with the Treasurer that the speech of the hon. member seemed to be entirely in the interests of the millers. I certainly never would be a party—more particularly holding free-trade principles—to allowing any protective rates to be charged on our railways.

Mr. MURPHY: This is only a question of equalising rates.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Equalising what rates?

Mr. MURPHY: For agricultural produce.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I do not think the hon. member has listened to the debate, or he would know that it is something very different from that. I think after the able, clear, and explicit speech of the Hon. Secretary for Railways it was hardly necessary for anything more to be said, because it cut the ground completely from under the feet of the hon. member for Warwick. Now, Sir, a word or two about Roma and the new industry that is being started there, which my hon. friend the member for Maranoa will no doubt speak about later on. I am led to believe that the Warwick people are discovering that their market out West—which was never very large—is being seriously interfered with by a new industry at Roma, and that it is their intention to stifle that industry in its inception. I have no hesitation in saying, from my knowledge of the country about Roma, that there is land there close to the railway—hundreds and thousands of acres of it—which can provide flour for the whole of the district west and north-west of Roma; and I object distinctly to any differential tariff which will lead to the destruction of that industry.

Mr. MURPHY: This would not injure the industry.

Mr. MOREHEAD: It would have a most injurious effect on the industry.

Mr. MURPHY: You do not understand the question.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Possibly the hon. member for Barcoo thinks I do not; but I think I understand it, at any rate sufficiently well to satisfy myself and to satisfy those of my hearers who are intelligent. I think I have said enough to show that this proposed change of tariff is of no benefit to the consumer. And, after all, I have come to the conclusion—I say it with fear and trembling, and with a dread of being found fault with by many hon. members—that

the rights of the consumer have to be considered as well as the rights of the producer, more especially when the rights are connected with the staple of life.

Mr. MURPHY: How would this hurt the consumer?

Mr. MOREHEAD: It would be creating a monopoly which would be abused by the producer at Warwick. If we agree to a special protective tariff for the Warwick farmer, where is it to end? Last night we passed a resolution—which I think will never become law—for the division of the colony into three parts; but I think there will have to be an extra part for the benefit of Warwick and the Warwick farmer. Had this been a proposal to deal with the carriage of produce generally it would have been different, and we should have been able to deal with it on broader lines; but seeing that it is brought in to benefit two Warwick millers, it is just as preposterous as the attempt made last night to enable the trustees of the racecourse in that town to sell a piece of land which really belongs to the State.

Mr. DUNSMURE said: Mr. Speaker,—I shall not detain the House long, but I wish to say a few words. I agree with the Colonial Treasurer's remarks, more especially with regard to the land open for selection in the district I have the honour to represent. I do not consider the land on the Downs is really suitable for wheat-growing. I will not say they have never grown good wheat; but they have never made good flour on the Downs. The land about Roma is very much more suitable, and the climate there is more adapted to wheat-growing. Within the last twelve months a very large amount of settlement has taken place in the district I represent, principally for the purpose of wheat-growing, and the people who have settled there, as well as the gentleman who has erected a mill there, deserve some consideration. I know the class of men who have settled on the Wallumbilla village settlement are determined to make things a success if they possibly can; and the progress already made is astonishing and most satisfactory. The rapid progress of the settlement puts me in mind of the growth of a digging township in Victoria. I hope that nothing will be done to check that progress, as it promises a prosperity that will be indirectly advantageous to the whole of the colony.

Mr. GANNON said: Mr. Speaker,—I think the hon. member for Warwick deserves a great deal of credit for bringing forward this motion; and I was rather astonished to hear the hon. member for Balonne speak as he did. Instead of this motion doing Roma an injury it will benefit Roma when the mill there is in full swing just as much as Warwick and Allora, or any other part of the colony. Whenever the question of railway tariffs has cropped up, hon. members who do not represent farming constituencies try to make the House and the country believe that the farmers are not suffering under any disabilities; but I say they are suffering under great disabilities. There is a proposition before the House with regard to buying back estates, and it is possible that some estates on the Downs may be offered to the Government; but the railway tariff is very much against farming settlement on the Downs, because the amount of profit is so small since the rates have been increased. I could give strong reasons to prove this, and I will give one. Before the railway tariff was altered I was selling a large number of farms every month on the Downs, but since the rates were raised I have not sold three farms. That is proof that the tariff has done a great deal

of injury to the farming population on the Downs. Intending farmers, knowing that no profit is to be made in consequence of the increased rates, have refrained from buying land.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Is that a reason?

Mr. GANNON: It is a reason.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It is an assertion.

Mr. GANNON: I declare that it is a reason, and I could prove, even to the Commissioners, that what I say is a fact. I was selling land at the rate of 8,000 acres per annum until the alteration in the railway rates, but I am not now selling at the rate of 1,000 acres per annum. That is absolute proof of the injury the freights have done to the Darling Downs. No doubt the Secretary for Railways is right in standing by the department.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I would not do so if I did not think it was right.

Mr. GANNON: I do not blame the Commissioners for trying to make the railways pay, but it is a mistake to try to make them pay at the expense of the community.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The Government take the responsibility.

Mr. GANNON: They often shirk the responsibility when they do not want to take it.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Never.

Mr. GANNON: I have endeavoured to show that this proposal is not only for the benefit of the Warwick farmers, but for the whole colony; it will not injure the Roma farmers or any others. I think that a great deal might be done by the Secretary for Railways and the Commissioners to help the farmers in their difficulties, by enabling them to get their produce to market at low freights. In America they run special freight trains at night, and that might be done here with advantage. Trains might be run to bring down the produce from the Darling Downs at low rates. This matter has been spoken of in this House before, and it is well worthy of consideration. There is sufficient rolling-stock in the colony, and it will cost very little to run them. I may also point out that there is a special rate in regard to Roma wines, which is very low indeed. I have not the figures before me, but the other day a gentleman told me that he brought a case of wine from Roma to Toowoomba, and the freight upon it was four or five times what it would have been from Roma to Brisbane. No doubt the Secretary for Railways will be able to correct me if I am wrong, but that is what was told me.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That low rate to Brisbane does not apply only to Roma wines. There is a special rate for all colonial-made wines to the nearest port.

Mr. GANNON: I think Roma is the only place at any considerable distance from a port where wine is made. That gentleman told me that the freight to Brisbane would have been about 1s. 6d., but he had to pay 6s. to Toowoomba, so that Roma is protected to a large extent. We are not asking such a large concession as that for flour sent by rail either from Warwick or from any other part of the colony. I trust this motion will be agreed to, and I shall vote for it.

Mr. ALAND said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. member who has just sat down is more sanguine than I am. I have not the remotest idea or the faintest thought that the House will agree to the motion that has been brought forward by the hon. member for Warwick. I am not one of those who like to speak about what may happen,

or hold out what amounts to a threat, but I must say that I think the time will come, and that perhaps before very long, when the farmers of the colony will have their interests conserved and attended to, and more zealously guarded than they have been at all events in the past. It is quite certain that the interests of the farmers have been to a certain extent sacrificed of late. I well remember, Sir, when the House was discussing the Financial Statement of the late Treasurer—the hon. member for Bulloo—that hon. gentleman saying that he did not see where he could look for more revenue from services rendered by the Government. I also remember at the same time the hon. member for North Brisbane, the present Treasurer, saying that he did not think that was so—evidently he knew what was going to take place—and that if he once got into the position of Treasurer again he would see if something more could not be rendered for the services supplied by the Government; and here is one of the things which has been done, for the charges for services rendered in the matter of railway carriage on the different products of the colony have been greatly increased.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: And on all other goods too.

Mr. ALAND: It is true, as the hon. gentleman says, that the charges have been increased on all goods, but not to so great an extent—that is, as regards the percentage—as they have been upon agricultural products. The hon. member for Balonne wanted to know where the hon. members for Warwick and Toowoomba were when the tariff of 1888 was brought in and the duty was taken off wheat. The hon. member for Balonne might have taxed his memory, and gone back to the time when this motion was constantly being brought before the House. Session after session some hon. member used to bring forward a motion that the duty should be taken off wheat. That motion was always opposed by the hon. members for the Darling Downs, because they plainly foresaw what would happen—and what really has since happened—if the duty were taken off. The reason why we gave a tacit assent, when the tariff of 1888 was under discussion, to the duty being taken off wheat was largely owing to the fact that the then Treasurer told us that the farmers themselves were in favour of having this duty remitted. But we have heard from the hon. member for Warwick this afternoon, in an interjection, that the farmers referred to on that occasion were men who really had nothing to do—and never have had anything to do—with the culture of this cereal. Now, my opinion is that the agitation for the remission of the duty on wheat was an agitation got up by the few millers of the colony. There can be no doubt about that. I have been connected with the milling trade myself in my time, I am sorry to say; and I know that the duty on wheat, from a miller's point of view, was a matter which was not in their favour. What has been the effect of removing this duty? It will be said that we have had two or three flour-mills established in the Southern portion of the colony, and I am sure we are all pleased to know that these mills are in existence, and we hope that the dividends payable to the shareholders of the companies will be of a very satisfactory nature; but what has happened has been what was prophesied in this House years ago. It has led to a large importation of wheat from the other colonies, and that importation does not benefit the wheat-growers of this colony. It rather tends in the other direction. It is to be borne in mind that the production in the colony of the wheat required for the quantity of flour which is consumed in the colony would be of very much greater benefit than the estab-

lishment of a few flour-mills to grind wheat brought from the other colonies, because, after all, the labour in connection with the working of a flour-mill is not very large. The number of hands employed in and about a flour-mill is not very great, unless the output of the mill is very large indeed—much larger than it is likely to be from any of the flour-mills in Queensland for some time to come. But the growth of wheat in the colony would give employment to a large number of persons, and would keep many a man with his wife and family. Then there is this point: The protective duty has been taken off wheat; it has been taken off at the expense of the farmer, and for the benefit of the flour-miller on the coast and for the benefit of the Railway Department.

Mr. MOREHEAD: And for the benefit of the consumer.

Mr. LUYA: That is not to be considered, though.

Mr. MOREHEAD: No; it is put on one side.

Mr. ALAND: As I have more than once observed, the policy of the Government, both in this matter and in the matter of the railway freights on agricultural produce generally, has been that what they have given with one hand they have taken away, to a very much larger extent, with the other hand; that whilst the duty on different agricultural products was somewhat increased by the tariff of 1888, the action taken by the Government in raising the railway rates has more than counteracted any benefit the farmers got from that tariff. The Secretary for Railways is great on figures; and I confess that in the matter of figures I am unable to compete with him. I do not refer merely to what he said this afternoon, but also to what he said during the discussion of the railway rates, and I really think that the prices he told us with respect to produce sent into this colony are rather beyond what is actually paid. If, Sir, you or I were to go down to any of the shipping firms and ask them what they would bring a ton of chaff from other ports for, we should be given the outside price. We should be told the price was £1 10s. a ton, say—that was, I think, the price quoted by the Secretary for Railways.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I could give it to you at much less than that.

Mr. ALAND: The hon. member for Balonne I know deals largely in that article. The figure does not matter much, because what I want to point out is that the vessels coming here with agricultural produce are chartered at very low rates indeed.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The information I have is from the agents of the vessels. I will place the document I have at the hon. member's disposal.

Mr. ALAND: I really do not want it.

Mr. MOREHEAD: No; you would much rather not.

Mr. ALAND: I do not like to take any advantage of the Secretary for Railways.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You would be taking no advantage. You are welcome to the document, and I wish you would read it.

Mr. ALAND: I may read it to-morrow. The hon. gentleman's good nature is well known, and I for one have never doubted it.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: No; but you doubt my statements.

Mr. ALAND: The contention of the hon. member for Warwick is that flour should be carried at or somewhat near the present rates on wheat. The effect of the present tariff is to force the farmers to send their wheat down to Brisbane, and place them at the mercy of the Brisbane millers.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: They are at the mercy of the Warwick millers.

Mr. ALAND: It places them at the mercy of the millers on the coast, because on the Minister's own showing the carriage on wheat from Warwick is within a trifle of what it costs to bring wheat from Adelaide. We know the Brisbane millers would much rather buy Adelaide wheat if they could get it at about the same price as they could get wheat from the Downs, or the western country about Roma. We know that is the case, and therefore the farmers have to submit and accept the prices the millers down here are disposed to give them. When I compliment an hon. member I mean it, and I say the hon. member for Warwick in bringing forward this motion made a very good speech, and made out a very good case on behalf of it; and whilst I cannot hope with the hon. member for Toombul that it is going to be carried, something of the kind will be carried by-and-by. It will come some day, when, perhaps, as suggested by the hon. member for Cunningham, the farmers are represented by men who will not be so amenable—

Mr. MOREHEAD: Why should they not come here?

Mr. ALAND: I do not say that they should not. I was making use of the remark made by the hon. member for Cunningham. I shall be satisfied to see any class come here, because I believe all classes should be represented; and I believe they will be more fully represented in the coming Parliament than they are in the present.

Mr. LUYA said: Mr. Speaker,—I have listened with a great deal of attention to the various speeches made in support of the motion before the House, and the only conclusion I can come to in respect of it is that it has been framed solely in favour of the Warwick millers. If those who support this motion really have any wish to conserve the interests of the farmers, the motion would be for a reduction in the freight rates on wheat, and not upon flour. If that was done the farmers would be given the advantage of a much larger market, and that is the only way in which a fair and reasonable price can be secured for any commodity. The wheat purchased last year for manufacture into flour in Brisbane brought £80,000; and if the farmers of the Downs were enabled by a lower rate of freight on wheat to send their wheat into the market here, they could have had a share of that £80,000. If the reduction is made only in the rate of freight for flour, the Warwick millers only will get the benefit of it. I look very hopefully towards the establishment and successful issue of the new venture in the Roma district in the taking up of land there for the growth of wheat and the formation of a large agricultural settlement. The soil there is of a different nature to that on the Downs.

Mr. MOREHEAD: It is much freer.

Mr. LUYA: Yes, it is lighter and better adapted for the growth of wheat. Anyone who knows anything of the subject knows that wheat grown on a sandy loam will produce a strong white and better flour than wheat grown on black soil, and it will, of course, command a better price. The price of wheat in Brisbane last year was 3s. 8d. a bushel landed from Adelaide, and at that rate some Warwick

wheat was bought in Brisbane. At the present time it is 5s. 4d. a bushel landed in Brisbane, giving a rise of 1s. 8d. a bushel. With the 6d. a bushel freight the farmers have an advantage of 1s. 8d. a bushel in the price of wheat at the present time, and yet they come down here and ask for a reduction in the rate of freight. It only makes it more clear to me that this motion is in the interests of the Warwick millers, and is intended to stop the mills in Brisbane and prevent also the erection of a mill in the Roma district. It seems to me so evident that I cannot see how hon. members can come to any other conclusion. The market here is open to them, and there is a rise in value of 1s. 8d. Surely there is margin enough there. I was offered wheat from Warwick the other day—2,000 bags—but I am sorry to say it was of so poor a quality that I could not take it. It would not do for us to buy inferior wheat, mix it with good wheat, and thus destroy our flour. In Queensland, the best flour can be manufactured if a good raw article is obtained, and I say if the land in the Roma district is of the sort described, the wheat-growers will always have the Brisbane market open to them. They will not only have two mills to sell to, but in a short time there will be many mills at their command, and competition being the life of trade they will get full value for their product. Now, Sir, if the motion had dealt with a lower rate on wheat, I should have certainly gone with the hon. gentleman. There would have been some reason at all events in his contention. It would have shown that his sympathies remain with the farmers, and not with the millers. In the matter of railway freights we are all on the same level. Everyone has to pay the same rate of freight, no matter whether we live in Brisbane, Warwick, or Toowoomba; but I will give an instance of the competition that the Brisbane miller has to put up with. If others suffered an injustice of this kind they would certainly call out. The rate of freight from Adelaide to Brisbane is 17s. 6d. per ton of 2,000 lb., and from Brisbane to Cooktown £1 15s. per ton. Yet the company that we subsidise to carry our mails along the coast charge £1 15s. from Adelaide to Cooktown. The southern merchant has, therefore, 17s. 6d. a ton advantage over the Brisbane merchant. Now, there is something for the Warwick millers to do; let them try and equalise the different rates of freight. I shall most certainly vote against this motion. As I have said, if it had been framed in the interests of the farmers I dare say I should have supported it, because it would then have opened the whole of the markets to the farming community, and would have led to the establishment of mills in Ipswich and all other centres of population where there is a certain local demand. I will not say anything about the quality of the Warwick wheat.

Mr. PATTISON: You did speak of it, an said it was worthless.

Mr. LUYA: No; I said the wheat we were offered was bad. A number of Warwick farmers have often asked what price they could obtain for wheat in Brisbane, and the answer has been returned to them in all cases that they would get the same price within a trifle that was paid for South Australian wheat. If they can get that, I think they have nothing to complain of. The rates of freight on our railways is a tax on all alike. If the Brisbane merchant wants to send produce to the interior he has to pay the railway freight, no matter what it is, and I for one do not grumble at the rate of freight charged on the railways. I have always grumbled at the general community being called upon to make up the loss sustained by our railways. Cheaper

rates of freight will undoubtedly come when we have a larger population settled inland, and more produce to bring down. That is the only way in which I consider the rate of freight will ever be brought very much below what it is at the present time. I shall oppose the motion.

Mr. FOXTON said: Mr. Speaker,—This is one of those discussions which will continually arise as long as it continues to be the policy of the Railway Department to manage our railways in the way they would be managed if they were in the hands of private companies competing for business and endeavouring to get an immediate return for the money invested. I submit that the railways should be worked in such a way as to ignore, to a large extent, immediate returns, but with a view to the settlement of the country. I understand that the Railway Commissioners are here for the purpose of managing the railways on commercial principles, and although the Government, as has been said by the Secretary for Railways, are prepared to take the whole responsibility for the management of the lines and the tariffs which exist, yet we might fairly look for the carriage of agricultural produce to be arranged in such a way as to tend towards the development of the industry. Notwithstanding the fact that the Commissioners are supposed to conduct the lines on commercial principles, I understand that the freight for the carriage of coal is hardly sufficient to pay the cost. I have been told by the late Commissioner of Railways, Mr. Curnow, by several Ministers, and by one or two of the present Commissioners, that the charge for the carriage of coal at the present time is so low that the coal is practically carried at a slight loss.

Mr. POWERS: Not at a loss.

Mr. FOXTON: Well, at no profit. It is difficult to decide whether it is a profit or a loss. The object, as I understand it, of doing that, is for the purpose of developing our coalfields, and by that means employing a large number of people, and indirectly increasing the railway receipts. It has been alleged by the Secretary for Railways, and probably with truth, that the Warwick farmer can place his wheat in the Brisbane market at a figure slightly below that which is paid for imported wheat. Some hon. members, however, allege that the Warwick wheat is of inferior quality, and that a larger measure of protection than is afforded is necessary in order to give full impetus to that industry. If it will barely pay the Warwick farmer at the present time to place his wheat on the Brisbane market in competition with the Adelaide wheat, surely we should encourage the larger production of Downs wheat by giving even greater facilities to the farmers in that district to send their produce to Brisbane. The loss which the Secretary for Railways has told us would accrue to the country through the carrying into effect of the principle embodied in this resolution is something approaching £10,000; but in order to arrive at that amount, if I understand the hon. gentleman aright, the whole, or nearly the whole, of the flour which is now consumed in the Southern and Western districts must be manufactured from Queensland-grown wheat. I am quite sure that everybody will agree that it is very desirable that manufactures of all sorts, including of course flour-milling, should be encouraged as much as possible, whether in the metropolis or in any other part of the colony. Would it not be far better that the wheat which is now gristed by the mills in Brisbane should be produced in the colony than that it should be imported from another colony? If all the wheat gristed in the colony were produced in the colony, employment would be given to a large number of farmers, and others who are dependent on them,

and other important industries would be called into existence. Mills would spring up wherever the wheat was grown, and though it might have the effect of closing the Brisbane mills they would be replaced by others elsewhere.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The farmers have a market in Brisbane at the present time if they like.

Mr. FOXTON: The hon. gentleman says the farmers have a market in Brisbane at the present time if they like. But the facts which have been adduced go to show that for some reason or other they are unable to avail themselves of that market, and that the imported article successfully competes with the home-grown article. The Minister apparently ignores the fact that all the other colonies make the concession to farmers that is asked for in this resolution. He says that each colony has its own lines of doing business. But, Sir, I contend that the circumstances of each colony are so similar that we would do well, looking at the success which we know attends the Adelaide farmers in growing wheat, to follow the example of South Australia in the matter of railway freights for agricultural produce. It has been said that if this concession is granted it would hamper the industry that is springing up in Roma. I, for one, cannot see that the Warwick flour would successfully compete with Roma for the Western trade. The Roma farmer would have 250 miles less railway carriage, and surely that, with the reduced rates which he would also enjoy, would be sufficient protection for him against the Warwick farmer. It would also give the Roma farmer complete protection against the Adelaide farmer. For the reasons which I have given I feel bound to support the motion of the hon. member for Warwick.

Mr. POWERS said: Mr. Speaker,—I am sorry that so little interest is taken in this matter. Judging by the number of hon. members present during the time the last speaker was making a very good speech on the subject, there are not more than a dozen hon. members interested in the matter. If that is so, it is a very serious thing for those engaged in wheat-growing on the Darling Downs. I believe this motion will affect the Wide Bay and Burnett district, as Professor Shelton has reported that the lands on the Degilbo run, which have lately been thrown open to selection, are the best wheat-growing lands he has seen in Queensland. If that is the case this motion will affect that district as well as the Warwick district. The more we can encourage wheat-growing and encourage people to utilise the land in that district the better it will be for the colony.

Mr. SMYTH said: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to call attention to the state of the House.

Quorum formed.

Mr. POWERS: I am glad that sufficient hon. members have come in to make a quorum. If hon. members think that by leaving the Chamber and getting a count-out they will burke discussion on this question, they are making a mistake; for the motion is bound to be brought forward again, and at a time, perhaps, when other business ought to be gone on with. The matter may as well be discussed now. It is a very serious matter to those engaged in this industry. I do not intend to take up the time of the House long. I noticed that when the last hon. member was speaking, there were only eleven hon. members in the Chamber. I did not draw attention to the fact, because I thought those who were outside did not take an interest in the discussion; but I am certain that if the House is counted out now, more time will be taken up by the subject afterwards. This is not, as has been asserted so often, simply a question of the Warwick

farmers. It is one of general importance, and must affect all parts of the colony where wheat-growing is carried on. If Warwick is so situated as to be able to benefit from this motion, it does not follow that Warwick alone will be affected by it. Those who are engaged in farming know best whether what is now asked for is in their interest. It is said that this concession is asked for in the interest of the millers and not of the farmers. That is a style of argument that is very common. Immediately a person gets up and argues for protection, the freetraders say he is working in the interests of monopolists. My own opinion is that the hon. member has taken this matter up in the interests of the farmers. And we have the additional fact that a deputation from a very large section of people on the Downs waited on the Secretary for Railways, and asked him that the tariff should be reduced in this direction. That convinces me that the interests of the farmers, and not the interests of the millers, are considered in this matter. The motion, I believe, is in the interests of those who want to continue to grow wheat on the Downs. I personally would rather see it grown there than see it coming in from the southern colonies. I shall support the motion because I believe it will give the farmers the protection they require; the protection which was formerly granted to them having been taken off when the new railway tariff came into operation. To further show the anomalous nature of the railway tariff, I may mention that in my own district sugar is charged at the rate of 6d. per ton per mile, while coal is carried at the rate of 1d. per ton per mile. The Secretary for Railways has been told that the sugar-growers will not continue to pay that increased rate, and I think the Commissioners have lately reduced it to 5d. The sugar-growers say that if they cannot get a lower rate they will send it by water. But the farmers on the Downs cannot send their wheat to market by water; they are entirely in the hands of the railway authorities. Then there is the increased rate for carrying timber in my district by rail. It does not seem a very serious increase, but it was the last straw, as it were; the people interested could not stand it, and now they are drawing timber from Tiaro to Maryborough. If I thought there would be any chance of carrying a motion to reduce it, I should have brought one forward before now; but as there is not, I simply enter my protest against it.

Mr. PATTISON said: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to call attention to the state of the House.

Quorum formed.

Mr. POWERS: I say it is against the interests of the country that these railway rates have been increased; it has hampered industry without benefiting the railways or the railway returns. The people on the Downs will see what little interest is taken in this matter when they ascertain the fact that a House can hardly be kept together at the early hour of 8 o'clock. I will not take up the time of the House any longer.

Mr. SMYTH said: Mr. Speaker,—I am somewhat surprised to hear the hon. member for Burrum talking about farming in his electorate. The hon. member represents a coal-mining district.

Mr. POWERS: An agricultural district.

Mr. SMYTH: A coal-mining district. I know more about it than the hon. member does himself. I have had to pass pay-sheets for £50 a month for coal got from a mine in which he himself is, or was, a shareholder. Certainly the coal is carried for 1d. per ton per mile, and that is only a fair thing to develop the coal-mining industry. I do not suppose there is an acre of

wheat in the hon. member's electorate. The hon. member for South Brisbane, Mr. Luya, informs me that he can send flour from Brisbane to Maryborough, and from Maryborough to Gympie by rail, at a cheaper rate than he can send it direct from Brisbane. If that is the state of things it is time it was altered. The poor farmers of the colony are always being brought before the House, and I think they may well say, "Save me from my friends." They are always put down as a lot of paupers. They are nothing of the sort. They are good, honourable men, and they do not want to be dragged here as a lot of paupers. There are plenty of farmers in my district—honest, hardworking men—and they do not want to be held up to the people of the colony as a lot of paupers, always asking the Government for concessions of different kinds. What do the farmers want? Do they want to be placed on a different footing from anybody else? If South Australia can send wheat here, handicapped with insurance, freight, brokerage, and all kinds of imposts, surely our local farmers ought to have a show. There seems to be a tendency to centralise the whole of the farming business of the colony on the Darling Downs. We are to be asked to buy a lot of large squatters out, who have got a great deal of agricultural land on the Downs; in fact, everything is to be centralised on the Downs. I hope some attention will be paid to Wide Bay, and to the fine district represented by the hon. member for Burrum, as well as to the Darling Downs. There is no need for the Government to buy back those large estates. Considering the vast quantity of land we possess, it seems an unwise thing to buy land from other people. We have a big estate. We are not like the unfortunate colony of New Zealand, the Government of which had to buy land from the Maoris before they could sell it to the farmers. We have an immense estate of our own; but every session a sort of third party in this House, that I may call "the hay and corn party," come down to this House trying to get great concessions for the farmers, which I am sure the farmers do not thank them for. They ask for concessions in the carriage of their produce which no other agricultural districts, or the pastoral or mining industries, ever ask for. I do not think that two or three members of this House should be able to monopolise the time of private members. The hon. member for Burrum is, I believe, the greatest sinner of the lot. He and one or two other hon. members monopolise the whole of private members' day. They did it last session and they are trying to do it this. There is only one way of dealing with them—that is, that if they insist upon doing as they have done, other hon. members must stop away from the House.

Mr. MURPHY said: Mr. Speaker,—What puzzles me about this matter is why the Railway Commissioners should think it necessary to make a differential rate—

Mr. PATTISON said: Mr. Speaker,—I am very sorry, but I must again call your attention to the state of the House.

Quorum formed.

Mr. MURPHY: I say I cannot see why it is necessary to make a differential rate between flour and other agricultural produce. Flour is agricultural produce, and I do not see why it should not be carried at the same rate as wheat and all other similar products. If it is necessary to use the railways as a means of developing one industry, I cannot see why another industry, of equal if not very much greater importance, should not be treated in the same way. We all know that the coal-mining

industry is being developed entirely by our railways. That is the policy of the country, and I am not quarrelling with that policy in any way. It is the policy of the country, so far as coal-mining is concerned, for the Government to assist in developing those mines by charging a low rate of freight—a rate which admittedly does not pay, or more than pay, the expense of carrying the produce. If it is necessary to do that in the case of one industry, why should it not be a fair thing to do it with respect to another industry which may also be in a struggling condition? For this reason I am inclined to support the hon. member for Warwick in his motion. Some hon. members in talking about the newly-discovered wheat lands about Roma, which many of us have known for years and years and looked upon as the most likely place in the colony where wheat can be grown that will make as good flour as Adelaide wheat does—I say some hon. members have argued that by lowering the freight on flour made from Queensland-grown wheat we shall be placing the Roma farmers at a disadvantage as compared with the Warwick farmers. I think that is a very stupid argument, because if the Warwick wheat-growers are benefited by low freights upon their produce, the Roma farmers must be equally benefited, because they will still have the protection afforded by the difference in carriage between Warwick and Roma. That will always be a protection to them, such a protection, at all events, as will prevent the Warwick farmers—when they grow sufficient wheat at Roma to feed the Western country—from having a chance against them. Some hon. members argue that this will injure the consumers; but that is a pure fallacy. Although it may not have the effect of reducing the price of Adelaide flour or of flour manufactured in Brisbane from Adelaide wheat, it will have the effect of reducing the price of flour made from wheat grown in the colony, more especially on the Darling Downs. I do not agree with some hon. members who argue that Warwick flour is good keeping flour. It may be better now than it used to be, and I dare say it will improve as the land upon which it is grown gets older, but my experience of flour made from Queensland-grown wheat is that it will not keep in the Western portion of the colony, where we have to store flour for a long time. Therefore, we have always to buy Adelaide flour, or flour made in the colony from Adelaide wheat. I should have very much preferred the motion if the hon. gentleman who introduced it had not put in the words “from wheat grown in Queensland.” If it had read in this way—

“That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable, in the interests of the country, that flour, bran, and pollard manufactured in Queensland should be carried by rail at agricultural produce rates.”

It would then have met with much greater sympathy from me than it does now, because I do not see why the proposed benefit should be extended only to wheat grown in Queensland. I think our millers in Brisbane should receive some benefit from this motion as well as the Warwick or Darling Downs millers. At the same time I must support the motion, because I think it is a step in the right direction. As some hon. members interested in the mills in Brisbane have not thought fit to propose the amendment I have foreshadowed that would make the motion more acceptable to me, I do not think it my duty to do so. I shall support the motion.

Mr. DALRYMPLE said: Mr. Speaker,—I am rather sorry on the whole that I am unable to support the motion. I believe that the rates imposed have been carefully thought out by the Commissioners, also that the Secretary for Railways sees no just reason why the proposed reduction should be made. The Colonial Treas-

urer pointed out that the reduction would affect in the main the millers of Warwick, and that it would deprive a certain portion of the colony—namely, the Roma district—of a protection which it would otherwise enjoy through natural advantages. The hon. member who spoke last does not appear to see that any such protection is afforded to the people of Roma, but I imagine that if their market is to the westward the cost of railway carriage from Warwick to Roma would have to a certain extent a protective result. The hon. member pleaded that because the reduction would take place on the freight of all flour, bran, and pollard throughout the colony, the proposal would not have a protective effect specially with regard to Warwick. It has been pointed out clearly, however, that the cost of carriage between Warwick and Roma would have a protective effect so far as Roma is concerned; and it is not right to take away the result of a natural protection by artificial means. It would have the effect of discouraging private enterprise. If people go to Roma to erect flour-mills, and their calculations are deranged by an alteration in the railway tariff brought about by political influence, it will have a bad effect on enterprise throughout the colony. I cannot help feeling that this is an endeavour to obtain special privileges for a certain number of people—they may be deserving people—at the expense of the community. That is to say, a proposal is made that these articles should be carried at a loss—which is to be borne by somebody—for the benefit of certain persons in Warwick. I am willing to admit that protection under certain circumstances may be desirable in starting an industry; but if we are to have protection we had better have *bonâ fide* protection. To have protection by carrying produce along the railways at a loss is to have protection in such a way that the people do not really know its effect. They cannot calculate what it costs them. I would rather support a proposition to give a bonus to the Warwick farmers than a proposition of this nature, because if we pass this motion, though we shall be doing something which the hon. member for Warwick desires, we shall be also doing something which he does not desire. He desires to benefit his constituents; but I do not think he wishes to do so at the expense of other people. Whatever is done in regard to these freights will be taken as a precedent, and I hope it will be affirmed that advantages shall not be gained in this way by any town through bringing pressure to bear upon this House. No sufficient reason has been shown why the rates should be reduced. The hon. member for Warwick pointed out that the rates in New South Wales on these articles were less than the rates here. That is quite possible. He might also have shown that the rates in the United States were about one-fourth of the rates in New South Wales; but it does not follow that the New South Wales people ought therefore to make their rates conform to the rates in the United States, where there is an enormous traffic. Nor does it follow that the rates here are unfair because they are higher than the New South Wales rates. The management of the railways in these colonies must be conducted with reference to the circumstances of the colonies; and I think there is a desire throughout this colony that our railways should return a reasonable percentage on the cost of construction. That is not only a good thing with regard to the revenue, but also with regard to its effect on the future railway policy of the country. When people desire a railway, they say it will be highly profitable; but the moment they have the railway they say the rates must be reduced. It is evident that the result of yielding to pressure of this

description is likely to have a serious effect when the time comes—I hope it will come some day—for again inaugurating a policy of railway construction. It will be impossible for this House to take into consideration proposals for railway construction, if hon. members urge their construction on the ground that they will pay, and after they are constructed, continually advocate the reduction of freights, although the lines do no more than pay. Therefore we must consider the effect of such a proposal on the future policy of the country; and I think that, as the rates imposed are satisfactory to the Government and to the Commissioners, who have imposed such rates as they believe it is necessary to impose in order to avoid carrying products at a loss, we should, at any rate in this matter, support the Government, who really represent the whole colony. There is no reason to suppose that the Government desire that the people of Warwick should suffer. Knowing the ability of the hon. member for Warwick, and knowing the fertility and importance of the district, there is every reason to believe that the Government would endeavour to conciliate that gentleman and propitiate his district. But if the Government are unable to see their way to agree to this proposal, we should have better reasons than I have heard adduced, why we should step in and pass a resolution which would be distinctly equivalent to a vote of censure on the Government, and also equivalent to a vote of censure on the Commissioners. Before we pass a motion of this sort, I should like to be satisfied as to what the effect of the motion would be. So far as I know, even if we do pass the motion, it will produce no effect. The Commissioners have a fixed position, which can only be affected by a vote of both Houses of Parliament. I assume that the rates they have imposed are rates which they consider fair in themselves, and rates which are endorsed by the Secretary for Railways—in fact, by the Ministers generally—and it seems to me that even if we pass the resolution things will remain precisely as they are at present. There will be no relief granted to the hon. member's constituents. So that apart from the consideration of the position generally, as to whether it is judicious—having reference to the colony at large—to depart from that principle, there is a special application to the motion before the House. I do not think it would produce any effect whatever, and I do not think it is desirable for the House to interfere with a deliberate decision of the Government upon a question of this sort, having in view the consequences which I have endeavoured to point out, and which would in all probability accrue from our interposition in a matter of this sort.

Mr. MORGAN, in reply, said: Mr. Speaker, —I must say a few words in reply, although it seems difficult to keep a House together. Hon. members are quite ready to attend agricultural shows, and assure the assembled farmers and agriculturists of their undying desire to help them. That is the story they tell in the rural districts in the presence of the farmers. But when a subject of primary importance to them is brought forward in this House, hon. members spend their time on the balcony, smoking. Now, I will endeavour to be as brief in reply as possible, but I would like to say a few words in answer to the hon. member who has just sat down. When I was a small boy I, like many other small boys, was very fond of toffy, not the article that there is so much of in this Chamber, but the sweet kind. I also recollect that I had to pay a particularly high price for that toffy, and when I got a little bit older I discovered that the reason I had to pay a high price for it was because there was an import

duty upon sugar; and that that import duty upon sugar was imposed in order that the sugar-planters at Mackay and other Northern sugar-growing districts might be protected. When I got older I found that I was still called upon to pay my contribution to maintain the Central sugar-mills in the Mackay and other Northern districts—sugar-mills that did not pay their way. I suppose the hon. member for Mackay will call that “natural” protection. He does not object to that; but he objects to what he calls “unnatural” protection. I am sorry the hon. member did not go to the trouble of explaining the difference. I think there is a distinction without a difference. What we are asking for is assistance—protection such as is extended to almost every other industry in Queensland, and which, I maintain, the wheat-growing industry is just as much entitled to, and no more. I want to fix the Secretary for Railways upon a statement he made by way of interjection. He assured the House that the present railage rate upon flour does not pay. I want to ask the hon. gentleman now if that statement is true?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Certainly.

Mr. MOREHEAD: That is a very direct answer, anyhow.

Mr. MORGAN: Then we are paying 3d. per ton per mile for the carriage of flour, and that does not pay the Railway Department. I would ask the hon. gentleman: Is it a fair thing to the other portions of the colony that the people interested in coal-mining should have their coal carried at 1d. per ton per mile? How does the hon. gentleman justify his action in giving protection in one case which he refuses to concede in another? I would like to hear the Ministerial distinction between the two charges. If that low rate upon coal is fair, the reduced rate which we are now asking for the carriage of flour, which will be more than double that of coal, is surely fair also. If there is no flour to be carried there can be no loss. The hon. gentleman told us that the granting of this motion will simply mean a loss to the colony of £3,000 a year.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: A great deal more than that; more like £10,000.

Mr. MORGAN: I know what the hon. gentleman said, and I can repeat it. He said the carriage of flour manufactured in Warwick at the low rates would result in a loss of £3,000.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I said nothing of the sort.

Mr. MORGAN: Then he said if the whole of the flour carriage upon the Southern and Western railway system, not manufactured in Warwick, was also carried at this low rate it would mean an additional loss of £5,000.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS said: Mr. Speaker,—I rise for the purpose of correcting the hon. member, if I may be permitted to do so. I said that the revenue from the carriage of 1,560 tons of flour last year was £3,075; but if carried at the rate the hon. member asks for there would be a loss of £2,103.

Mr. MORGAN: Very well; it is less than I said. The hon. gentleman says there would be a loss of £2,103 on flour alone, but I think he looks at the matter simply from the point of view of the Railway Department. But would it not be better to lose that than to lose the whole of the wheat-growing industry?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: There is £5,000 more.

Mr. MORGAN: That is not affected by the motion. I ask, is it not better that we should lose that £2,103 than lose the wheat-growing industry? I maintain that the answer must be in the affirmative. It has also been said by the hon. member for Balonne, and by other hon. members, that this motion has been brought forward in the interests of the millers. That is not so.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It is so.

Mr. MORGAN: That is not so; and it is useless for hon. members representing mining constituencies and squatting constituencies to get up here and attempt to tell the farmers they do not know their own business. They know it a great deal better than those hon. members. The farmers on the Darling Downs have assembled and held meetings, and requested their representatives to bring forward this matter in their interests, and not in the interests of the millers; and those representatives are simply carrying out the wishes of their constituents. The farmers know perfectly well, and hon. members of this House know perfectly well, that any reduction in the value of wheat brought about by the increased railrage upon flour will fall upon the shoulders of the wheat-growers, and not upon the shoulders of the miller. It is only reasonable that must be so.

Mr. MOREHEAD: It is not true all the same.

Mr. MORGAN: The hon. member does not know anything about it.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I say it is not true.

Mr. MORGAN: Then I say the Secretary for Railways does not know anything about it. The hon. gentleman knows a great deal about the distribution of imported flour, but very little about that of flour manufactured in the colony.

Mr. MOREHEAD: He knows how to manage the railways, anyhow.

Mr. MORGAN: The Secretary for Railways is in accord with the hon. member for Balonne on a point of fiscal policy; they are both free-traders. The Secretary for Railways has a temporary period of power, but it will not always be so. I hope not. I hope that the other side will have an innings before long, and I am perfectly sure in my mind that if that result does come about, the result will be very beneficial to the colony. I will not take up the time of the House, as I am sure I cannot convince hon. members; but I will take a division so that I may have the votes of hon. members upon record. I will say this, without assuming the rôle of a prophet, and without threatening, that I have not the least doubt the votes of the farmers will confirm what I have said to-night on their behalf. They are firm believers in the absolute necessity of encouraging that industry in which they are endeavouring to make their way against many difficulties—against the difficulties of nature hitherto, but now against the difficulties interposed by the Secretary for Railways and the Board of Commissioners.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Take up the railways then, and let them go back to their bullock drays.

The Hon. P. PERKINS: Have you ever been a farmer?

Mr. MORGAN: Yes; I have been a farmer. I have worked at farming.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I don't suppose you produced much wheat where you were.

Mr. MORGAN: Well, I have reaped a good deal of wheat in my time.

Mr. MOREHEAD: It was the other fellow who grew it then,

Mr. MORGAN: I will say this again—that I deny *in toto* anything savouring of jealousy towards the industry that is springing up, or that we hope will spring up, in the Roma district. I am told that an hon. member was packed all the way down from Roma to vote against this motion.

Mr. DUNSMURE said: Mr. Speaker.—The hon. member for Warwick has made an accusation against me as the member for Maranoa. I distinctly say that I was not asked to come down here to vote either one way or the other.

Mr. MORGAN: I did not mention any hon. member.

Mr. MOREHEAD: We knew well enough whom you implied.

Mr. DUNSMURE: You ought to have given the name.

Mr. MOREHEAD: You were afraid to.

Mr. MORGAN: I am not afraid of the hon. member for Balonne.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Nor am I of you.

Mr. MORGAN: I do not want to offend the hon. member for Maranoa, and I wish to assure the people of Roma that we are not in any way jealous of their industry; but at the same time I would point out in connection with the industry that it is as yet in its infancy, and that it has not yet been floated. The question whether wheat can be grown in the Maranoa district and the Western district has still to be solved.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Not at all.

Mr. MORGAN: The Secretary for Railways has taken up the rôle of a professor of agriculture, and assures the country that this can be done and that can be done; but the difficulties that wheat-growers have had to encounter are greater than the hon. gentleman seems to imagine. I hope that the Roma people will get over all those difficulties. I hope to see the day when these Western lands will be covered with fields yellow for the harvest. It will be better for all of us; but I say the way to encourage and bring that about is not by crippling the men who have been the pioneers of the industry in Queensland. It is rather to be attained by encouraging them to persevere in the work they have in hand, and by encouraging others to follow their example. They are doing the pioneer work by showing how it is possible to overcome disease, insect pests, and fungoid pests. They are doing good work, not only to the district in which they are labouring but to the whole of the wheat farmers who are to come after them. It is in the interests of these men that I am speaking just now, and it is in the interests of those who we hope will join them, and make wheat-growing a success, that I ask the House to pass this motion, and not in the interests of the millers. The miller is entitled to the same consideration as other manufacturers, and no more. The miller is essential to the success of the wheat farmer; but I would point out that the wheat-grower in Queensland has never come to this House asking for votes for central mills. The mills that the farmer has to reduce his wheat into flour have been erected by private capital and not with State assistance. We have asked no State assistance in any way for the industry. We have asked no special consideration, and we are asking no special consideration now. We are simply asking for the same measure of protection as the sugar industry and other industries are receiving.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Do you want central flour-mills?

Mr. MORGAN: No; we have never asked for them.

Mr. MOREHEAD: And black labour?

Mr. MORGAN: No; we do not want black labour, although I have no doubt the hon. member would be willing to give us black labour if we asked it; but we do not want any form of cheap labour.

Mr. MOREHEAD: You could use the flour to make them look white.

Mr. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am going to push the motion to a division, simply to give hon. members an opportunity of recording by their votes whether they are prepared to give the farmer any assistance or not.

Question put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 11.

Messrs. Morgan, Aland, North, Watson, Foxton, Powers, Salkeld, Murphy, Gannon, Buckland, and Allan.

NOES, 17.

Sir S. W. Griffith, Messrs. Pattison, Perkins, Unmack, Morehead, Cowley, Dalrymple, Dunsmore Callan, Little, Stevenson, Crombie, McIlmaster, Morry, Luya, Adams, and Sayers.

PAIR:

For the motion—Mr. Groom.

Against—Mr. Annear.

Question resolved in the negative.

BONUS FOR THE MANUFACTURE OF CEMENT.

Mr. WATSON, in moving—

That this House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of an Address to the Governor, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to direct that a reward of £5,000 be offered to the person who first manufactures 50,000 casks, or 6,000 tons of cement, made from materials found within the colony, and passing the standard test prescribed by the Railway Department, provided such cement is manufactured within five years from 1st January, 1892—

said: Mr. Speaker,—My only reason for moving this motion is to encourage the establishment of a local industry. We have throughout the colony great quantities of material suitable for the manufacture of cement, and for many years past we have imported large quantities of the article for use in the erection of public buildings, railway bridges, and other public works. I think it would be for the benefit of the colony if we could manufacture here the cement we require. The amount of cement imported into this colony in 1888 was 98,491 barrels, or about 16,400 tons; in 1889 we imported 104,357 barrels, or about 27,425 tons; and in 1890 we imported 78,995 barrels, or about 13,130 tons. In the three years we imported 281,843 barrels, or about 46,955 tons of cement, giving a yearly average import of 93,947 barrels, or about 15,651 tons. There has been a slight falling-off in the imports of this article this year, but that has been owing to the dulness in trade, due again to some extent to the fact that we are not now going on with our railways. No doubt in a little time, when things become more prosperous, and the carrying out of public works and railways is resumed, the imports of cement will be very largely increased. If you look at our railway bridges and railway stations, and at almost any of our public buildings, you will find that imported cement is very largely used in their construction. I would very much like to see this industry started in the colony, and there can be no doubt that if it was once started, there would be an opportunity given for a very large employment of labour. We would require to import the necessary machinery for the establishment of the industry, and it would cost from £25,000 to £30,000. We have ample materials here for the

manufacture of cement, and a great consideration is that the establishment of the industry would give employment to a great many men and boys. That would be a great consideration at a time when the colony is in the depressed state it is in at the present. If we could give encouragement to the establishment of this industry, our unemployed would receive some consideration at the hands of the capitalists of the colony. It is agreed that we have plenty of suitable material in the colony. I have seen it myself in the North, though I cannot give an authoritative opinion as to its quality. There are several hon. gentlemen here who have tested material we have in and around Brisbane, and found it good. I do not know whether it would come up to the requisite test, but that remains to be proved. I have no other motive in introducing this motion than a wish to see the industry get a start. I know other industries have received great encouragement at the hands of the Government, and I am sure every hon. member present has the encouragement of our local industries at heart. With regard to the reward I have mentioned in the motion, it is large, but it must be remembered that it will require a large sum to start this industry. I think as the sugar and cotton industries have received bonuses, that is one reason why this motion might be agreed to. I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. Sir. S. W. Griffith) said: Mr. Speaker,—My hon. colleague, the Colonial Treasurer, is not here. If he were, it would be his duty to speak to the hon. member's motion.

Mr. MOREHEAD: He does not want to be here.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not propose to say anything more than that the Government will offer no objection to the motion going into committee. They will not be able to agree to the terms exactly as proposed, but will offer no opposition to the motion at this stage.

Mr. MOREHEAD said: Mr. Speaker,—This is too absurd. I really feel surprised that the leader of the Government should accept a proposition to go into committee on such a subject as this.

The HON. P. PERKINS: Why not?

Mr. MOREHEAD: Why not? For this reason: That I cannot see any cessation of the number of motions to be put on the paper if we go into committee on a motion of this sort. The proposition is—

“That this House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of an address to the Governor, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to direct that a reward of £5,000 be offered to the person who first manufactures 50,000 casks—”

I suppose the hon. member means the contents of 50,000 casks—

“or 6,000 tons of cement, made from materials found within the colony, and passing the standard test prescribed by the Railway Department, provided such cement is manufactured within five years from 1st January, 1892.”

I think it would have been very much better if the date had been fixed as the 1st April. However, that is a matter that the hon. member in charge of the motion had entirely under his own control; even so, I should have thought that that would be the proper date. Now, Sir, is there any immediate demand for cement in this colony?

Mr. WATSON: Plenty. The freezing works down the river are going to take 100,000 casks,

Mr. MOREHEAD: The hon. gentleman knows all about that apparently. The hon. gentleman probably knows something more than that. Probably he has got some particular object in view, because I do not think any other hon. member knew that 100,000 casks would be wanted at the freezing works. Now, as far as I can understand, there is no building going on in the colony at the present time. It is, of course, very interesting to know that 100,000 casks are wanted at the freezing works, and it may be only fair to ask the hon. gentleman whether he has any special interest in this motion?

Mr. WATSON: None whatever.

Mr. MOREHEAD: To ask this House to grant £5,000 for the manufacture of 50,000 casks of cement is worse than absurd. I have not heard any complaint made by builders in this colony on the question of cement.

The Hon. P. PERKINS: I have.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I have seen cement in the southern portion of Italy, not far removed from Rome, that has lasted for a great number of years. I have not been able to find out that any cement has been made that is better than the cement used there. If the hon. gentleman were to move that a sum of £5,000 should be given as a bonus for the production of cement better than that produced elsewhere, I could understand his argument, but this is protection run mad.

Mr. WATSON: It is not protection.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I say it is protection run mad.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Encouraging native industries.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Encouraging native industries. Well, I suppose that is another way the hon. gentleman has of saying we are going in the direction of freetrade.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not think so.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I am glad the hon. gentleman does not think so. Now, if rewards of this sort are to be offered, does it not strike the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, and who practically has at command the Treasury—which at the present time is so full of money—that such a proposal as this should emanate from the Government? I don't see why the hon. gentleman should be poked in the back by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We like to encourage private enterprise.

Mr. MOREHEAD: The hon. gentleman laughs, and I laugh with him. He likes to encourage private enterprise—the hon. gentleman knowing perfectly well that private enterprise has no chance in this direction. But the Chief Secretary is remarkably clever, and I admire him for it. This is one of the series of comic operas that the present Government have produced. This is not the best. The best we had last night, but this will do as a farce after the more serious comic opera. The hon. member for Fortitude Valley has been put up. He has first consulted the Chief Secretary, because from my knowledge of him when he supported me I know he does not do anything without consulting the Chief Secretary.

Mr. WATSON: That is unworthy of you. I never asked the Chief Secretary or any hon. member in the House.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Of course it is unworthy of me; but the fact is I am dealing with facts. This is what is called a "put-up job." I believe that is the peculiar professional term applied to this sort of thing.

The Hon. P. PERKINS: Where did you discover that from?

Mr. MOREHEAD: From the records of the police office. Well, the hon. gentleman brings forward this motion simply in order to ventilate himself before his constituents. The hon. member knows as well as I do that this is a dying Parliament. I do not regret that this Parliament is in the pangs of dissolution. It is dying slowly but surely, and the hon. member is preparing for what I fancy will be his defeat as far as being a member of this House is concerned. But I am surprised at the reception his motion received at the hands of the Government whom he has supported so assiduously. He supported, first, the Government of which I had the honour to be leader, and now he is supporting the Government of the Chief Secretary. The hon. member has a most convenient mind, a most convenient conscience—a cemented conscience, so to speak. He is told by the Chief Secretary that the Government will offer no opposition to this motion going into committee, but no promise is given that the hon. member will get any support from the Government. There are many old members in the House who know what that means, who know that the Government are simply trying to be civil to an hon. member they do not wish to be in opposition to them. They do not want to throw out the motion, but they know that either the opposition to it will be so strong that they will be able to shelter themselves behind that opposition, or they will be able to defeat it by the amendments which will be made by hon. members on their own side of the House. Has any case been made out in support of the motion? Is the colony suffering any loss by the importation of cement from abroad? If we found that the colony was suffering any loss by present importations, or it was proved that by carrying the motion and giving the proposed bonus a great benefit would result to the colony, then we might view it more favourably, but that has not been proved. I certainly shall oppose the motion and vote against it. I had hoped that the hon. member at the head of the Government which has got a very strong following would have given very good reasons for allowing this motion to go into committee, but he has not done so. If we pass this motion we may have some hon. member introducing a proposal to offer a reward for the manufacture of cement for cementing broken plates, or for cementing parties, or even for making a union, which I think does not exist so strongly now as it did, between certain members of the Ministry. It seems to me that the Government, knowing what the feeling of the House is, should not have been so led away as to agree to the motion for going into committee simply because it is brought forward by an hon. member who not more than twelve months ago sat behind my back, and now sits behind the Chief Secretary.

Mr. ANNEAR said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. member who introduced this motion wants to make the House believe that if it is carried it will be in the interest of protection. I maintain that it has nothing whatever to do with protection. I claim to be a consistent protectionist, and before I sit down I shall show that it is to the general interest of the colony that the motion should not be passed. We have proper material for the manufacture of cement in the district I represent, and in the districts of Ipswich, Burrum, Gympie, Rockhampton, and Townsville. What is the proper material for the manufacture of cement can be ascertained by going to the Government Geologist, or the Brisbane Museum, or by taking up any standard work on the subject. Cement can be manufactured from carbonate of lime 62 per cent., clays containing the necessary proportion of silica and alumina, oxide of iron, magnesia, etc., 38 per

cent.; and those materials can be found in the whole of the districts of the colony in profusion. At the present time there are companies outside of Brisbane, especially in the town of Rockhampton, who are preparing machinery for the manufacture of cement, without coming to this House for any bonus at all. Cement is very cheap in England at the present time, and the freight to the colony is very low. I contend that in order to give persons in different parts of the colony an opportunity of manufacturing cement, the duty on the imported article should be increased. The duty now is 2s. per cask; that should be increased to 4s. per cask. If that is done it will cause cement to be manufactured in various parts of the colony. The hon. member who has introduced this motion, wants the Government to give a bonus of £5,000 out of the Treasury for the manufacture of a certain quantity of cement, but I maintain that it would be far better to increase the duty to 4s. per cask on the cement which is imported from the countries of Europe. By so doing we should cause cement to be manufactured in the colony. The hon. member stated that the persons who might be interested in the formation of this company would spend £35,000 in the erection of the necessary machinery. Why should not a man who has only £500 to spend, and can only manufacture 500 or 1,000 casks of cement in the year, have the same opportunity as is proposed to be given to a big company like that? The hon. member let out something in the few remarks he made this evening, which has gone the round of the city of Brisbane, and was especially referred to by the deputation which the hon. member introduced to the Chief Secretary the other day. After that deputation came out, they said to some of the members, "Oh! there is not the slightest fear of brickwork being substituted for concrete while Annear has a seat in the House and is supporting the Government." Now, Sir, to make a yard of good concrete it will take a cask of cement. There are eleven cubic yards in a rod of brickwork, and to make a rod of brickwork properly it will take eight casks of cement. I have never, since I have been a member of this House, advocated the use of concrete in preference to brickwork, or suggested it to any Minister. With regard to the thousands of casks of cement the deputation referred to as having been used on a particular work, I never had an opportunity of selling one cask to the contractors, and I am very pleased to have this opportunity of saying so. I should like to correct one statement made by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, because I know he would not like it to go forth in the papers to-morrow that he had made a mistake. The hon. member stated that 100,000 casks of cement would be required for the freezing works. I have it from the contractors tendering that, at the very outside, it will not take more than 3,500 casks. I believe the works are the same as those that were lately let at Townsville at a cost of £33,000. The cost of cement alone, for those works, at 10s. per cask, would be £50,000. I trust hon. members, especially those representing constituencies outside of Brisbane—because this little matter has been under consideration a long time—will vote against this resolution. It is not to the interest of the colony to pay a bonus of £5,000 to any separate company who may be first in the field, with all their arrangements complete and ready to go in for the manufacture of this article. I advocate, in the interest of men with small means, as well as in the interests of companies with a large capital, that to foster the manufacture of cement in this colony the import duty should be increased from 2s. to 4s. a cask.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: What is the value of a cask of cement?

Mr. ANNEAR: The value varies. First-class cement can be bought for from 15s. to 15s. 6d. per cask, after payment of duty. Inferior brands can be bought at any price.

Mr. MORRY: Six months ago the price was 17s. 6d. per cask.

Mr. ANNEAR: I have paid as high as 18s. 6d. for it. I know the hon. member, Mr. Watson, is anxious to do all he can in the interest of the working men of the colony. The hon. member stated that our stations and railway works are all now being done in concrete. That is not so. Both at Fortitude Valley and at South Brisbane the stations and sheds are constructed of brick, laid in lime mortar. At neither place is there any concrete above the ground, nor is there at the Brisbane station. At Townsville they have splendid material for the manufacture of cement, likewise at Rockhampton and in the country above Ipswich; and at the town of Ipswich I believe there is no better material in the colony. We have also in the Maryborough district any quantity of the clays, the carbonates of lime, and the silica and alumina I have named. I quite agree with the hon. member for Balonne that if these motions are going to be brought in, instead of the House adjourning next Christmas we shall not adjourn until Christmas twelve months. If we pass this resolution it will do no good to the bulk of the people of the colony. It may do good to a few persons who have got their arrangements properly matured, and who are ready to go into the market and swamp everybody before any other persons are ready to go on with the manufacture. I claim the same consideration for the man who can manufacture 100 casks, as for the capitalists who are prepared to manufacture 50,000 casks. I trust, therefore, that the House will not allow the motion to be carried, and that the Treasurer will see his way to stop the importation of cement from Europe by putting on an extra duty. If he does, we shall very soon see the manufacture of cement taking a prominent place amongst the industries of the colony.

The HON. P. PERKINS said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. member who introduced this resolution did not tell us the place where the materials for the manufacture of cement are to be found. No one would be more pleased than myself to learn that we had the materials for making cement in the colony. I know a little about cement. I paid for my experience. I had to go to law at Frankfort-on-Main, in Germany, over cement. If we had the materials for making it here I should be very glad to encourage the industry. But I think myself that the way to encourage it is to put another 2s. a cask duty on imported cement, instead of offering this bonus. I do not think the people of this country are prepared at the present time to give £5,000 or £10,000 as a bonus for any industry, more especially as we have been so often told by the Secretary for Railways, and by the Treasurer, that the Treasury is empty. Cement is not understood by most people, not even by engineers. I do not think our railway engineers know much about it, although they learned something about it from a contract in which I was once concerned in another colony. The industry, if established, would be a very useful one, and very valuable to the country, but, as I said before, the proper way to establish it is not to give a bonus of £5,000, but to put an extra 1s. or 2s. per cask on the imported article. That would give those who wished to go into the industry some inducement to do so. The hon. member has not told us where the place is where the materials are, or anything at all about it. He simply spoke in a vague fashion. If

he had told us where the material is, and given us more particulars about it, possibly I might have said a little more on the matter. He has neglected to do so; either he does not know or he does not care to give the information. But, under any circumstances, to offer a bonus of £5,000 for the manufacture of cement in the colony would, I think, be a great mistake. I think all that is desired could be obtained by increasing the duty on imported cement. I am in favour of protection in every way, against the other colonies and against the whole world; and if we have the raw materials here necessary for cement, I say let us manufacture it ourselves.

Mr. PATTISON said: Mr. Speaker,—I think there is one reason why all hon. members of this Chamber should oppose this motion. I do not intend to enter into details as to whether we should impose an increased duty upon cement. That is a question that is, or rather should be, outside the scope of our consideration on the present occasion. It is one that may fairly be argued when the question of protection is being fully considered. The question that occurs to me, and to which I think we should devote our attention, is this: Can we, in the present position of the finances, afford to offer to pay any such bonus as is now proposed? I think all hon. members of this Assembly must be convinced from the Treasurer's Statement that we are not in a position to offer any such money for the establishment of an industry that fairly falls within the scope of individual effort. The hon. member for Maryborough, Mr. Annear, has very truly stated that syndicates are being formed for the purpose of starting this industry. It was only while walking up Queen street last Thursday that I was invited to take an interest in a syndicate for the very purpose of starting a manufactory of this sort in the district which I represent. The hon. member for Cambooya has asked where is the material? Well, I think the hon. member for Maryborough, Mr. Annear, pointed out many localities in which the material necessary for the manufacture of cement exists in abundance; and if it is any information to the hon. member, I may say that I possess a property, some thousands of acres in extent, within a very few miles of Rockhampton, where that material is to be found in great abundance. I believe that is one of the spots referred to by the hon. member for Maryborough, in which it is very likely that this experiment will be started. I do not think it is necessary in starting an industry of this sort that we should go to the State cow and request to be spoon-fed. It is a matter for private enterprise, and I think private enterprise will take the matter in hand without appealing to the State. The margin between the cost of the imported article and what it can be produced for in the colony is sufficient to justify the undertaking—that is, supposing that those who enter into the enterprise are satisfied that they can produce quite as good an article. I believe that question is almost set at rest, if not fully so. At all events, evidence has been laid before me showing that I should be justified, possibly, in investing in the manufacture of cement, without something fresh occurs. That is the state of my mind at present. I do not mind putting a reasonable sum of money into that industry, and I shall not come hat-in-hand to ask for a reward for doing what? For looking after our own interests. Supposing the House agrees to this motion, which I say is more than it dare do in the present condition of the finances, it would be in direct contradiction of the Treasurer's statement that we cannot afford to keep even the waterways of the colony open. Under those circumstances how can we vote for £5,000 for such a purpose?

Mr. WATSON: The money will not be due until five years hence.

Mr. PATTISON: I am not one of those who like to discount the future. Of course, I believe that in five years the colony will be in a very much better position than it now is, but do not let us discount future prospects. Let us leave all such matters to private enterprise. If we agree to this we shall probably have people asking for bonuses or subsidies for all sorts of purposes. The bonus system has always been to my mind a rotten one. Why should the taxpayers of the colony be called upon to subsidise a company for this purpose? I am told that some hon. members of this Assembly are interested in a syndicate that is actually formed for the purpose of securing this reward. Whether that is true or not I do not know or care. Rumour says so. I have always been opposed to the bonus system. I remember bonuses being granted in the early days of the colony for different purposes, and it was simply so much money thrown away. I never knew an instance in which an industry of any importance was brought into existence by the bonus system. I do not wish to take up the time of the House longer, but say that I feel disposed to seriously oppose this motion. If I may be pardoned for a moment, I may say that I was very pleased to hear the Chief Secretary say that he is going to abolish private business on Fridays. We have had some experience of it, and I think the sooner it is abolished the better. We may then be able to get a little rest without wasting time, and, on some occasions, losing our tempers as well.

Mr. MACFARLANE said: Mr. Speaker,—I agree with the hon. member who has just sat down in some things, in others I do not. If we could get private individuals to undertake the work that this motion wants the House to grant a bonus for, I do not suppose the hon. member for Fortitude Valley would have brought the matter before the House. It is because no company or individual has attempted to start such an undertaking that the hon. member has tried to stimulate the industry by offering a bonus. Bonuses have not always been a failure. I know that many years ago this House gave bonuses for things that did not fail; but, on the other hand, bonuses have been given for things that have proved a very great success. The bonus system has been the means of starting the woollen mill, which would not have been started without it. It has also been the means of starting a cotton-milling company, which would never have been started if it had not been for the bonus offered. How does the bonus system work? It works in this way: The Woollen Company are now employing over 200 hands who are all consumers of dutiable goods, but those people would not have been engaged in that industry if it had not been for the bonus. If a bonus will lead to the establishment of an industry that will give employment to hundreds of individuals in the colony, the bonus will be paid back over and over again to the Government in a very short time. The hon. member for Maryborough, Mr. Annear, prefers protection. Why? To benefit a few individuals.

Mr. ANNEAR: To benefit the many.

Mr. MACFARLANE: See how this bonus would act. On the one hand, we pay £5,000; on the other hand, cement would be sold to the builder or to the Government at 2s. a cask less than if it came from home and paid 2s. a cask duty. The country benefits far more by a bonus than by protection, though a bonus is protection in another form. Supposing this motion does not pass and a company is formed to make

cement, their first effort will be to get an additional tax of 2s. or 3s. a barrel on cement, and that will go to enhance the profits of the makers of cement.

Mr. LITTLE said: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to call attention to the state of the House.

Quorum formed.

Mr. MACFARLANE said: Mr. Speaker,—I was astonished to hear the argument of the hon. member for Rockhampton, Mr. Pattison, that the colony was not in a position financially to grant a bonus. He must remember that if the work is not started we do not require to pay the bonus; but that if the Government should be called upon to pay it—as I hope they will—the reward to the colony from the establishment of such an industry will pay back to the Government over and over again the money paid out during the next five years. I shall therefore support the motion.

Mr. BARLOW said: Mr. Speaker,—I am thoroughly in accord with what my hon. colleague has said. The only thing to be considered is the cost of the plant to be employed in making this cement. When the cotton bonus was before the House it was stipulated that the plant should be of a certain value. I am entirely in favour of anything that will afford employment to people in the colony; but this question of the plant must be thoroughly considered in order that the bonus may not be given for the manufacture of a large quantity of cement with a very small plant.

Mr. McMASTER said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. gentleman who has just sat down tells us he is prepared to support anything that will give employment to the people. But this will not do it. To my mind this motion, if carried, will have the effect of driving the mechanics already in the colony out of it. It is well known that bricklayers are leaving the colony by the score; and more will leave if this is carried into effect. Brickwork and masonry provide a larger amount of labour for the working classes than cement work. Brickwork affords employment not only to the bricklayer, but also to the brickmaker, the carters of bricks, and the men who get the coal and timber for burning bricks; whereas cement work affords employment for very few men. We have heard from the hon. member for Rockhampton that a company is being formed for the manufacture of cement; that being so I think we should not offer any bonus at all, because it would be almost sure to go to that company. The hon. member for Maryborough, Mr. Annear, who is a cement merchant, has his eyes open; and he has given us his reasons for believing that it would not be a proper thing to give a bonus of £5,000 for the manufacture of cement. He says there is plenty of the material in the colony, and all that is wanted is an extra duty. As a freetrader I am not prepared to go that length with him; at the same time I am satisfied that we have enterprise and capital enough in the colony to start these works without giving a bonus of £5,000.

Mr. MORRY said: Mr. Speaker,—I am sorry I cannot agree with the remarks made by my friend the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. McMaster. I think I may charge him this evening with having spoken upon a subject in regard to which he knows very little. The remarks which he made show his utter ignorance upon this very question. He has told us that the manufacture of cement in this colony would have the effect of putting out of employment a large number of artisans, such as bricklayers and masons. He seems to forget that at the present time we are importing, as his colleague, Mr. Watson, said, about 100,000 casks of cement per annum, and if we could manufacture only 50,000

casks per annum in the colony, we certainly should not be reducing the quantity of work which will have to be performed by artisans in connection with the building trade. I am in a position to know something about this matter. I think it would be a piece of impertinence on my part if I attempted to speak to the hon. member for Fortitude Valley about articles that he is better acquainted with than I am; and that hon. member should not speak upon subjects he evidently does not understand. I am very glad that the hon. member has brought this motion forward. I am glad for several reasons. In the first place, I am always glad to see an attempt made to encourage local industries; and this is an industry which may become a very important one. I am thoroughly convinced that in another twenty years at any rate—and twenty years is a very short time in the history of a country—we shall not only be able to manufacture a sufficient quantity of this article for our own demands, but also be able to export it to other portions of Australia. The hon. member for Maryborough, Mr. Annear, has already told us that this colony possesses, in a very remarkable degree, the very ingredients necessary in the manufacture of this article. All up the coast this material abounds to a very large extent, and also inland from Brisbane, in the neighbourhood of Ipswich, Dalby, and Warwick, besides other places such as Rockhampton. We have very large deposits of lime and silicates, but I would point out that the manufacture of cement is a very difficult industry. It is not every man who can take up a book, read about the manufacture of cement, and then set to work and make it successfully. It requires a vast amount of perseverance and technical knowledge to make it successfully. Since I have been in the colony, some seven years, I have carefully studied it, and am speaking now with some knowledge of the subject. The hon. member for Maryborough gave as a reason for opposing this motion that he did not wish to do anything which would prevent men of small means from undertaking the manufacture of Portland cement, and I should be very sorry to do so; but I know that to successfully start the manufacture of this article a very expensive plant is necessary; therefore it is impossible for men of small means to go in for it. The amount necessary would be from £20,000 to £30,000 at any rate. Several attempts have been made in the neighbourhood of Brisbane and Rockhampton to form syndicates for this purpose, but not one has succeeded. In Victoria, some years ago, no less than £20,000 was expended in an attempt, which failed, to manufacture this article which we import so largely.

The HON. P. PERKINS: That was owing to the absence of material.

Mr. MORRY: The hon. member is right. The principal reason of the failure was the absence of material. I have not the least doubt that had they possessed the necessary material they would soon have imported the necessary experts to carry out their wishes.

Mr. LUYA: How much a cask would it cost?

Mr. MORRY: That would depend entirely upon the quantity which was produced, and the kind of machinery employed. I am in a position to say this: That I am certain that if this industry were established it would require no further protection than it has now. The cost of landing it now is something like 15 per cent. upon the cost of the article at home, and its present value is from 13s. to 18s. per cask. What I wish to point out is just this: That in encouraging the establishment of an industry of this kind, we would be encouraging an industry

which may have a very important effect indeed upon the manufacturing industries of the colony. We have the lime deposits which are necessary, and we also have the necessary coal, which is entirely wanting in Victoria. We also have an advantage over New South Wales, because I happen to know that the lime deposits do not exist there to the same degree that they do in this colony in the neighbourhood of the coal deposits.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Are you interested in this bonus?

Mr. MORRY: I am in no way interested in the bonus this House is now asked to grant. I knew nothing about the motion until I saw it upon the notice paper, and that remark comes with a very bad grace from the hon. member. That hon. member referred to the comic operas which he says have been going on in this House, and all I have to say in regard to that is this, that the most comic figure in these comic operas has been the hon. member for Balonne. I cannot say that I heartily support the amount which is mentioned in this motion; but I hope the House will consent to go into committee. This amount asked for is rather too large, and I should like to see it reduced, but the matter should be debated in committee.

Mr. LUYA said: Mr. Speaker,—I certainly hope the House will not go into committee upon this matter. If any further protection is required for those who wish to undertake the manufacture of cement, the legitimate method is to place a heavier import duty upon the imported article, and not to grant a subsidy. It has been said that syndicates have been formed for the manufacture of this article, and it is also an open whisper that they are waiting for this bonus to be declared before they start operations. I was told that it could be turned out here at a little over 8s. per cask, and if that can be done, or anything near it, there is plenty of margin for a good and legitimate profit without applying for aid from the State. They will do it whether or no. If this motion is not carried they will do it, because they have got everything ready now, although of course if the motion is carried, and they get £5,000, so much the better for them. But there is no doubt that they will make a start in a short time in any case. The first indication I had of this was a statement made yesterday by the hon. member for Stanley, when he informed us that a syndicate had been formed for the purpose of making cement in a part of the Ipswich park—and I notice that the hon. members for Ipswich are supporting this motion. They have got that far, and it is in that direction that the material is to be found. Some three months ago I saw a most beautiful sample of stone cement—in fact it par-took more of the appearance of marble; and if syndicates can only turn out material of that kind they need not fear foreign competition, and they want no protection.

Mr. ALLAN said: Mr. Speaker,—I cannot quite see the force of the arguments used by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. He says that syndicates are now in course of formation, for the purpose of making cement at 8s. a cask, and we know that it costs 18s. a cask.

Mr. LUYA: No.

Mr. ALLAN: We have just been informed that it costs from 13s. to 18s. a cask. It is utterly absurd to imagine that if cement costs even 12s., or whatever it may be a cask, and they can make it here for 8s. a cask, that there is any need for a bonus to be given. But I am sure that if a bonus of even £2,000 is given, it will encourage the formation of a new industry. I know that the material for making cement exists in great quantities in the district I come from; and the hon. member for Balonne, who

scoffs at the motion, has it in his own paddocks at Dalveen. If a small bonus were given it would be a very good thing, as it would start a new industry. At any rate, I do not think we shall do any harm in allowing the motion to go into committee; and I shall vote for its going into committee.

Mr. WATSON, in reply, said: Mr. Speaker,—I have only a word or two to say in reply. A company was formed in Victoria, and they went to an expense of something like £30,000 in getting out the machinery; but through the failure of the engineer in taking out the material it did not come up to the standard of Portland cement, and the machinery is now lying at Footscray. They likewise tried it in New South Wales; and some seven years ago a bonus of £2,500 was offered, and is yet in existence; and they are again trying to make cement in New South Wales. And I hold in my hand the prospectus of a company which it was attempted to start in Brisbane some years ago. I shall not trouble the House with reading it, but I shall read one short extract from it. The capital was to be £250,000 in 250,000 shares of £1 each.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Is that the island down the Bay?

Mr. WATSON: No.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Another one?

Mr. WATSON: The hon. gentleman is dreadful for interrupting. If anyone interrupts that hon. gentleman when he is speaking he does not like it. I consider I am just as good-looking as the hon. gentleman, and I consider that I have as much wisdom as he has; and I can see as far through a stonewall as a mason, and further than the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman does not like others to interrupt him.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I rather like it.

Mr. WATSON: This is the extract I referred to:—

“The cost of such plant, according to the estimates of Mr. Seitz, mechanical and consulting engineer, will be about £38,000, to which add £2,000 for the necessary machinery for cask-making, and there will remain a considerable sum, say £8,000, for contingencies.”

Some hon. members in this House allowed their names to appear as provisional directors in this company.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Read the names.

Mr. WATSON: Perhaps the hon. member's name may be here.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I do not think so. Read the names. Is my name there?

Mr. WATSON: No; the hon. member's name is not here. With regard to what my hon. colleague has said, I may state that the more cement that is used the more bricks there will be used. In Rockhampton there is no natural foundation, and they have to lay about 100 cubic yards of concrete as a foundation for all the brick buildings they put up in that city.

Mr. ANNEAR: That is only 100 casks of cement. It takes a cask per cubic yard.

Mr. WATSON: At any rate, cement is one of the things we require here; and it will give more employment to brickmakers, and stonemasons, and to others as well. I trust my motion will be carried.

Mr. PATTISON said: Mr. Speaker,—I crave the indulgence of the House to make one remark.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member has spoken.

Mr. PATTISON: I wish to correct a misstatement that has been made by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, and I am sure he will withdraw what he has said. I am one of a company in Rockhampton, and our last purchase was 1,500 casks of cement for one work alone, so that the hon. member has not confined himself strictly to the truth.

Question put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 14.

Sir S. W. Griffith, Messrs. Cowley, Unmack, Watson, Isambert, Allan, Adams, Buckland, Morry, Gannon, Barlow, Macfarlane, Morgan, and Salkeld.

NOES, 11.

Messrs. Morehead, Perkins, McMaster, Dunsmure, Callan, Luya, Pattison, Stevenson, Dalrymple, Annear, and Little.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

ADJOURNMENT.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said: Mr. Speaker,—I move that this House do now adjourn. The principal business on Tuesday will be the Special Sales of Land Bill.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at four minutes past 10 o'clock.