

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 29 MARCH 1892

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

QUEENSLAND
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

FIFTH SESSION OF THE TENTH PARLIAMENT,

APPOINTED TO MEET

AT BRISBANE ON THE TWENTY-NINTH DAY OF MARCH, IN THE FIFTY-FIFTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF
HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA, IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD 1892.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, 29 March, 1892.

Vacancy During the Recess.—Member Adjudged Insolvent.—Member Sworn.—Seat Declared Vacant.—Elections Judge for 1892.—Petition: Continuation of Polynesian labour.—Adjournment.—Bill *pro forma*.—The Opening Speech.—Address in Reply.—Auditor-General's Report.—Adjournment.

THE House met at 12 o'clock, at which hour a message was conveyed by the Usher of the Black Rod that His Excellency requested the attendance of Mr. Speaker and hon. members of the Legislative Assembly in the Council Chamber.

THE SPEAKER, accompanied by hon. members of the Assembly, accordingly proceeded to the Legislative Council, and, having heard the Address of His Excellency, returned to their own Chamber.

The House resumed at half-past 3 o'clock.

VACANCY DURING THE RECESS.

THE SPEAKER said: I have to report that since the termination of last session, the death of Francis Reid Murphy, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Barcoo, created a vacancy in the House; that upon the occurrence of the said vacancy I issued my writ for the election of a member to fill the same, making the writ returnable on Saturday, the 26th instant. It was not, however, returned to me until the 28th instant, and upon my so informing the Chief Secretary a proclamation was issued in the *Gazette* of the 28th instant, validating the said election, notwithstanding that the writ therefor was not returned within the time prescribed therein for such return. I now produce the said writ with certificate endorsed thereon by the returning officer of the electorate of Thomas Joseph Ryan as member for the said electoral district.

1892—B

MEMBER ADJUDGED INSOLVENT.

THE SPEAKER said: I have to further report that by notification, dated the 20th day of January last, signed by M. Jensen, Deputy Registrar of the Supreme Court, and published in the issue of the *Queensland Government Gazette* of the 23rd of that month, it was publicly notified that John Francis Buckland was on the 20th day of January adjudged insolvent.

MEMBER SWORN.

MR. THOMAS JOSEPH RYAN was sworn in and took his seat as member for the electoral district of Barcoo.

SEAT DECLARED VACANT.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. Sir S. W. Griffith) said: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move—

That the seat of John Francis Buckland hath become and is now vacant by reason of the insolvency of the said John Francis Buckland since his election and return to serve in this House as member for the electoral district of Bulimba.

Question put and passed.

ELECTIONS JUDGE FOR 1892.

THE SPEAKER said: I have to report that on the 28th instant I received the following letter from His Honour the Chief Justice:—

"Brisbane, 25th March, 1892.

"SIR,

"I have the honour to notify to you that the Judge to preside at sittings of the Elections Tribunal during the current year will be the Chief Justice.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"CHARLES LILLEY, C.J.

"The Hon. the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, Brisbane."

PETITION.

CONTINUATION OF POLYNESIAN LABOUR.

MR. BLACK presented a petition from 400 farmers and labourers in the Mackay district in favour of the continuation of Polynesian labour; and moved that it be read.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said: Mr. Speaker,—I move that this House, at its rising, do adjourn until 3 o'clock to-morrow.

Question put and passed.

BILL *PRO FORMA*.

The CHIEF SECRETARY presented a Bill to amend the law relating to cemeteries, and moved that it be read a first time.

Question put and passed.

THE OPENING SPEECH.

The SPEAKER said: I have to report that the House this day attended His Excellency the Governor in the Legislative Council Chamber, where His Excellency delivered an Opening Speech to both Houses of Parliament, of which, for greater accuracy, I have obtained a copy, which I shall now read to the House:—

“HONOURABLE GENTLEMEN OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, AND GENTLEMEN OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,—

“I have summoned you to meet at a much earlier period of the year than usual, in order that you may be able to deal without delay with matters of urgent public importance.

“During the recess Her Majesty's loyal subjects in all parts of Her dominions have been deeply distressed by the untimely death of the Duke of Clarence and Avondale, the eldest son of the Prince of Wales. I was absent from Queensland when this sad event happened, but messages of respectful condolence on the part of my Government and the people of Queensland were at once transmitted by the Deputy-Governor to Her Majesty and the Prince of Wales, who have been pleased to signify their most gracious acknowledgments of the sympathy thus expressed.

“The condition of the sugar industry in the coast lands of Queensland has for some time attracted the attention of my Government, and it has become abundantly manifest that under the conditions of the existing law a sufficient supply of labour is not available to enable this industry to be extended or even maintained in its present position. Many efforts have been made, from time to time, by the legislature and the Government with a view of encouraging Europeans to undertake this work, but hitherto, from various causes, without success. This matter appears to my Ministers to be pressing, and to demand immediate action. It is well known that a considerable supply of suitable labour can be obtained from the Pacific Islands, whence many islanders are willing and anxious to come to Queensland. You will therefore be invited to remove the restrictions which now exist upon the importation of labourers from these islands, and also to make such provisions as may be necessary to prevent them from entering into undue competition with European labour in other industries.

“The condition of the money market throughout the world is such that we can no longer look to the immediate extension of public works by

means of money raised by loan. At the same time, the need of improving the means of communication with many parts of the colony is urgent. You will therefore be invited to consider proposals for authorising the Government to enter into contracts for the construction of railways approved by Parliament, and to pay for such construction by means of grants of land which would otherwise remain comparatively idle and unutilised. By this means I trust that the construction of necessary railways may be continued, and that the efforts of the grantees of the land may be enlisted in promoting settlement upon the lands granted to them.

“The late prosperous seasons have resulted in a very large increase in the numbers of the live stock of the colony, which are now far greater than are required to supply our own consumption. The markets of Europe are open to the stock-owners, but, having regard to the difficulties of inaugurating an export trade, my Ministers are of opinion that the owners generally may fairly be called upon to co-operate in this work, and a Bill to give effect to this principle will be laid before you.

“GENTLEMEN OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,—

“The general depression to which I have already referred has necessitated the utmost economy in the administration of the government. My Ministers have given their best endeavours in this direction.

“The Estimates for the ensuing financial year will be submitted to you at an early date, and will be framed with a due regard for the circumstances of the colony.

“HONOURABLE GENTLEMEN OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, AND GENTLEMEN OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,—

“I hope that time may allow of your devoting your attention to the draft Constitution for the Federal Union of the Australian colonies under the Crown, which was laid before you during the last session.

“The proposals for the division of Queensland into provinces for the better administration of government in respect of matters of local concern, which were submitted to you in the form of resolutions during last session, will be again laid before you in the form of a Bill, setting out in detail the proposed Constitutions of the several provinces, and of the United Provinces, and the powers of their respective Governments.

“I am glad to think that the organised interruptions to industry to which I had occasion to refer when I last opened Parliament have to a great extent come to an end. The unfortunate effects of this action have, however, not yet ceased. But I hope that, with a fuller recognition of the real community of interest of all classes of the people, and a general determination to rely upon and to develop our own undoubted and ample resources, a restoration of confidence will ensue, and that the existing depression, which is in a large degree owing to these interruptions, will pass away.

"The question of modifying the railway tariff with a view to encouraging agricultural settlement is receiving the anxious attention of my Government, and it is proposed shortly to make some alterations in the tariff which it is hoped will conduce materially to this end.

"A measure to deal with the difficult question of mining on private property will be submitted to you.

"You will also be invited, as time and circumstances allow, to deal with several other matters of importance affecting the good government of the colony. I commend to your best attention the several measures that may be brought before you, and I pray that the blessing of Divine Providence may attend your labours."

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Mr. ANNEAR, in moving the adoption of the following Address in Reply to His Excellency's Opening Speech:—

"To His Excellency General Sir HENRY WYLIE NORMAN, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, Companion of the Most Eminent Order of the Indian Empire, Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Colony of Queensland and its Dependencies.

"MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,—

"We, Her Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, the members of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland, in Parliament assembled, desire to assure Your Excellency of our continued loyalty and affection towards the Throne and Person of Our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to tender our thanks to Your Excellency for the Speech with which you have been pleased to open the present session.

"We, in common with the rest of Her Majesty's loyal subjects, sincerely deplored the bereavement suffered by Her Majesty and the Prince of Wales in the untimely death of the Duke of Clarence and Avondale, and we desire to record our satisfaction that an expression of the sympathy of the people of this colony was at once transmitted by the Deputy-Governor to Her Majesty and His Royal Highness.

"We will give our most careful attention and consideration to the several measures which Your Excellency has specially mentioned, and to all other matters that may be brought before us, and it shall be our anxious endeavour so to deal with them that our labours may be conducive to the material and moral advancement and prosperity, and the good government, of this portion of Her Majesty's Dominions."

said: Mr. Speaker,—I think that this is a fitting opportunity to draw the attention of hon. members to the loss this colony has sustained by the death of the late Francis Reid Murphy, the late member for Barcoo.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ANNEAR: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that that gentleman was held in the highest esteem by every hon. member of this House. An election has taken place since, and Mr.

Ryan, who has taken his seat to-day, has been elected. I must say that I have been pleased by the moderate remarks of that hon. member. I trust he will continue in that line of conduct in this House, and if he does I am sure he will meet with good feeling from hon. members, and will in some way help to carry out legislation which will be for the benefit of the people. Now, Mr. Speaker, the first portion of the Address refers to the death of the Duke of Clarence. His Excellency has very feelingly referred to the sad death of the Duke of Clarence and Avondale, and I need hardly say that this expression of sympathy is re-echoed by every individual member of the House. I know I am only expressing the views of every hon. member when I say there is no colony more loyal to our Queen than this land which bears her name. Nowhere was the sad death of the young Prince more deeply deplored than in Queensland, and I am certain that had this House been sitting at the time a motion of sympathy with the Queen, the Prince and Princess of Wales, and other members of the Royal Family would have been carried unanimously. Now, Mr. Speaker, the next portion of the Address refers to the introduction of a Bill for the re-introduction of Polynesian labour for the sugar industry of this colony. The sugar industry is known to every member of this House as one of the most important industries of the colony, and I think I shall be able to show those hon. members representing agricultural districts that, in the interests of the whole colony, they should support this measure. The Australian colonies, exclusive of Queensland, consume about £2,750,000 worth of sugar over and above what they manufacture. Queensland produces about £1,400,000 worth, and consumes £400,000 worth. Therefore, she exports sugar to the value of £1,000,000, and to supply the present demands of the other colonies must make sugar to the value of £1,750,000 more than she now does. The total value of the sugar to supply the whole of the Australian colonies, including Tasmania and New Zealand, would be £3,150,000. The whole exports of the colony from all sources at the present time amount to about £8,000,000, or £20 per head of the population. We have a large quantity of land in this colony suitable for the growth of sugar. At the present returns from cane and the present price of sugar 320,000 acres of land would bring in a return to this colony of £10,000,000. Now if we can secure, not the £10,000,000, but the £3,150,000, I am confident we should see Queensland in a far better position than that which she occupies to-day. We have 110 mills in the colony, and it has been said, How will the extension of the sugar industry find work for the people? We have in this colony foundries that can turn out the whole of the machinery required. We need not send to England for one shilling's worth of the machinery required to extend this industry. Hon. members can form their own conclusions as to the number of extra mills we would require to manufacture sugar to the value of £3,150,000. A greater acreage will have to be cleared and planted. This means the employment of thousands of white men in every branch of trade, and labourers as well. I was very pleased the other day on reading the speech delivered by the Hon. the Minister for Lands, at Bundaberg, where he addressed a meeting of planters and others, and said the production of sugar must be carried out under two heads; first, the clearing of the land, the planting and cultivation of the cane, also the cutting and loading into trucks and drays—this to be performed by Polynesian labour; and then the

drawing of the cane to the mill by horses and locomotives to be superintended by white labour exclusively. The hon. gentleman further said that the manufacture of sugar in the mill should also be carried out by white labour. Now, hon. members know that the men working in the mills are working under a roof, and not exposed to the sun, as they are in the cane-field. It has been definitely proved that white men will not work in the field in a climate like that of Bundaberg; how is it possible for them, therefore, to work in the fields further North, where the heat is far more oppressive? I have seen in my district the people who clamoured for work, and who proved to be men sent from Brisbane to work on Duncraggan, and who were sent up to try and injure the sugar industry. It was, in fact, a put-up job. I have seen a great deal of the sugar plantations of this colony, and I could refer to many remarks of mine on the subject appearing in *Hansard*. It has always been my contention that the islanders receive humane treatment from their employers. They are well cared for, they are well housed, well fed, and in time of sickness they receive good medical treatment. I hold in my hand, Mr. Speaker, a paper which was distributed outside several churches on Sunday last. It is headed, "God's curse upon black labour. The protest of Dr. J. Paton, chairman of the Presbyterian New Hebrides Mission, against the revival of the Queensland slave trade."

The Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: Don't read it.

Mr. ANNEAR: I am not going to trouble the House by reading it, because it will be quite sufficient to show hon. members what it is worth when I tell them that it is printed at the office of the *Worker*. I ask again, how can hon. members representing agricultural districts oppose the reintroduction of Polynesian labour? Look at the price of agricultural produce at the present time. There are thousands—I believe I should be correct in saying tens of thousands—of tons of agricultural produce in the West Moreton and Darling Downs districts for which there is no market. If we extend the sugar industry, as the Minister for Lands said at Bundaberg, by the employment of the Polynesians in the cane-field and the manufacture is carried on by white men, I venture to state, and I challenge contradiction, that the employment of 100 Polynesians in the cane-fields makes work directly on the plantation, and indirectly outside, for fifty white men. I have the very best authorities for that statement, and, if anything, it is within the mark. There will then be a market for agricultural produce, for which there is no market at the present time. I notice that several hon. members who claim to be protectionists are opposing this measure. Some years ago when this industry was in full swing it was a hard matter to buy draught horses on the Darling Downs. The other day at Ipswich I saw a horse given a ton trial up Nicholas street, and it was sold for £5. Six or seven years ago you could not buy the same horse at Ipswich under £20. So I say it cannot be denied that the extension of this industry will bring about a very different state of affairs. Some hon. members will say, "Look at the returns from sugar this year." Whilst we can see vessels conveying the islanders back to their homes, no vessels are bringing more islanders to engage in the work, and white men will not take their place. So that unless Polynesians are reintroduced this great industry must come to the position that the hon. member for Fassfern said the other night it must come to; that hon. member said, "Let it die out." Can we afford to let the smallest of our industries die out, much less an important industry like this?

Mr. SALKELD: You are not quoting what I said.

Mr. ANNEAR: I am quoting what appeared in the *Courier*: "If people cannot live in comfort let this industry die out."

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: That is what the Chief Secretary said.

Mr. ANNEAR: We hear that the introduction of Polynesians into this colony is slavery. I say there is not a tinge of slavery attached to it.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: You know nothing about it.

Mr. ANNEAR: I know as much about it as the hon. member, and perhaps more, and I repeat that there is no tinge of slavery attached to it. Those men come here protected by the law. The employer must place in the hands of the Government the passage money for their return. They are protected in every way. We are well aware that abuses did exist in this trade long before some hon. members who so much denounce the traffic arrived in the colony; but many members of Parliament, and the people of the country, demanded that those abuses should cease. The Chief Secretary introduced a Bill into the House known as the Polynesian Labourers Bill, which has removed those abuses, and I say that there has been no more abuse in connection with the introduction of Polynesians these last six years than with the introduction of immigrants from Europe.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: You are forgetting the "Hopeful" case.

Mr. ANNEAR: Who are the men who are denouncing the Government and denouncing hon. members who are going to support this measure? The very members who denounced the Government of which the present Chief Secretary was Premier when the "Hopeful" prisoners were sent to gaol. There is also in the colony a sort of religious crusade against the introduction of Polynesian labourers. I must touch upon this, because clergymen have stood on platforms and preached in the pulpits of Brisbane against it. I say they are mistaken in many of the statements they have made. The Rev. Dr. Paton wrote a long letter to the Chief Secretary, denouncing the proposed measure. This same gentleman some time ago brought serious charges against men employed as officers of the vessels and the Government agents. I ask hon. members to look up *Hansard*, vol. lix., pages 1971 and 1972, and read the debates on an inquiry held by one of Her Majesty's commanders of a man-of-war, and they will come to no other conclusion than that it was clearly proved that this reverend gentleman was nothing else but a slanderer and a wilful perverter of the truth.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Shame!

Mr. ANNEAR: I make that statement fearlessly. I am only stating what hon. members can read for themselves in *Hansard*; it is the decision come to by the captain of a man-of-war who presided at that inquiry. From whom do these reverend gentlemen receive the applause which greets them? They receive it from men, the leader of which irresponsible body in this House I heard say he was thankful that he did not belong to any branch of the Christian church.

Mr. GLASSEY: You never heard me say that in your life, and I give it a most emphatic denial.

Mr. ANNEAR: What was their language during the late trouble? "Remember the Commune." The so-called labour leaders of Queensland asked their followers to emulate the deeds of men like Robespierre, Danton, and Marat—to fill the streets with blood—men who not only destroyed sacred edifices, but murdered

in cold blood the bishops, nuns, and sisters of charity, and who, when the guillotine would not do their work fast enough, put those good people into vessels and took them out and smothered them in the sea; the people who set up a goddess of reason to worship, who established a reign of terror abolished all forms of justice, and thrust 200,000 loyalists into prison.

The Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: I suppose you got that from Carlyle?

Mr. ANNEAR: Carlyle's are beautiful works; I have not yet read them through. Mr. Speaker, hon. members are aware that at the present time all branches of trade and industry are depressed.

Mr. SALKELD: Why?

Mr. ANNEAR: The land boom I dare say had a good deal to do with it, and the high prices paid, but the chief cause is the doctrine preached by the labour leaders, who will not engage in work themselves, nor, as far as they can prevail, allow anyone else to do so. Through their action employers were compelled to send to the other colonies for men to do the work which they advised the workmen in the colony not to do, and by following their advice there are hundreds of families in the colony who were previously in good circumstances and are now living in a state of destitution. I think, Mr. Speaker, I have said enough to show that the sugar industry is a very important one at the present time. There is plenty of room for its extension, and it will be, I am sure, one of the best means of restoring the colony to that prosperity which is now absent from us. The next question is the extension of railways by land grants. All hon. members are well aware that it is now almost impossible for the colony to borrow in the English money market for the construction of further railways, and if an equitable proposal is made—fair to the promoters and the people—I shall be prepared to give such a measure my warm and hearty support. We are living in a country having a vast amount of land. We have unlimited resources, which I believe are not to be surpassed in any country in the world, and we ought to utilise them by every means in our power. Then comes the question of a bonus for the export of meat. I think there will be no trouble in passing a measure of that kind through the House, because the pastoralists will be only taxing themselves. The next question is the federation of the Australian colonies, which will no doubt receive your most serious consideration. Also the proposals for the division of Queensland into provinces for the better administration of government in respect to matters of local concern.

The Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: Bogus concern.

Mr. ANNEAR: That too, will, I am sure, receive your serious consideration. As I said before, matters are very depressed in the colony, and in connection with that subject I shall now refer to the words spoken by a very high authority, as they appeared in the *Brisbane Courier* of yesterday morning. A deputation of the unemployed waited upon his Eminence Cardinal Moran, in Sydney, and the Cardinal said this—

"He could not deny the existence of vast numbers of unemployed, but he regretted that there were vast numbers of professional unemployed, men who were sowing dissensions and stirring up evil passions, a class of men who had a hand in everything except work."

There is no doubt about that. We have seen some of the men of that class in front of Parliament House to-day.

The Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: Very decent men.

Mr. ANNEAR: I am sure that every hon. member must have heard with disgust their hootings at our respected Governor and their cheering of the hon. member for Bundamba. What do they cheer him for? Is it for the state of destitution he has brought them to at the present time?

An Honourable Member: Yes; of course.

Mr. ANNEAR: As regards their hooting of me—I left this House in company with my wife—I take their hootings as a compliment, but I wish to point out that they cannot respect even a woman. And, Mr. Speaker, these men talk about the brotherhood of man. I would like any one of them to show me where he ever performed one act which would entitle him to claim the brotherhood of man. Look at the late dock strike in England! Look at the state of parties at that time in this colony! While labour gave its 1s. or its 2s. 6d., capital gave its £10 and £20. Supposing the same strike to take place to-morrow, what would be the result through the action of the so-called labour leaders? I say "so-called," because to call them "labour leaders" is a libel on labour—men who will not work themselves and try all they can to prevent others from working. I am an old unionist; I was a unionist in England for many years, and during the whole of my life I have tried to do something to benefit my fellow-men. I shall now, Mr. Speaker, give a quotation from a work written by a leader of labour in the House of Commons, Mr. George Howell, member for Bethnal Green. About twelve months ago he wrote a book entitled "The Conflict Between Capital and Labour," and in a later book he reiterates the opinions expressed in his older work, and further draws attention to what he speaks of as "one of the leading characteristics of new unionism, the habit of fiendish vilification of every man who differs from them. The vilified man may have been for years a hard-working unionist of the old school, but that does not save him if he does not accept the teaching of the new order." I think I have detained the House quite long enough. I thank hon. members for the hearty reception and patient hearing they have given me. Last night week, Mr. Speaker, I appeared before the largest meeting that was ever held in honour of a public man in the town of Maryborough. It is said that the righteous will be crowned after they are dead; but, Sir, the manhood, the intelligence, and the independence of Maryborough crowned me last Monday evening. I stand here—

Mr. NELSON said: Mr. Speaker,—I rise to a point of order. The hon. member is referring to a meeting at Maryborough; there is nothing about such a meeting in the Governor's Speech, and I submit that the hon. member's remarks are therefore irrelevant.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member has not raised a point of order. The hon. member for Maryborough is quite entitled on the motion before the House to refer to the meeting he has mentioned.

Mr. NELSON: My point of order is in regard to the Standing Order referring to relevancy—that an hon. member addressing the House must speak to the question. The question before the House is the Governor's Speech, and there is no mention in that of a meeting at Maryborough.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member's point is not a point of order. A great deal of latitude is always allowed in discussing the Address in Reply, and the hon. member for Maryborough is quite in order in referring to the meeting.

Mr. ANNEAR said: I thank the leader of the Opposition for giving me an opportunity of having a little rest. I have now come to the close of the Speech as delivered by His Excellency to-day; but there is one matter that I omitted to refer to, but which I wish to mention. A reverend gentleman in Maryborough, on the platform, said that the introduction of the Polynesian labourers was worse than the slave trade in America. Now, I am sure that had that gentleman known what he knows at the present time he would not have made that statement. I find from the return I hold in my hand that there are only 3 per cent. of the prisoners in the colony who are Polynesians. When I was in America I visited the gaol in Washington, called the Model Prison, and in that gaol 80 per cent. of the prisoners were coloured people. I have great pleasure in moving the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor this day.

Mr. WATSON said: Mr. Speaker,—I have much pleasure in seconding the adoption of the Address in Reply, and in doing so I must congratulate the hon. member for Maryborough for the masterly style in which he has moved the adoption. He has stated distinctly that he thinks the Government have acted wisely and justly in what they have done, and that the Government need not fear as to the results of their actions. With regard to the first question, I am very pleased indeed to think that the Government have called us together so early. They have not made a great many promises, nor are they, I think, going to split hairs; but, at the same time, it shows that they have the interests of the country at heart, more particularly as the country is in such a depressed condition. Every hon. member knows perfectly well that the depression which exists at the present juncture has never been equalled since 1866, if it were equalled then. At that time, three months after that period of depression, the colony was flying ahead, and a period of prosperity came which was the means of introducing a population which has done a great deal of service in this country. I am pleased to see that the Government are about to reintroduce kanaka labour for the sugar plantations. I have been many years in the North, and I have carried out many works in the North, but have never been opposed to the employment of kanakas in the canefields, although I have been strongly opposed to the abuses which existed in bringing them from their islands to Queensland. I have seen many kanakas crying bitterly when leaving Queensland, and have heard them state that they would come back again provided they were allowed to do so, as they had been so well treated and so well fed. If proper restrictions can be placed upon the trade, so as to employ proper men as the captains of the labour vessels, as recruiters, and as inspectors to visit the plantations and see that the kanakas are well and fairly treated, the sentiment which prevails at the present moment would not be felt by the great labour party. It would be a great injustice, after having sold the sugar lands on the understanding that the purchasers would be able to obtain kanaka labour for the fields, if they were prevented from obtaining that labour. I have travelled over the North, and I have been on most of the plantations. Even in 1878 I visited a number of plantations, and I was truly pleased at the treatment that the kanakas received—more particularly at Ingham, where some of them were better treated than some white men. I know that the workers of Queensland are not against the employment of the kanakas in the sugar industry. The workers are decidedly opposed to the Polynesians being brought

into competition with them, and taking the bread out of their mouths. I have seen kanakas employed in various occupations. I have seen them driving horses and carts and working on wharves. I have seen thirty carts at a time driven by kanakas carrying sugar from the mills, and I have seen them employed on board steamers, taking the bread away from white men. But I am positive that the Government can and will place such restrictions upon the kanaka labour, that in a year or two hence the colony will be in a prosperous condition by the granting of kanakas to the sugar plantations. I can say from experience that in many cases those who were savages when they landed in Queensland went away Christians. In 1872 I saw kanakas brought to Ingham who stared about as if they were mad; but twelve months after they were put on a punt and taken up the river, they were pulling the punt and doing all the work themselves, the same as if they had always been used to it. I know that there is a great deal of sentiment amongst the missionaries in the South Sea Islands, and for what reason? Because, by taking the kanakas away from the islands the incomes of the missionaries are no doubt in a great measure reduced. I have been in a number of the islands of the South Pacific, and I found in all the churches I was in that all the week they were engaged in making copra, the cocoanuts being pitched outside on the Sunday. That is no doubt one reason why the missionaries of the South Sea Islands do not wish the kanakas to come to Queensland, as it is a great loss to them. With regard to this question, the Government are acting very justly and wisely, and I trust they will carry it through to a successful issue. I was a short time ago before my constituents. I told them plainly that I intended to vote in favour of the proposal indicated in the manifesto of the Chief Secretary, and I still intend so to vote, knowing well that good results will follow the reintroduction of kanaka labour. I have myself been a large employer of labour; I have never employed kanakas, but I have noticed that when the sugar industry was in a prosperous condition I always had to pay higher wages to my workmen. I remember that during the time the sugar industry was most prosperous, men refused 12s. a day to work at Ingham, Mackay, and Townsville, and I paid as much as 17s. a day for good carpenters, and also their expenses up and down. But what is the state of affairs at the present time? Why, you can get men at 9s. per day. What are the workers doing in reference to the proposed extension of the period for the introduction of Pacific Islanders? I believe that the shipwrights, ironworkers, and the workers in many other industries in Brisbane are decidedly in favour of the continuance of kanaka labour on the sugar plantations. I am confident that when I recently addressed my constituents in Fortitude Valley nearly three-fourths of the electors approved of granting kanaka labour to the sugar planters so long as it was restricted to the canefields, and I firmly believe that three-fourths of the people of Queensland view the matter in the same light. We all know very well that at the present time the struggle for subsistence in Brisbane is very hard indeed with many people. Last Wednesday, while I was on the new wharf which I am just about completing for the Australian United Steam Navigation Company, I saw no less than 450 women, cleanly dressed, going over the river to the immigration barracks to get relief, and I could not help feeling deep sympathy for them in their unfortunate position, as I observed the women and children crying bitterly. I thought then that if instead of giving relief the Government

would set apart 7,000 or 10,000 acres of good land, pick out the good husbands of those women and settle them on the land under village settlement conditions, they would be doing one of the most meritorious actions that has ever been done by any Government. Settling people on the land, and that only, will be conducive to the permanent welfare of the colony. Queensland has been endowed with abundant resources, and she is bound to thrive in spite of blunders in legislation and in the actions of the labour organisations, whose objects may be right, but whose method of attaining their objects are thoroughly wrong. I respect labour and love my fellowmen. I have worked hard for my living in this country, often from fourteen to sixteen hours a day, and as an employer of labour I can truly say that I have never done a single bad action towards my workmen. But what do we find is taking place among workmen at the present time? We find that many of them are taking jobs so cheap that they can only make about 4s. a day at them, while persons like myself have to pay the same class of workmen 8s. and 9s. a day. Such action tends to intensify the evils of the existing depression. The remedy for this state of things is very simple. Let every man be at liberty to work for whom he pleases and for what he pleases, and enter into contracts on his own account; let there be freedom of contract. No institution has any right to dictate to a man whom he shall work for or what he shall work for. Let every man be at liberty to do the best he can for himself, and there is no fear but that he will get on in the world. That is the way I got on, and I would like my fellowmen to adopt the same course. I shall not take up the time of the House much longer. It is not long speeches that we require at the present time. We have been called together earlier than usual, and having now met, I hope that we shall all do the best we can for the country, and assist in formulating such legislation as will benefit the workers, as by benefiting the workers we shall at the same time benefit the whole community. The worker must, however, join hands with the capitalist, otherwise we shall never prosper. I had a letter from a friend of mine in New Zealand the other day, and he says the shearers there who came to Queensland last year stated that they were received right royally and well treated, and trust that they will have another opportunity of coming back here and earning an equally large sum of money.

Mr. HYNE: We don't.

Mr. WATSON: No, we don't, but there will not be a satisfactory state of things in the colony until there is harmony between capital and labour. Labour must join hands with capital; if it does we shall have prosperity in less than two months, for prosperity will come as sure as the sun will rise to-morrow. Queensland has got unbounded resources, unbounded wealth, and has been endowed beyond any other country in the world. I am a labour leader as much as any hon. member in this House, and I would beg of those who claim to be labour leaders, for the sake of their fellowmen, to preach the gospel of peace, and not a gospel which enjoins workmen to work only for certain persons and on certain conditions. Preach peace, and there is no fear what will be the result.

"Heaven metes us mercy here below,
As we to others mercy show."

I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The SPEAKER said: In presenting the motion which has been moved to the House, I think it my duty to call the attention of hon. members to the fact that the practice followed

hitherto in this matter was not adhered to to-day. The practice of referring the Address in Reply to a committee of the House, in order that a formal address may be brought up before the motion for its adoption is moved, is merely the practice as stated in the Standing Orders. It is not necessary that that course should be invariably followed, and the practice adopted to-day is the practice now followed in the House of Commons. I have, however, felt it to be my duty, under the circumstances, to call the attention of the House to the fact that a change has been made.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said: Mr. Speaker.—The usual practice followed after the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Governor's Speech has been put from the Chair is for some leading member of the Opposition to rise to comment upon it, and usually also upon the conduct of the Government during the recess, and upon any other matters to which he may think it right to call the attention of the House. It is therefore somewhat unusual for me to rise at this stage of the debate. I do so on this occasion, and not altogether without precedent, because the circumstances of the case are unusual, and I think it is not unfitting that I should make a statement to the House, which will to some extent be in the nature of a Ministerial statement, that may be fittingly made at this period of the session. But before I do so I desire to say a word or two with reference to some other matters. The first is the loss of our friend, Mr. Murphy, the late member for Barcoo, a man who, I am sure, was the friend of every member of the House. The death of no member of this House would have been more regretted, and the regret in this instance was the greater, because the hon. member's death was so entirely unexpected. I wish also to refer to the melancholy event referred to in the Governor's Speech—the death of the Duke of Clarence and Avondale, the eldest son of the heir apparent. We express in the proposed Address in Reply officially and collectively our sympathy with the Queen and the Prince of Wales. There is another lady not less worthy of our sympathy, though the usages of Parliament do not allow of her being formally referred to. If ever there was an object for the sincere sympathy of the civilised world, it is the lady who was so suddenly compelled to resign the prospect of occupying the proudest throne on earth and a long life of happiness, and who was in a few days deprived both of her lover and of a future throne. I am sure we all feel the warmest sympathy for her as well as for the father and grandmother of the late Duke. Now, to come to the matters which specially induced me to rise at this moment. Parliament has been summoned to meet at an unusually early time—at a time which certainly is not suitable from the point of view of the convenience of Ministers, however it may suit other hon. members, as it has given them an unusually short time within which to prepare for the session. Parliament has been summoned so early because, as stated in the Governor's Speech, it is thought desirable that we should deal at once with matters of urgent public importance. I intend to refer now especially to the question of the introduction of coloured labour on which so much has been said of late. It is just six weeks ago, I think, since, with the consent of my colleagues, I addressed, through the Press, a manifesto to the people of Queensland. I am glad to know it reached not only the people of all Australia but also a great many people in Great Britain and in some Continental countries. The matter has attracted, if I may say so, world-wide attention. The Government considered it to be a matter of most serious consequence, and of such importance that they were

bound to take Parliament into their confidence, and ask their opinion upon it, at the earliest possible moment. I shall ask hon. members to bear with me while I read what I said on that occasion through the Press, and it will shorten the rest of what I have to say. I may confess also that I should like to see it embodied in the pages of *Hansard*. I know the course adopted was somewhat unusual. This is the manifesto I addressed to the people of Queensland, and all others who would read it. I said this:—

"In common with the rest of the community the Government have of late had their attention directed to the present condition of the sugar industry in Queensland, and especially to the difficulty of obtaining labour for carrying it on. It cannot be too often impressed upon our minds that we all directly or indirectly depend for our livelihood on the products of the land of the colony. Any serious falling off in its productiveness, from whatever cause, is therefore a matter of national concern. It has been urged that a revival of the sugar industry, which is at present in a condition of depression and uncertainty, would result in a restoration of prosperity throughout the colony. But while I am unable to attribute to this cause alone so much of the prevailing depression as some people are disposed to think, many other causes being apparent not only in Queensland but throughout the rest of Australia, I have arrived at the conclusion that it is the imperative duty of the Government, and perhaps more especially of myself, to whom rightly or wrongly much of the blame or credit of the existing state of things has been attributed, to review the present position, and to state plainly what we think is the right policy to be adopted by the country at this time. The urgency of the case induces me to adopt the present somewhat unusual mode of declaring that opinion.

"You are aware that I have been for many years one of the most determined opponents of the introduction of servile or coloured labour into Queensland. My objection has not been on account of the colour of men's skins, but I have maintained that the employment of such labour under the conditions to which we had become accustomed was injurious to the best interests of the colony regarded as a home for the British race, and principally for the following reasons:—

1. It tended to encourage the creation of large landed estates, owned for the most part by absentees, and worked by gang labour, and so discouraged actual settlement by small farmers working for themselves;
2. It led to field labour in tropical agriculture being looked down upon as degrading and unworthy of the white races;
3. The permanent existence of a large servile population amongst us, not admitted to the franchise, is not compatible with the continuance of our free political institutions.

To these reasons was added, so far as Polynesian labour is concerned, the discredit that had been brought upon Queensland by the abuses that for some years prevailed in the South Sea Island trade.

"I recognise the force of those reasons as fully as ever. It was, however, answered that tropical agriculture could not be performed by white men, and that the employment of coloured labour was therefore inevitable. This statement I always doubted, and careful inquiries made from time to time led me to reject it altogether.

"My objections to Polynesian labour were, however, from the first, less strong than to the introduction of Asiatics. The people of the Pacific Islands are not so numerous as to be a permanent danger to our social or political institutions, and I have always regarded their employment as a temporary and transitional expedient. It was not, therefore, until 1855 that I was induced, under circumstances to which I need not now refer, to propose to put a limit upon the time within which they might be introduced. And this proposal, which was accepted by the Legislative Assembly without division, though not without dissent, was, I believe, supported as much on the ground of the scandals which had attended the labour trade as for any other reason.

"Let me now invite your attention to what has happened since that time. I will state results only. But I premise that those results are, in my opinion, due, in great part, to the legislation to which I have just referred, as well as to a general conviction, on the part of the planters as well as the people generally, that a radical change was necessary in the system of sugar culture.

[The CHIEF SECRETARY,

"In the first place, the system of large estates worked by gang labour has fallen into dis favour. The owners are not only willing but anxious to sell or lease portions of their estates to farmers who will themselves grow the cane and sell it to the manufacturers. And it is recognised, I think generally, that in future the cultivation of the cane and the manufacture of sugar must be in different hands.

"In the second place, it has been established by actual trial that sugar is a profitable crop to be grown by small farmers, if they can command a sale for it to the manufacturers at reasonable prices. And this system is already carried on with great success, notably in the Bundaberg, Mackay, and Herbert River districts.

"In the third place, it has been proved that in Queensland cane can be grown by white labour. I am aware that this position is still disputed, but it is admitted by most of the more liberal-minded planters with whom I have been in communication.

"These results have not, however, been attained without the troubles which invariably attend the trying of new experiments. Successive Governments have endeavoured to assist the enterprising experimenters, by giving facilities for the introduction of European labour of various kinds and by aid to central mills. But these endeavours have been counteracted from two different directions. While some of the planters have loyally tried to make the best of the altered conditions and prospects—and I am glad to know, in many instances, with conspicuous success—others for a long time set their faces against any change, and did all in their power to compel a return to the old objectionable state of things. On the other hand, amongst the working population, whose interests I had perhaps too exclusively in view, there has arisen a body of men, claiming to be leaders of thought, who have by their speech and action rendered it impossible that the experiment of the employment of white labour in tropical agriculture should be fairly tried. There are not at present in Queensland a sufficient number of Europeans able and willing to do the necessary work, and to take the place of the Polynesians who are gradually leaving the colony, and of whom no more can be introduced under the existing laws. Yet every opposition has been offered to the introduction of any additional labour, the opinion has been promulgated that field labour in tropical agriculture is degrading, and the employment of white labour in that industry has been denounced except at rates of wages which the industry cannot pay. In short, these men will neither engage in the work themselves, nor, so far as they can prevail, allow anyone else to do so.

"In the meantime the planters as well as the smaller farmers already engaged in sugar culture do not know where to turn for the necessary labour to cultivate and take off their crops, while the many others who are anxious to engage in the industry on the new conditions are deterred from doing so for the same reasons. The immediate prospect is that many of the mills will be closed and some removed, and the productiveness of the lands of the colony, instead of being largely increased, will be seriously diminished.

"We are then in this position:—On the one hand, it is proved that the sugar industry offers a field for the settlement of numberless families upon the land, where they can live and bring up their families in comfort. The danger of the aggregation of large estates is past; and it is shown that Europeans can engage in the industry with success when certain preliminary work has been done. On the other hand, in many places that preliminary work has not yet been done, and where it has been done the necessary European labour is not here, and cannot at present, nor for some time to come, be brought here. And before it can be brought here under existing conditions there is great danger that this means of employment for it will to a great extent have disappeared.

"What then is to be done? It is, I conceive, the duty of the Government under such circumstances to offer their advice to the people.

"At the last general election the question of the continued introduction of Polynesian labour was treated as settled in the negative, and I accept my full share of the responsibility for that result. But, in my opinion, the altered condition of things not only justifies but demands a reconsideration of the whole position.

"And it seems to me that there are only two alternatives—to do nothing, and let the sugar industry slowly struggle on until the necessary European labour can be introduced and acclimatised, with the possible result that in the meanwhile it may be greatly diminished, if not altogether extinguished; or to take some action to bridge over the interval which must necessarily elapse before the change of system can be brought about. This

can only be done by making immediate provision for the supply of some labour which is at once available. With such a supply I believe that in a few years the existing large plantations would be divided amongst small farmers, while large numbers of farms now held by selectors would be devoted to the cultivation of sugar-cane for sale to central mills. Such a result, which is now no longer a matter for fanciful conjecture, is, I think, worth striving for, and we ought to adopt the means most likely to bring it about.

"The only form of labour that is, under existing circumstances, immediately available for this purpose seems to be Polynesian labour. And I think, as I have said, that this labour is less open to objection than any other form of coloured labour. If, then, the system, now happily inaugurated, of small farmers is to be carried on to a final success, I can see no alternative but to permit for a time at any rate the resumption of Polynesian immigration.

"Adequate provisions must of course be made, and they can be made, for preventing abuses in the introduction of the labourers, and for preventing them from entering into competition with white labourers in other occupations, and it should be provided that the immigration shall continue (unless, of course, otherwise determined by the legislature) for a definite but limited period of, say, ten years. By that time I have no doubt that such further developments will have taken place as will enable the sugar industry to be carried on without fear of our reverting to the former system, with its dangerous incidents and consequences, and in the meantime I believe that a valuable impetus will be given to the producing industries of the colony.

"I have not arrived at this conclusion hurriedly, nor, I confess, without reluctance, and I am not unaware that I may be charged with inconsistency. But those who keep steadfastly in view the great end of settling a European population upon the lands of the colony, and the maintenance of our free political institutions, will not, if under existing circumstances this end can only be attained by a temporary change in the means, be deterred by the fear of a charge of inconsistency from proposing the only practicable means. I believe that the adoption of this course at the present time will tend to that end, and for the reasons I have given, I am satisfied that the social and political welfare of the people will not now be imperilled by it.

"I should add, that while my colleagues concur in the conclusion, I am alone responsible for the political retrospect, and for the arguments."

I have read that manifesto, because it is upon that matter I have to speak. That manifesto, I believe, has produced already considerable effect. I believe it has given a tone of encouragement and hopefulness to the people in many parts of the colony, where before there was a feeling almost of despair. That is something to have done. On the other hand, as has been said by the hon. member for Maryborough, Mr. Annear, it has been met by the most extreme vilification. No attempt has been made to meet argument by argument; no attempt has been made to combat the arguments I have put forward; but they have been met by the wholesale vilification of those who do not consider themselves so wise that they cannot be taught. I do not think that sort of argument will have much effect, however. As has been pointed out by Mr. Howell, vilification is the special weapon of a particular class of people who have lately made a great noise—condemnation of all those who will not do what they are told by them. I am very sorry that a matter of such serious consequence should be so dealt with. I hope that during the debates that will take place on the subject during this session, it will be dealt with as a matter of serious importance to the welfare of the colony, and not by the vilification of one man or another. I certainly shall not be deterred by any amount of abuse from pressing forward anything that I consider to be for the benefit of the country, and I do not think any useful purpose is to be served by adopting the arguments of abuse. Only to-day I received a resolution on this subject, which contained the most remarkable combination of abusive epithets which I have ever seen in any resolution respecting myself. But that sort of thing does not carry

any weight. This is a matter that must be carefully considered and earnestly thought out. I ask hon. members to consider the present state of the country. There is no doubt the country is in a state of very serious depression. How is that depression to be remedied? I will put the arguments very briefly. How can you remedy the depression?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: By establishing confidence.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: To establish confidence is a good thing to begin with, but confidence alone will not produce bread and butter. Food must be got from somewhere. Where is the food to come from? The only possible way is to increase the producing powers of the earth. Let us begin with the case of the unemployed persons at present in Brisbane—the people who disgraced themselves to-day by insulting one of the noblest gentlemen who ever set foot in Australia. Take the case of those men. They want money to buy food. How are they to get it? By work, I suppose. I hope so, at least. That is the way they ought to get it. How are they to get work? Are they mechanics or general labourers? No one wants houses built in Brisbane just now. Very few people want repairs, and therefore that sort of work is not required. Why? Because the population of Brisbane have not so much to live upon themselves as to have any superfluity to expend for such purposes. But it is necessary that these people should find work. There must be some kind of employment found for them unless the population of the city is to decrease instead of increase. The proportion of the population of these cities who earn their living by direct production is a very small proportion of the population. The greater number really are distributing media. They receive goods from abroad; they distribute them to the people in the interior who produce, and in the same way they deal with goods for exportation. They are middlemen and media of transit. There is no doubt that, as a matter of fact, the people in the towns are to a great extent consumers, and the beneficial work they do is for the most part the work of middlemen; that is to say, they transmit productions from one part of the earth to another. But that work cannot be increased unless there is more work found for them by men who are actually engaged in raising produce. The pastoral industry finds employment for a great many people, and the mining industry keeps a great many people in the city going, but beyond those what have we? The only thing we have to look to to raise the country out of its depression and to find employment for the people who are here, and for more people whom we hope to see here—because I suppose most of us desire to see the population vastly increase during the next few years—I say the only thing we have to look to is an increase in the agricultural production of the country. That is the only thing to which we can look for a permanent alleviation of the depression existing at the present time. There is nothing else. If hon. members do not believe it, let them controvert the argument. Will hon. members bear that in mind, and also persons outside the House who denounce every proposition made by the Government as if the Government were a set of malignant demons who go about seeking whom they may devour; as if the Government were not charged more especially than any one else with the duty of seeking the welfare of the country, and as if it were not a sufficiently difficult task for them to see how best they can do it. Can we not have credit for trying to do our best, and to reach to the root of things, and base our proposals upon the only sound foundation? It

may be said, Why not borrow more money? That is the advice given by some persons, which, if followed, might produce a temporary and fictitious, but only apparent prosperity. That is to say, it would give higher wages for a time to a number of people. But that comes to an end, and then you have to pay the interest.

Mr. DONALDSON: It is only lately you have found that out.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. gentleman says it is only lately we have found that out. Are there any of us who can afford to throw stones at one another? I certainly do not claim to have been wiser than my generation for the last twenty years. We are all of us to blame more or less, and I think it is our business at the present time not to engage in recrimination with one another, but to help one another, and to help the country as best we can out of its difficulties. I have pointed out the absolute necessity of looking to the increased productiveness of the land, and getting more people to settle upon it, as the only certain means we can look to for getting over the present depression. What agricultural industries have we in the colony at the present time? We have the growing of wheat and maize. Maize is certainly not a very profitable crop at present, I understand; but wheat is profitable everywhere, and no doubt the cultivation of it will be largely increased in the future. But there are large areas of rich agricultural land in the colony that are not fit for growing wheat, and are fit for growing sugar. We have had for some years a large sugar industry going on in the colony. At present it is certainly not increasing; indeed it is suffering under a very great depression—so great indeed that only three or four months ago it was the avowed intention of the owners of certain mills and land to withdraw from the industry—to save as much out of the wreck as they could, and then withdraw. It is of no use denying that. But if the sugar industry is doomed to disappear, what have we to take its place? Nothing. Some of us—I for one—have been struggling for years to induce white people to engage in that industry—taking the place of the kanakas whom they desired to displace. I have done my best, and what do we find? How many amongst the unemployed persons in the community who are clamouring to go upon the land have been found willing to go to work upon the canefields at reasonable wages? Not one of them. In one instance some men did go; they were said to have been sent by the unions. But there is very strong reason to believe that before these men went on to that plantation it was arranged that they should make the experiment a failure. That was the only experiment that was tried. It is a fact that those men who are clamouring for access to the land, and to keep out the kanaka, have absolutely refused to do his work.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: At kanakas' wages?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I never heard of white men being offered kanakas' wages, nor has anybody else. But if an industry cannot afford to pay more than a certain wage, either people must take that wage or the industry must stop. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. LUYA: How much did the Alice River settlers earn?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am afraid not very much, nor will anybody else on that land. There is no doubt, as I said, that if an industry cannot pay more than a certain wage, people must either take that wage or the industry must stop. But, I ask, what right has anyone to say that some of the best

portions of Queensland shall remain idle because certain persons will not work under present conditions? I maintain we have not the right to do so. What right have we here, more than the Chinese or the kanakas? Only that we are here, and have the strength to keep them out, and that we are justified in keeping them out if their being here would be injurious to our social welfare. That is the only right. But we are not strong enough, nor is any nation in the world strong enough to lock up a portion of the earth, not using it themselves and not letting anybody else go upon it.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: How was that with regard to the transcontinental railway?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member is thinking of something quite different. If he will only make his interruptions relevant to the subject, I shall be only too glad to answer them. What is the position we find ourselves in? At the present time this industry is languishing, and by the end of the year it will be much worse. Yet we cannot afford to sacrifice it. We cannot afford to go back; we cannot afford to stand still. As to the unemployed—a term which I fear is becoming one to be almost ashamed of, as was shown by the extract the hon. member for Maryborough read from Cardinal Moran's letter—the men unfortunately out of employment, what remedy has been suggested by their own leaders who go about denouncing the Government? What do they propose? They took in hand, first of all, to regulate the mechanical industries. What was the result with respect to those industries? A large number of mechanics have been driven out of the country, and of the remainder over one-half are out of work. Then they took in hand to regulate the pastoral industry of the colony. With what result? That between £60,000 and £70,000 was spent by the Treasury—which could ill afford it—to keep order and to prevent something like a threatened revolution, and that the men engaged in that industry, so far from being better off, are much worse off than they were before. And not only that, but a large amount of wages which would have been spent in the country have been sent abroad to New Zealand. That is the result of their efforts to regulate the affairs of the country. They have taken in hand two of the great industries of the colony, and they have now, I am sorry to say, begun to take in hand the third. Now, if for any reason the Government are prevented from adopting the best possible course in any case, surely the proper thing to do is to adopt the next best course. That is the only practical way in which to deal with questions. Suppose, for instance, a man said he had conscientious objections to drink anything but filtered water, and found himself in the interior where there is nothing but unfiltered water, the only alternative for him would be to drink unfiltered water or die. Here we find a great agricultural industry in such a condition that there are only two alternatives—either to let it be carried on with the assistance of coloured labour or to let it die; and I say that any man in this colony, or any member who will stand up in his place in Parliament and say he would allow a great industry to die is a traitor to his country.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. SALKELD: What is the qualification?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The only qualification is that the means proposed to attain the desired result are not morally wrong. That is the only qualification.

Mr. SALKELD: A very important one.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: A most important one, and one that I have always put forward. The first question to ask in dealing with any matter is—Is the proposal morally wrong? If it is not, then it is entirely a matter of expediency whether it should be adopted or not. That is the only manner in which a solution can be got. For these reasons, which I shall not dwell upon at greater length, I believe the only chance we have of saving a great industry is to remove the existing prohibition with regard to Polynesian labour. It is said that this is inconsistent with what I have said and done before. I do not think it is. I am not ashamed at any time to admit that I have changed my opinions, if I have done so. I have certainly not changed my object. It is not my object to keep out black men, yellow men, or white men, or anyone else; my great object is to see the country prosperous, and if we cannot attain that without letting some black labour into the country I say let us have it. Surely the prosperity of the country is of greater moment than the question whether we shall have a few black men in our streets—not in our streets, I hope, but on our plantations. I have endeavoured, as long as I have been able to understand things, to distinguish between the end and the means. I know that is a lesson some people never learn, but I have always endeavoured to make that distinction. The end is the good government and the welfare of the people. Means may vary from time to time, and, if some means are proved to be insufficient, then others must be adopted. I have said more on that subject than I intended. I now come to a very important matter, that is for the purposes of the day. When the Government had come to that conclusion, it was plain to them that it ought to be announced at once because of the things they saw going on around them—that this industry was languishing, and that the depression in the country, so far from being relieved, was rather increasing. Therefore they announced their intention and summoned Parliament together at the earliest possible moment at which it could be done with fair notice to hon. members. It is said that this Parliament has no right to deal with the subject. That is the point that I wish particularly to address myself to. Some hon. members consider themselves mere delegates—mere mouthpieces.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Special pleading.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Does the hon. member know anything of the theory of representative government?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: No; you know it all, so how can I know anything.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Will the hon. member please restrain his epithets until he has heard what I say? The theory of representative government is this: The whole of the people are not able to make laws for themselves, and they therefore choose from among their number certain persons who they think are fit to make laws for them, and send them into Parliament for a fixed period for that purpose.

Mr. DRAKE: Under certain pledges.

The Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: Who was sent here under pledges?

Mr. DRAKE: About sixty, I believe.

The Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: I was not.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That, I say, is the theory of representative government. Of course, before the electors elect a man they like to know what his opinions are, and they ask him accordingly; but whether a man who goes into Parliament with the intention of pursuing a certain course is justified in not doing so

under an entirely different set of circumstances is a matter for his own conscience. Supposing a man said that he would commit suicide in a certain event, would he be bound to do it? I do not think so, although in Japan it was considered that a man may be bound in honour to do it. I do not think any man is bound to do that which is wrong. This Parliament was sent here for five years to legislate for the good of the country; for four years we pursued a certain policy, which in the opinion of the Government, and I believe of an overwhelming majority of this House, now requires a change, and it is necessary that that change should be made at once, if for no other reason than this: That the seasons do not wait for us. The seasons will not wait until a certain number of days have revolved from the election of this Parliament. If anything is to be done for the benefit of the agricultural industry to which I refer it must be done at once, so that the people engaged in it may know in time to plant their crops. That is surely an important matter. No doubt, when the general election comes on next year, the people will speak out with no uncertain voice on this subject.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: And I have not the slightest doubt as to what their opinion will be.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why not go to the country now?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am coming to that. The people who are dependent on this industry cannot wait until it is known what the opinion of the next Parliament is. At least the Government think so. Of course there may be differences of opinion on that point. Some people say that the sugar industry is now more prosperous than ever, and others say that it ought to go to destruction. All argument is wasted upon them. I believe that I am addressing myself to a number of reasonable men, both inside and outside this House, who desire to do what is right. It is plain that in order to decide what is to be done during the coming season, there are only two alternatives—either for this Parliament to deal with the question or to dissolve the House and have a general election. This House is perfectly competent to deal with it. The suggestion occurred to myself—seeing that some people think I have changed my opinions—

The Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: The versatility of genius.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I say it occurred to me that I should like to resign and go to my constituents; but looking at the condition of the country I did not think that in the position I have the honour to occupy, I should be justified in doing so to gratify mere personal feeling on my part. In fact I think it would have been an extremely improper thing to do. Then the Government had to consider whether it would be a proper thing to dissolve Parliament at the present time. Why should it be dissolved?

Mr. DRAKE: Because it has lived too long.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Why should the Parliament be dissolved because perhaps half a dozen members think it has lived too long? Whoever heard of a Government having a large majority desirous of carrying on the business of the country dissolving Parliament because a few members say it has lived long enough?

Mr. DRAKE: Because the leaders have changed their policy.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member says Parliament should be dissolved because the leaders have changed their policy. If there was the slightest doubt as to whether the policy

of the Government was that of the country there might be some reason in it, but when it is clear beyond all reasonable doubt that the people have changed their opinions, and that the Government are only giving effect to the general opinion of the country, I think it would be wicked for the Government to ask for a dissolution.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Perhaps we should do like an hon. member who lately went before his constituents, and said he held certain principles; but if they did not like them they could be altered. Because a mere handful of certain persons happened to be present at his meeting he accepted their views, and promised to alter his principles straight away. I think, however, that when he comes to meet his constituents he will find that it would have been better if he had stuck to what he said were his principles. Now, if Parliament is satisfied—and of that who can be the judges except Parliament—that we do represent the opinions of the people of this country, I say the Government have no moral right, although they have the physical or constitutional power, to dissolve Parliament. I did not come to this conclusion hastily, for I confess my first thought was that we should have a dissolution. My natural impulse was that, as there had been a radical change of opinion on the part of the Government, of Parliament, and I believe of the people, it would be best to dissolve; but on further consideration I came to the conclusion that if we really represented the opinion of the people, and there is no moral doubt about it, then we had no right to dissolve. Then, again, we had to consider whether on other grounds a dissolution would be a desirable thing at the present moment?

MR. DRAKE: You will get no confidence in the country till there has been a dissolution.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is a matter of opinion, and different people form different opinions. The Government had to form their own opinion, and they did so with the best lights they had; and we did not consider that in the present condition of the colony the turmoil of a general election, with such indications as we have had of the gospel that is to be preached throughout the colony by a certain section of the community, would be to the benefit of the country. The Government had to take into consideration the actual condition of the colony. They know more about the actual condition of things than it is necessary to explain at length, but members on both sides of the House know the actual condition of this country at the present time. I believe it is the opinion of a very large majority—of all but a handful of hon. members—that a dissolution ought not to take place at the present moment unless it is absolutely necessary. We believe that we have a right to act on this opinion, although a number of persons outside the House, and who would like to get in, think a dissolution would be an admirable thing. Apart altogether from matters personal to ourselves, I believe that our decision has been rightly come to, that a dissolution is not desirable at the present moment. Under these circumstances I think we are bound to ask the opinion of this House this year. This Parliament cannot bind a future Parliament. This Parliament cannot bind the next Parliament. If the Parliament which must meet here next year disagrees with anything we do they will at once reverse it, so that no irretrievable injury can be done in the meantime by doing what we propose to do, that is simply to allow what has been going on for several years to continue for one year longer, until another Parliament has an opportunity of

reversing it. No Parliament can bind its successors. These are the reasons that induced the Government to meet Parliament at this time, and why they intend to ask Parliament to deal as soon as possible with this urgent and pressing question—because we want to give immediate relief to the sugar industry. We want to give that relief in time for those engaged in the industry to take advantage of the coming season, and that is the reason why we meet just now. I am very sorry that some of the various things that have been said in opposition to the policy of the Government have been—I do not wish to call them unfair arguments; but it is impossible to call some of the things that have been said fair arguments. I shall mention one matter. Something like a religious crusade has been started. I think it is a most unfortunate thing that a manifesto—or I believe it is called an appeal—should have been issued, addressed to the people of Australia, of Great Britain, or of the world, against the proposals of the Government. I have read this appeal with the greatest pain and regret, because, although the statements contained in it are mostly true—literally true—yet the only impression that would be produced by reading it, upon the minds of persons not intimately acquainted with all the facts of the case, would be absolutely false. It is not much less unfair than to go to the South Sea Islands and abuse the Roman Catholic Church, on the ground that there used to be an Inquisition in Spain.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yet the fact is certainly true. I certainly am not going to minimise anything that took place in connection with the "Hopeful" atrocities. Those matters have been referred to. I have been in nearly all the places where those atrocities took place, and I say that there is no more chance of kidnapping a man in those places where kidnapping took place years ago than there is of kidnapping a man in Fortitude Valley. Is it fair to hold out to the world that a state of things would continue which was severely punished by the Governments of this colony when they discovered its existence, and which has absolutely ceased to exist? That is not fair argument. I am sorry to see ministers of the Christian religion injuring their own power and influence in the world by using such arguments.

The Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: They used to burn one another.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That might be used with equal force as an argument against Christianity. Of course, whatever is done, whatever conclusion Parliament may come to, I am quite sure hon. members will see, and the Government will see, that the abuses which took place in the past are not continued. I think it is very unfair—I might almost say unchristian—to state, as has been openly said, that the Government are deliberately intending to reintroduce those abuses and atrocities. I have said that I have adopted the unusual course of speaking at this period of the debate because I thought it just as well, in the unusual circumstances of the case, that the House should be in full possession, as early as possible, of the reasons which have induced the Government to summon Parliament at this period of the year, and of the reasons why we think it clearly within the province, and is also the duty, of this Parliament, to deal with this matter and during this year.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. NELSON said: Mr. Speaker.—There has been a departure this session from the ordinary practice of Parliament, and to some extent I

thoroughly coincide with what has been done. It has always appeared to me that the appointment of a committee to draw up an Address in Reply to the Governor's Speech is a piece of mummery—one of those farces that we have derived from somewhere or other in olden times, I don't know where, but the significance of which I have always failed to see. We generally see a couple or a quartette of hon. members appointed to make a committee. They go outside the House, perhaps to the Ministers' room, or perhaps down to the bar, and they pretend they are drawing up the Address in Reply. They come back and bring up an address, and within a minute or so the Clerk produces about 100 copies of this address, which he has by some species of legerdemain had printed. I think it is quite time we did away with this farce. Now, there has been another departure from the ordinary course as well, and because it is a special occasion, and that Parliament has been called together out of the ordinary course, it has appeared to the leader of the Government to be his duty to give some explanation of this procedure. To this I do not object. It is usually the lot of the leader of the Opposition to congratulate the members who are selected by the Government to propose and second the Address in Reply. On this occasion I will thank the hon. member who proposed the Address in Reply, first of all, for his special reference to my friend, Mr. Frank Murphy, the late member for Barcoo.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. NELSON: I wish to do that, and I also may thank the leader of the Government for his nice reference to that gentleman. I think he echoed the sentiment of every member of this House. Having been a particular friend of the late hon. member, I should like to add my feeble testimony to his worth, and to the reverence in which we hold his memory. I think we can all agree on the solemn occasion of offering our condolence to Her Majesty the Queen on the sad affliction of Providence that has been suffered by Her Majesty and by the whole British nation. I am glad to see that introduced into the Speech; and I need not refer to it further than to say that I believe every member of this House cordially sympathises with Her Majesty and with the British nation. When I get beyond that part of the Speech I feel that I am in the position generally occupied by members appointed to propose the Address in Reply, who begin by craving some indulgence on account of being new members. The members at the command of the Ministry on the present occasion have not done so, and it falls to my lot to ask for the indulgence of the House, because this is the first time that I have addressed the House on the occasion of a Governor's Speech, my reason being that I have always looked upon the thing more or less as a piece of tomfoolery, more particularly when we see it made the occasion of trying to get an expression of opinion from the House on matters which are not really before it. The real object of a Governor's Speech is to present us with a concise syllabus of the business we have to transact during the session, and in that respect it is a good thing; but we might just as well have the whole thing published in the *Gazette* that calls us together. And if the Government would give an assurance that after we had done that business we would be free to go home and look after our own affairs, there would be something in it—or even if we were assured that we would not be called upon to transact any business not mentioned. I see a clause in this Speech which I fully expected to find—namely, that the Government reserve to themselves the right to introduce a Bill on any mortal subject.

The Bill we have read a first time to-day is one I do not like; but I most of all object to the practice of introducing a Bill *pro forma*. It is nothing but a fraud, and the sooner it is done away with the better. I get the credit of being a most staunch member of that ancient order vulgarly denominated "Tories"; but I certainly am not in favour of perpetuating this mummery at the opening of Parliament. I would like to see it all wiped away, retaining only what is useful. With regard to the speeches we have heard this afternoon, I must say that I cannot congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. It would have given me great pleasure to have done so, but I really cannot conscientiously do it. When a Speech from the Crown has been given to us, we do not expect it to be made an occasion on which to obtain an expression of opinion from the House on matters altogether outside the Address. Anyone listening to the hon. member for Maryborough, Mr. Annear, would think he was making a second-reading speech on some Bill which he has in his possession, and which no other hon. member has seen. He has his statistics all ready, and he gives us an amount of detail that would hardly be admitted on a second-reading speech; and then he asks us to approve of some clause in the Governor's Speech. I ask, in the name of the House, is it fair to expect us to give an expression of opinion on the hon. member's details on a measure which we have not seen, and which we only know in a general way? I say it is altogether unreasonable, and altogether beyond the constitutional practice of Parliaments throughout the world, more particularly the Parliament of Great Britain. Are we to accept the details of the hon. member for Maryborough as gospel? I say no; I say they require verification. Then I particularly object to the speeches made by the mover and the seconder—and this also applies somewhat to the speech made by the leader of the House—on the ground that they were polemical speeches. This is no occasion for making polemical speeches and throwing down challenges. I would like to know to whom those speeches were addressed. I do not think they were addressed to me or to this side of the House; and I do not think they were addressed to the House as a whole. They exalted and magnified two or three members on the cross benches, and addressed the whole of their remarks to them.

Mr. ANNEAR: Not at all.

Mr. NELSON: I think the whole of those speeches were addressed not to this House, but to a few members of the House. The hon. members who have spoken actually threw down a challenge; their words mean war; they want a disturbance, and I suppose they will have it. I suppose they will get their way. After the challenge which has been thrown down—in my opinion in the worst possible taste—I expect to find that this session will last till next Christmas. I may say that I am a disciple of the gospel of sweet reasonableness. I believe that if the speeches made by hon. members contained more of the spirit of reason, and less of the pugnacious element, the business of the House would be very much facilitated. I do not intend to go into details with regard to the Governor's Speech, because I do not think this is the proper occasion. I have never seen much good come out of speeches made on the Address in Reply, though it is a capital occasion for the leader of the Opposition to criticise the Government; and perhaps no leader of the Opposition ever had a better opportunity than I have at the present moment of throwing mud. That, however, is an occupation which I despise. I do not believe in throwing mud at all. We are only too glad to congratulate the Government

upon their conversion. I think, Mr. Speaker, the present Opposition have shown a great deal of skill in doing nothing. We like to sit quietly and see our own policy carried out by other people, who do it very nearly as well as we could do it ourselves. I am not going to follow the leader of the Government in his disquisition as to constitutional law. Constitutional law is a thing that I abominate. I am quite sure when the hon. gentleman is so particular in laying down the constitutional law, that he is wrong. If he were not so particular in laying it down, he might possibly be right, but on every occasion that I have had to deal with his constitutional law I have found that his constitutional law is very weak. It is one of those things which we make for the occasion, and which exists only in the mind of the speaker. The only difference between the leaders of the Government at present, because there is a dual Government, is that one is always right and the other is never wrong! As I have said, I am not going to follow through the whole speech. We are willing to accept the speech in reply, because the speech in reply is colourless; there is nothing in it so far as I have been able to read it. I forgot, there is one point which I marked as worthy of notice. I must say I object to tell His Excellency the Governor, whatever the Government may do, and I think the House will agree with me, that we will give most careful attention and consideration to all other matters that may be brought before us; I do not promise anything of the sort. I am quite prepared to give my attention and consideration to the three or four measures specially defined, but beyond that I am not going to make any promise.

Mr. HYNE: Won't you deal with a Sanitary Bill?

Mr. NELSON: I have dealt with that already and dismissed it. There is one other small matter, and yet I do not know that it is a small matter either, that I may refer to. I think I have said before, with regard to several Bills that are specified here, that this is not the time for the House to give any definite opinion upon them. The proper time for us to do that will be when we have the Bills before us, and when they come up for their second readings. It may be that some of these Bills may be considered not worthy of that consideration, and should be thrown out at once. In that case it is the duty of any hon. member who thinks so to move an amendment. I have no intention of moving any such amendment, because I think the Bills specified are worthy of consideration; but I am not going to commit myself to everything, more especially to the speeches that have been delivered from the other side. I am perfectly prepared to take these Bills into consideration, and give them the best consideration that I can, and I believe that by adopting a policy of that sort we shall be able to advance the best interests of the colony. What I wish to draw attention to is this: In the paragraph which refers to land-grant railways, near the end it says—

"By this means I trust that the construction of necessary railways may be continued, and that the efforts of the grantees of the land may be enlisted in promoting settlement upon the lands granted to them."

What I want to know now is whether there are any grantees of land in the colony or not? I doubt very much whether there is a single grantee. I have a couple of hundred of these grants myself, but apparently, so far as I can judge by what is going on, they are positively worthless. What is to become of all our grants of land? Can you expect grantees of land, every one of whose grants may be called into question, to assist in constructing railways?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We have not a Government of confiscation yet.

Mr. NELSON: We have not; but we have courts of law that will confiscate. I think the Government should be compelled to bring in some legislation on the subject to tell us whether our titles signed by the Governor are of any value or not. If this matter is not decided I firmly believe that nothing that has happened, not the quarrel with the Bank of England, or the stonewalling in 1889, or anything else, will do so much harm to the credit of the colony as the doubt thrown upon grants of land. I think it is the worst thing that has happened to us yet, and the severest blow that we have received. The time is short, and I think I have said all I ought to say upon the present occasion. I can only add this: That with regard to the specific measures of the Government, I know I can assure the Government that, from this side of the House, they will have the most careful and favourable consideration.

Mr. MACFARLANE said: Mr. Speaker,— We have had two or three changes this session from what has taken place in past sessions. I do not know whether these changes are omens of good or omens of evil. The first change is the early time of the year at which we have been brought together. The next thing that we may look upon as a change is the shortness of the Governor's Speech; and then we have another new departure in the non-appointment of a select committee to prepare and bring up a reply to His Excellency's Opening Speech. I do not think any of these changes will tend to do any harm; they ought rather to tend to better debates. The early meeting of Parliament this year will, I hope, be taken as a precedent for future sessions, so that hon. members may have an opportunity of meeting earlier than we have done in the past, as it is much pleasanter to sit here during the winter months than it is during the summer months. With reference to the mover of the Address in Reply, I think he rather went out of his way to attack the labour members. There is no use in any member of this House intensifying the evil that exists by aggravating his opponents. Such a course can tend to no good; it can only result in evil. The hon. member also referred to the kanakas as being well looked after and well fed, and he assured this House that they received the best medical attendance. I want to know if it is really a fact that these kanakas have in years past had the best medical attendance? If so, why is it that so many of them drop off this mortal coil, and that according to the last statistics we have they have been dying at the rate of six to one of the white people of the same age? Does that show that they have had proper medical attendance? I think not. Then, again, the hon. member said that Dr. Paton, the missionary to the South Sea Islands, was—I think he termed him, a slanderer. I did not quite catch the hon. member's remarks, and I cannot say whether he used the word "slanderer" to that gentleman or in some other way.

Mr. ANNEAR: If the hon. member will allow me I will explain. I do not wish it to go forth tomorrow morning that I called that gentleman a slanderer or a wilful perverter of the truth. What I said was that hon. members could read *Hansard* and the decision come to by the gentlemen who held that inquiry, and they could come to no other conclusion.

Mr. MACFARLANE: I think it is very inadvisable for hon. members to attack an honoured gentleman such as the Rev. Mr. Paton, whether they disagree with him or not in reference to the letter he sent to the Chief

Secretary. We should give him credit at all events for sincerity. Hon. members should remember that Dr. Paton left his own country for the benefit of the people of those islands. He has been amongst them for many years, and has educated many of them in the profession of Christianity, and to see many of these people carried out of those islands to perish in Queensland is, it appears to me, a very serious matter. On that account I think that no statement that is not strictly correct should be made with reference to anyone who takes an interest in the kanakas. We cannot expect everyone to agree in matters referring to the kanakas, and hon. members will remember that about four years ago, when the general election took place, no man had the courage to say he was in favour of kanakas.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, yes.

Mr. MACFARLANE: Very few. With the exception of the Colonial Secretary I do not remember one.

Mr. ALAND: The hon. member for Burrum.

Mr. MACFARLANE: There may have been some, but they were very few in number, and how it is that the whole population should have been converted on the subject, as is claimed by those who are in favour of the proposal, I cannot make out.

Mr. DRAKE: It has not.

Mr. MACFARLANE: I can only speak for my own constituency, and I cannot judge from my constituents that any such conversion has taken place. There appears to be as many of them in favour of the new departure as against it, and I cannot say therefore, judging by my own electorate, that public opinion has much changed on the subject. On that account I would much prefer that the matter should be referred to another general election. I do not say that it will not be well to adopt the plan proposed by the Chief Secretary to give the sugar industry time to get into a more satisfactory condition than it is in at the present time. But I think this ought to be left to the people. It ought to be left to the electors, and if they at the general election, which cannot be more than twelve months hence, decide by their votes that their minds have so completely changed as is now contended for, then I will give in. I think, therefore, it would be well for the Government to consider that matter. Now, the Chief Secretary gave several reasons why he thought this House was perfectly justified in dealing with the matter in the last year of this Parliament. He said at the outset that at one time he was a determined opponent of coloured labour. I give him credit for what he says. I know no man in this colony that I have more faith in than the Chief Secretary. I thoroughly believe that his intentions are good; they are intended for the benefit of the colony. I believe he is anxious to lay the foundations of the colony in righteousness, but I think he has made some mistakes, and he cannot therefore expect all those who so faithfully followed him in the days when he was against black labour to follow him now. He said at one time that this should be a country for white men, and that no other labour should be in it. We all believed that four years ago, but some of us do not believe in it now. There seems to be a general somersault. Sudden conversion I never thought much good. I have never seen much good come out of it, and I do not think any good will come out of it.

Mr. DONALDSON: Except they are teetotallers.

Mr. MACFARLANE: We are not talking about teetotallers.

Mr. ALAND: You will before you sit down.

Mr. MACFARLANE: Possibly I may, but if I do, what about it? It has nothing to do with this subject. Now, Sir, the Chief Secretary told us that at one time he was a determined opponent of coloured labour, and I should judge, from the way he spoke, that he is still as determined as he was then, only circumstances have changed. Well, while I like to see a man having a policy, I like to see him consistent. Policy is a very good thing, but principle is quite different. Principle is to be preferred to policy any time, and on that account I like to follow one who has thoroughly in view honest principles. The Chief Secretary also referred to the fact that we must increase the producing power of the country. Well, that is an evident fact. We shall never prosper unless we do; but what about the present state of the country? The producing power of the country at the present time is greater than the demand; I refer to agriculture. If we increase the productive power of the country, what are we to do with the produce? Where is it to go? We cannot send it to the other colonies on account of their protective tariffs. We cannot consume what we already produce, so that, I think, instead of increasing the producing power of the country, we want population, and that would increase the consuming power of the country. It would cause a demand for more labour and more land, and for everything else, because every man who comes into the colony, being a consumer, encourages trade in the colony. This fact must be remembered, that if we increase production on present lines it will do no good to the farmers. It will lower the price of farm produce, but there would be some reason in producing jute and hemp and such things.

The Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: Especially hemp.

Mr. MACFARLANE: That would do very well for the man who has so distinguished himself in another colony, but we are not concerned about him. We are concerned about the welfare of Queensland, and the question is, What are we to do to increase the financial power of Queensland? The Chief Secretary, in speaking about the legality and constitutionality of passing this law at the end of the Parliament, used some illustration that did not seem to me to be a very good argument at all. I will put this case to him: Suppose, at the beginning of this Parliament, the members had pledged themselves to their constituents that they would give separation to the North during the existence of the Parliament. Then, instead of doing so, they had dilly-dallied until the last year of the Parliament, and then refused to do it, what position would we be in then? Would we not have broken our pledges? I think so. Well, whilst I repudiate the idea of being a delegate to the House, I think on a constitutional question like this black labour question, we ought to go to the country before we finally settle it. I think after that is done every member will be placed in a far better position than he is in at the present time. Some people have consciences that are easily stretched. Others have hard and fast cast-iron consciences that cannot be stretched. Every man should act according to the dictates of his own conscience. I for one think I would very likely be in favour, after having been before my constituents, of providing some reasonable way of continuing the sugar industry, yet, according to the pledges I gave at the beginning of this Parliament, I cannot conscientiously vote for the reintroduction of kanaka labour. We can scarcely discuss the Bill now because it is not before us, but unless there are provisions in it to thoroughly protect and

thoroughly provide for the medical attendance of the islanders, I do not see how anyone can support it. There is another matter to be considered, and that is the way in which the Government propose to get these kanakas in future. As I understand it, they are sometimes very easily obtained by bribing the native kings. If there are provisions that the men come of their own free will, and that they know what they are coming to do, I should look upon them as free labourers coming to the colony, to whom I should not object; but if the Bill does not contain those provisions, I shall be compelled to vote against it. I do not intend to take up any more time now, for I suppose nearly every hon. member will like to say something about the matter; and I have said sufficient to indicate the position I take up with reference to this question.

The HON. B. D. MOREHEAD said: Mr. Speaker,—Everyone will admit that this will be—at any rate I hope after I have spoken—a very interesting debate. It is extremely interesting, with regard to the individuals occupying the Treasury bench, to see that their minds are ours, or rather that our minds are theirs. The Government have adopted the views that have been expressed by this side, not only in this one particular matter, but in two or three others. In fact, the whole of the views as contained in this Speech are the views that have been long held by this side of the House. Therefore I shall support them. These are the reasons—and I can give no better or more sufficient—why I intend to support them. I hold that the Government were in a very difficult position indeed, and I am perfectly certain there are many hon. members who will in all good faith, as I do, give the Chief Secretary credit for his action when he had to make a change of front. It was a change of front which was absolutely necessary for the well-being of the colony, and it was a change of front that has my entire sympathy and my hearty support, as far as I am individually concerned. I will say this with regard to the hon. member who moved the Address in Reply, and to the hon. member who, in a feeble way, seconded it: that the hon. member for Maryborough made a very unprovoked attack upon a section of the House who, up to the present time, have done nothing to entitle them to such an attack.

Mr. ANNEAR: They attacked me to-day.

The HON. B. D. MOREHEAD: I do not know whether they attacked the hon. member or not, but when he got up to speak as the mouthpiece of the Government, he made what appeared to me an unprovoked attack upon a certain section of the House. It was very ill-advised, and not well considered or well delivered.

Mr. ANNEAR: I am prepared to stand by it.

The HON. B. D. MOREHEAD: The hon. member may say he is prepared to stand by it. But I am here to assist, if I can, to make peace between man and man. There is no desire on this side, and I am sure there is none on that, to create ill-feeling in any one section of the House; at any rate, I will not be a party to it. Before going further, I—speaking, I am sure, for every member on this side of the House—wish to express our deep regret for the loss of one who has gone from us for ever—a genial, kindly, lovable person whom we shall see no more here; who was loved by this side of the House, and who had not an enemy, no matter what political differences there may have been, on the other. All were friends. He is gone, and, as John Bright once beautifully said, quoting from Scripture, “his place here will know him no more

for ever.” But we shall not forget him. There is not a man in this House who has enjoyed the privilege of friendship with Frank Murphy who will ever forget him. To return to the Speech, we really are met, Mr. Speaker, to deal with an extraordinary condition of affairs. We find that there must be a combination—not a combination of politicians, which, unfortunately, there is already, but a combination to extricate the colony, if we can, out of its difficulties. I hope that this combination will include even the party that has been condemned by the hon. member who moved the Address in Reply. Let all work shoulder to shoulder and try to get the colony out of its difficulties, as I am sure we all desire to do. There have been many mistakes made by the present Government. I think the dividend tax was a mistake, and that if it was repealed it would do a great deal of good. I dare say the Colonial Treasurer himself thinks that this is a matter which well deserves consideration. There is that other little quarrel of his, which I am certain he will get out of, knowing that perhaps there have been mistakes on both sides. There are ways and means of getting out of it, and I am sure the Treasurer will see his way to extricate the colony from the difficulty which has arisen from perhaps an inopportune remark. If he gives expression to what I believe are really his feelings, he will have every assistance from this side of the House to get out of that difficulty. As far as I am concerned, although I have spoken very warmly about it in the past, there will be no word of mine in the future but will tend to assist him and the colony out of their difficulties. I am not going to speak at any length on this matter, because my views are almost entirely in sympathy with the proposals of the Government. The colony, as we know, is in a difficult position, and it is our duty, if we are patriots at all, one and all of us—even the party led by the hon. member for Bundamba—to help to pull the colony out of its trouble with a long pull, and a strong pull, and a pull altogether. These are my views, and I have nothing more to say.

Mr. CASEY said: Mr. Speaker,—I rise at this early period of the debate, and I trust I may be pardoned for rising before older members, in order to take the opportunity of speaking on a subject which has been spoken to by almost every hon. member who has addressed the House this evening. I refer to the loss which we and the colony have sustained in the death of my friend and fellow-member, Mr. Murphy. I can hardly trust myself, even at this distance, to speak of it very fully. There has been no gap in our ranks since this Parliament met that has been more deeply felt than that left by the late member for Barcoo—a gentleman whom I am proud to have known as my personal friend—a man of broad and liberal views, and without an enemy in the House; with strong personal opinions, and fearless in the expressing of them when he thought they were right. He has left a gap in our ranks which it will be very difficult to fill. I feel sure the House will pardon me for taking up a moment of its time in placing upon record the opinion which I think everyone of us holds respecting our late friend. I perhaps feel his loss more deeply than most others, as he was an old and valued personal friend. I will not further allude to this matter, except to express the deep and poignant regret I feel that no more for ever shall we see that worthy gentleman in his place. With regard to the various matters mentioned in the Speech, the most important, or one of the most important, is that referring to the extension of kanaka labour; and I feel, Sir, with most other hon. members who have spoken before me, that the reversion in the policy upon which the Chief Secretary has worked in the past is not so

much a reversion of principle as a reversion of the circumstances under which he abolished the introduction of Polynesians into this colony. I do not think that any employer in the colony desires kanaka labour or coloured labour of any kind, except for the particular form of tropical agriculture which events have proved white labour to be unsuitable for. I am quite sure the pastoralists do not in any way desire that kanakas should be used in their industry, and I am satisfied that so long as kanaka labour is strictly restricted to the cultivation of tropical products, and that maize and other articles which can be grown by our farmers are exempted from their operations, the farmers as a body are very much in favour of their reintroduction. I have taken some pains to make myself acquainted with the feelings of the farmers amongst whom I live upon this subject, and I have not met a single instance of a man who was averse to kanakas being allowed to work in tropical agriculture in the North if restricted in the way I have mentioned; and I trust that a large majority will support the Government in that measure. Among the other grave and important measures outlined in the Speech, the bonus on the export of meat is one which I believe is called for by the pastoral industry of this country. Whether it will be acceptable in the form in which the Government will introduce it or not, I am not prepared to say; but I trust sincerely that before the House leaves the question it will be threshed into such a shape as will give an impetus to this great producing industry as will in some way assist to restore the prosperity which has left us. The question of land-grant railways is so briefly outlined in the Speech that I think we need not speak upon it at all until it comes before us in the shape of a Bill.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. DRAKE said: Mr. Speaker,—This seems to bid fair to be one of the most extraordinary sessions of Parliament Queensland has ever seen. I have been sitting here, as no doubt many other hon. members have, expecting to hear some explanation from members of the Government with regard to the policy that is foreshadowed in this Speech. So far we have heard nothing beyond what was said by the Chief Secretary, who got up and made what I understood to be a Ministerial statement with regard to his present opinion upon the kanaka labour question. Beyond that we have not heard one word from any member of the Government with regard to any of the points in their policy as foreshadowed here, which certainly contains some items upon which I confess I should like to have some information. For instance, the proposed bonus for the exportation of stock is a question upon which I honestly confess I should very much like to have some information. It looks a very fair proposal on the surface, and no doubt if the details could be arranged satisfactorily, so that the scheme would work equitably, it would be a very good thing for the colony. But we have not heard a single word about it except from the hon. member for Warrego, who just touched upon it. The subject of land-grant railways is also passed over without a word from the Government. The speech we got from the leader of the Opposition, who, as a rule, takes this opportunity to criticise the whole conduct of the Government since the preceding session of Parliament, consisted of about fifteen minutes of what I may call amusing chaff. In fact, it would seem as if the whole business of the Address in Reply has come to be looked upon as a mere formality. I do not use the expression the hon. the leader of the Opposi-

1892--c

tion used, because I am not a Tory. I think the hon. gentleman himself stated that he is a Tory.

Mr. NELSON: I am called so.

Mr. DRAKE: I notice that it is generally from these gentlemen who come under the suspicion of being Tories that we find our institutions most boldly attacked whenever they themselves are a little bit interfered with. If the expression of opinion used by that hon. gentleman in regard to the forms observed in connection with the opening of this Parliament had been used by my hon. friend the member for Barcoo, Mr. Ryan—whom I am glad to welcome here—I should not have been at all surprised if the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government had got up and called your attention to it. But, no! These are not the men who attack our institutions, but those who are ordinarily called Tories. The hon. gentleman in his short speech also made an attack upon another institution which I venture to say would not have been made by many members in this House. I want to emphasise this to show that it is not fair to make these continual attacks upon the labour party, as though they were the only people in the colony who attack our institutions. I say again that whenever any institution touches a man's corns you will find that the more Conservative or Tory he is the more ready he will be to get up and abuse that institution.

Mr. NELSON: It does not touch my corns at all.

Mr. DRAKE: The speech of the leader of the Opposition simply amounted to this: I am leader of the Opposition; the Government may depend upon it that during this session the Opposition will not oppose. There was nothing else in it. When the head of the Government asked why this Parliament should be dissolved, I suggested the reason because it had lived too long. Now, I shall give another reason, out of the hon. gentleman's own mouth, I think. When the hon. gentleman sat on the Opposition side of the House, I heard him say—I cannot quote his exact words; he will correct me if I am wrong—that the safety of the country required that there should be a strong Opposition. Is not that what the hon. gentleman said over and over again? Only a short time ago, when up country, did not the hon. gentleman tell us that it does not matter what names you give things the facts remain the same? Now, is that not a fact—that the safety of the country requires that there should be a strong Opposition? Is it not as much a fact now as when he was leader of the Opposition?

The Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: You have stolen our clothes since.

Mr. DRAKE: The policy I was elected upon—and that I intend to carry out as far as I can—is the policy which was promulgated in the manifesto of the leader of the Opposition in 1888. That was the policy which was before the country in 1888, and upon that policy I was elected, and I intend so far as I am able, so long as I am in Parliament—whether this or any other Parliament—to do my best to carry out that policy. If the hon. gentleman's dictum is correct, that it is necessary for the safety of the country that there should be a strong Opposition, then that simple fact condemns this Parliament as being unfit to be trusted with the destinies of this colony, because we have now a Parliament without any Opposition, as the Opposition, through their mouthpiece, have to-day said, "We are the Opposition, but we will not oppose you because you are carrying out our policy."

Mr. NELSON: You can form an Opposition to-morrow if you like.

Mr. DRAKE: It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to say that, but he knows that it cannot be done. He knows very well—and no one has put it more clearly before the country than the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government—that under our present system of constitutional Government there can only be two parties.

The Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: Why not three?

Mr. DRAKE: There can only be two parties. There never have been more than two clearly defined parties, and there are not now. The only thing is that, as the leader of the Opposition said, the Government are carrying out the policy of the Opposition, and therefore there is practically no Opposition.

The Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: We are doing it by attorney.

Mr. DRAKE: I say again, therefore, that in consequence of the present condition of affairs, for which the Chief Secretary is certainly mainly responsible, there is no organised Opposition in this House.

The Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: Well, organise one.

Mr. DRAKE: Using again the hon. gentleman's own words, that a Parliament that has no organised Opposition is not safe to be trusted with the destinies of the country, although there is no organised Opposition, there must be a certain number of members in this House who will feel themselves bound, whatever their opinions may be, to be faithful to the pledges they gave to their constituents. I hold that when a candidate is successful in winning a seat in Parliament he is bound in honour to adhere to his pledges, and if he finds that he cannot conscientiously carry them out he must resign. It is a distinct breach of faith to win a seat by giving certain pledges, and then afterwards turn round and act in exactly the opposite direction.

Mr. DALRYMPLE: If his constituents approve?

Mr. DRAKE: The hon. gentleman at the head of the Government made a point of this kind—and of course he was strongly supported by my humorous friend on my right—and that is this: He says, "I am not a delegate," and by claiming not to be a delegate he seems to think that he escapes the responsibility of having to carry out his pledges. There is only one constitutional means of finding out the opinion of a constituency, and that is through the ballot-box.

Mr. NELSON: Oh, leave the Constitution alone. I am sick of it.

Mr. DRAKE: I shall not leave the Constitution alone. I always stand in the same position with regard to the Constitution. I do not praise it to the skies when it suits my purpose, and then turn round and abuse it when my account lies the other way. The only constitutional way of finding out the opinion of a constituency is through the ballot-box, and therefore, when a man has once submitted his case to the ballot-box he cannot afterwards turn round and take the opinion of a few people in the constituency as that of the constituency, and on the strength of that alter his policy. The man who does that is the man who constitutes himself a delegate. If a man goes before a constituency, and lays down a certain platform, and gives certain promises and pledges, goes to the ballot-box and is elected on that platform, and then because half a dozen people—bank managers and others—come up the back stairs

and say, "Oh, take no notice of them, the opinion of the people of the colony is quite changed," he acts quite contrary to the platform on which he was elected, do hon. members mean to say that he is not making himself a delegate to those who have got him to change his policy?

Mr. NELSON: I agree with that, but that is not a constitutional point.

Mr. DRAKE: I do not care whether it is a constitutional point or not. It is a point of morals, and it should be discussed from that point of view first. I am an elector for North Brisbane; I vote for the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government on a certain platform that he lays down. If the hon. gentleman adopts a different platform afterwards because some other constituents, who perhaps did not vote for him, have come and asked him to do so, is not that making himself a delegate of those persons to whose wishes he accedes? What right has the candidate for whom I vote on certain promises to go away from those promises? If a candidate goes before a constituency of 1,000 electors and says, "If you elect me I will do such and such a thing," he makes a pledge to every one of those electors just as much as if he had addressed each one separately; and he cannot go back afterwards and vote in another direction. There is this difference in regard to the question as to whether a man is a delegate or a representative. If he goes before his constituents and says, "Vote for me if you like, but I give no pledges," he may call himself a representative. There was one candidate in North Brisbane who did that, and that was Sir Arthur Palmer, a man I do not admire very strongly myself.

The Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: That shows very bad taste.

Mr. DRAKE: I heard that gentleman on a platform in North Brisbane say distinctly, "I will give you no pledges." If a man does that I admit freely that he comes into the House as a representative to act according to his judgment on behalf of his constituents. But wherever any question that is actually on the political platform is submitted to the candidate, and he is asked, "If you are elected will you vote such and such a way?" and he says he will, and then goes and votes exactly the other way, his conduct cannot be defended on moral grounds. Again, is not this a fraud upon the other candidate? Supposing I am standing for a constituency, and another man is also standing, and I say "Vote for me and I will oppose the introduction of coloured labour," and the other man says "Vote for me and I will do this, that, and the other, but on the subject of black labour I will have to vote for it if it is proposed." On those promises I am elected, but I afterwards turn round and say, "I have got your votes now, and I have got in, and now I am going to vote for black labour." The votes that came to me would have gone to the other man in all probability if I had not made that promise. What will be thought of candidates in future if it is to be accepted in our new code of Queensland morals that if a candidate is successful he is not absolutely bound to keep his pledges? Why, the candidate will be looked upon simply as an artistic liar, and the man who has the most cunning in weaving a tissue of promises, pledges, and professions will get in. Look what will happen at the next general election if this business is carried as proposed. A candidate will come before his constituents with the usual programme. He makes an eloquent speech, perhaps has all his audience with him, and then a troublesome elector wants to put a question. He says, "Mr. Janus—Is a candidate, if successful, bound in

honour to keep his pledges?" That will place the candidate in an awkward dilemma if he is one of the gentlemen who were elected to vote against black labour and afterwards turned round and voted for it, because if he answers "Yes," the electors will say, "Out of your own mouth you are condemned as not being a man of honour, and not fit to represent the electors," and if he says, "Under certain circumstances, no," then they will say, "Just go home; tear up your programme and burn it. What is the use of making promises and professions and at the same time telling us that under certain circumstances, of which you are to be the sole judge, you may not keep your promises." Of course I know it has been industriously stated that it will be justifiable for members to vote against their promises and pledges if they think their constituents have since then changed their minds; and some of them have gone even further and put it almost boldly in this way—that success justifies everything, and if they break their pledges now and are successful at the ballot-box afterwards, their success will prove that their action was justifiable. Even taking that very low ground, I want to know what proof have we of this change of opinion?

Mr. HYNE: Altered circumstances.

Mr. DRAKE: Altered circumstances cannot be a proof. I say, "What proof have we that there has been this change of opinion in the country?" We have had one election since then—the election for the Barcoo. With regard to that particular election hon. members will know that the feeling round about Brisbane, at all events till nearly the day of the election, was that it would be a near thing. In fact I think that the gentlemen associated with the pastoralists thought Mr. Ryan was going to be returned, while the party more particularly interested in Mr. Ryan's return were beginning to be doubtful. Still it came as a surprise that he was returned by a majority of about 190. What does that mean? Both candidates declared against black labour.

Mr. STEVENSON: That spoils your argument, anyway.

Mr. DRAKE: It strengthens the argument very much indeed, because when Mr. Campbell first stood as the opponent of Mr. Ryan he expressed himself in favour of black labour, but Mr. Ryan was against black labour from the first. During the canvass Mr. Campbell saw, as any sensible man who knows anything about the Barcoo would know, that the action of the Government in proclaiming their conversion to black labour was sufficient to turn the scale and put Mr. Ryan in. My first intimate acquaintance with black labour was gained on the Barcoo.

Mr. POWERS: It was not in a sugar district.

Mr. DRAKE: It was not. It was on a station where I first met with them; and they were well treated. I administered the medical comforts myself, and none of them died; but I believe on other stations they were not treated so well. The people of Barcoo know very well what black labour is; and that constituency, being mainly inhabited by working men, would not be likely to return any candidate who could not be looked upon as absolutely certain on that subject. That is the one constituency that has been contested since this question came up; so that so far as any expression of opinion through the ballot-box goes, it is certain that the country has not changed in the slightest degree. Now I want to know what else is there. I have not any papers with me, because I did not expect I should be speaking to-night, but I remember that on the day before the Chief Secretary's manifesto appeared, an article appeared in the

Courier complimenting the Chamber of Commerce or some other institution of that kind, on some active steps they had taken to formulate public opinion; and it was suggested in the article that it would be a most excellent thing for the institution to organise public meetings all over the colony to get an expression of opinion on the subject. About a week after that I saw another article in the same paper rather deprecating the idea of holding any public meeting, and I do not think the Chamber of Commerce party have organised a single public meeting. I think there was a public meeting held in Maryborough before the manifesto appeared, but since then there has been no public meeting called anywhere to obtain an expression of opinion in favour of the manifesto. I know of none. Some members, I believe, have been before their constituents, and I have attentively watched the reports of their meetings. I would be the last to say that I would accept the opinion expressed either one way or the other at a public meeting as being in any way conclusive, because if you want the real opinion of a constituency the only way to get it is through the ballot-box. Though I would not accept the opinions expressed at public meetings for or against as absolute evidence, still I may say that I have been reading the reports of meetings that have been held in various parts of the colony, and I cannot come to any conclusion from them that there has been any great change of public opinion below the surface. I considered it was my duty as early as possible to inform my constituents that I had not changed my opinion, and that I certainly was not going to vote against any of my professions. I addressed four meetings, and I did not find any great change of opinion.

Mr. STEPHENS: Did you not lose some of your best committee men?

Mr. DRAKE: I believe I lost three or four of my supporters.

Mr. STEPHENS: Were they not some of your best supporters?

Mr. DRAKE: I do not reckon best supporters and worst supporters. I believe my best supporters are those who hold the same views that I do.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: The same faces were at each meeting?

Mr. DRAKE: The hon. member is quite wrong in that insinuation. In fact, there were only two or three gentlemen who did go to more than one meeting. The hon. junior member for Charters Towers was present at one of those meetings. It was the third of the series, and was held at the Ithaca Hall, Kennedy terrace.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Stick to the question.

Mr. DRAKE: We are told that there is a change of public opinion. I am discussing that point. The Chief Secretary has told us that there is a change, and the statement has been reiterated once or twice. I did not find any evidence of a change of feeling, and I challenged the hon. gentleman to give a proof. Surely it is perfectly relevant for me to give my reason for believing that there has not been a change in public opinion, and I will come down closer directly and show how some of those who really believe there has been a change of opinion are being deceived. It had been stated at a previous meeting that some persons who wished to express their feelings had not had an opportunity of doing so; but at the meeting I speak of I had no chairman, so I waited on the platform and asked the meeting to appoint their own chairman. They did so, and then I told them

that in order that everyone who was present should have a full opportunity of asking me any questions, or giving expression to any opinion, I would only speak for a short time, and would answer any question; and that anyone who disagreed with me could come on to the platform and give expression to his ideas. At the end of my address I waited, but there was not a single question asked, nor did any person come on to the platform to make any remarks. The hon. member for Charters Towers is perfectly aware that I am not in any way exaggerating the facts.

Mr. BLACK: They must have been very tired of the meeting.

Mr. DRAKE: They were not very tired of the meeting, because I made it most unusually short. It commenced at 8 o'clock, and we were all away at a quarter-past 9. They took a very lively interest in all the meetings, and at the others a lot of questions were asked. A vote of want of confidence was moved at the first meeting, and it absolutely failed because an amendment conveying a vote of complete confidence was carried by a large majority. Therefore, what reason have I for supposing that there has been a change of public opinion? It is not sufficient that a few papers and chambers of commerce take it up, to say that there is a change. If there has been any change at all, it is simply on the surface. It is a change on the part of men whose opinions were never convictions, and that is why I think a great number of members of this House are deceived at present. The matter has been so industriously worked up from a small centre in Brisbane that a great many people can hardly believe that it has such a slight foundation of fact. What has not changed is the deep conviction in the minds of people who know what the kanaka is, and have been in contact with him. That feeling has been growing the whole time. In the year 1883, when the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government swept the country on his policy of opposition to kanaka labour, the people who really had deep convictions on the subject were mainly round about the black labour centres. I think it was during that election that a gentleman went up from here to contest Mackay, and, if I recollect rightly, he did not get in, simply because he only arrived there the day before the election.

Mr. DALRYMPLE: Another week would have landed him with a smaller number.

Mr. DRAKE: The strong conviction arising from experience was then only to be found round about the black labour centres; but since then it has crept all over the country, and I will tell the House how I know that. When I went before my constituents I found one or two gentlemen who had been on my committee who had changed their views.

Mr. STEPHENS: You admitted four a little while ago.

The Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: When are you going to publish your reminiscences?

Mr. DRAKE: There were four or five persons present who supported this vote of want of confidence, but I cannot say if they were all on my committee. There were a few who told me they had changed their opinions on the subject, and they gave reasons which I think were fallacious, and which I think they themselves will yet see are fallacious; but I found men scattered about my electorate who had been actually working on the sugar plantations, and they had not changed their minds a bit.

The Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: Have they got minds?

Mr. DRAKE: I think the hon. member has parted with his. These men said they could do the work.

Mr. DALRYMPLE: They did not do it.

Mr. DRAKE: They did not do it because they said they would not be treated like kanakas. It was not a matter of wages so much, because a great many of them would work for very much the same wages that these so-called free kanakas receive, something like 15s. per week—the hon. member for Mackay will correct me if I am wrong. The men objected to the conditions under which they were called upon to work, and the way they were treated. The opposition to kanakas is also found in the towns, where they are getting 15s. a week wages with rations for doing work that can be done by white men.

The Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: Where?

Mr. DRAKE: In Brisbane and other towns. Does not the hon. member know that there are 2,500 of them in the colony doing that sort of work?

An Honourable Member: That is untrue.

Mr. DRAKE: It is not untrue. The census of 1886 shows that out of 10,000 kanakas there were less than 8,000 engaged in the sugar industry, including those employed in the mills. The hon. member for Townsville last session interjected a remark to the effect that there were not 8,000 kanakas engaged in the sugar industry out of 10,000 in the colony. We know that there is no other field work except that in connection with sugar; and we know that in the production of sugar they are also engaged in the sugar mills. Am I wrong then in stating that there are 2,500 kanakas going about entering into competition with white men?

Mr. BLACK: Yes; quite wrong.

Mr. DRAKE: Then I wish I could get some correct kanaka statistics. I have tried to get such statistics over and over again. In July, 1889, I asked what was the number of time-expired boys in the colony, and the answer I got was, speaking from memory, 2,879. That was the answer furnished to me by the Government of which the hon. member for Balonne was the head.

The Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: If that is so, it was true.

Mr. DRAKE: Very well, then, where are those time-expired boys? Are they not working in competition with white men?

Mr. BLACK: No; they are re-engaged on the sugar plantations.

Mr. DRAKE: Mr. Speaker,—I do not want to engage in a controversy on this point. I have got the figures as correct as I could get them, and have quoted from the records. It is hardly necessary to speak further on this subject now, but I hope we shall have full census returns before very long, and as soon as we get those we shall find out what proportion of the 10,000 kanakas are engaged in sugar cultivation. I think it will be shown that I am not very far wrong in the estimate I have given of the number who are walking about the colony competing with white men. The men who really form the backbone of the opposition to kanaka labour are not politicians, but the working men of the colony who have come directly into contact with it, and know exactly what it is. That is my experience at any rate; I have been through my constituency and found that out. I do not suppose that other members have been through their constituencies to ascertain the truth or otherwise about the alleged change of public opinion on this subject. I shall now state where I think the fallacy comes in, in connection with the reasons given by some of

those gentlemen to whom I have referred as having informed me that they have changed their opinion on the subject. They have changed their opinion because they have been told—

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. W. O. Hodgkinson): How can you speak so *ex cathedra* as to whether they have changed their opinion?

Mr. DRAKE: How could the Chief Secretary speak so *ex cathedra*?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I stated my opinion.

Mr. DRAKE: And I state my opinion that there has not been the thorough change of opinion which it is alleged there has been among the people. I say the change is only on the surface, and I am going now to state the reason why I think some of the gentlemen who have told me that they have changed their opinion have done so on fallacious grounds. The reason they have given me is that they have been told that the colony is now in a state of depression.

Mr. DALRYMPLE: Is that not correct?

Mr. DRAKE: That is quite correct; but they have been told further that if a Bill is brought in providing for the reintroduction of kanakas there will at once be a great change in the condition of things. Have not the farmers who are now getting 1s. 3d. a bushel for their maize been told that if kanakas are introduced there will be a great change, and they will get 4s. or 5s. a bushel?

The COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. Sir T. McIlwraith): They might not get 4s. or 5s., but they will get a great deal more than they are getting now.

Mr. DRAKE: I am not sorry to hear these interruptions, because they throw a little life into the debate. The men to whom I refer have been pointed to the state of affairs existing in 1882, 1883, and 1884, and they have been told that if kanakas were introduced now there would suddenly be a return of that prosperity. I say that there are no grounds for that statement; that there are no grounds for saying that if Polynesians were reintroduced there would be an extension of the sugar industry. We have heard that some gentleman managing the Colonial Sugar Company is reported to have stated that the company were going to take away their mill next October if kanaka labour was not reintroduced. That is about the only fact I can get hold of upon which, it appears to me, is based the belief that if Polynesians were reintroduced, there would be an increase in the operations in connection with the sugar industry. Is this true, in the Governor's Speech, that "a sufficient supply of suitable labour is not available to enable this industry to be extended, or even maintained, in its present position"?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is incontrovertible.

Mr. DRAKE: When there are 10,000 kanakas in the colony? When we had a telegram the other day from Maryborough stating that there were 300 kanakas going about the town there looking for employment; and another telegram from Bundaberg stating that there were fifty walking about the place fishing?

Mr. DALRYMPLE: Was that true?

Mr. DRAKE: I cannot say whether the telegrams were true. But upon what is all this talk about a change of opinion in the colony based, if it is not upon reports in the papers? Have not the newspapers sent special men into the sugar districts to report upon the subject?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: You admit that the newspapers are a gauge of public opinion?

Mr. DRAKE: I do not; I regard them in the same way as I regard opinions expressed at public meetings. I said, in regard to public meetings, that I would not take resolutions passed there as absolute proof of a change of opinion; neither would I take anything that appears in the newspapers as absolute proof of such a change. But I listen to everything I hear, and read everything I can get the opportunity to read, and form my own conclusions of them.

The Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: You believe what you like?

Mr. DRAKE: I accept what comments itself to my judgment. I believe that a good many members, especially those round about Brisbane, confine their reading very much to the Brisbane papers. I do not think they industriously read the papers from Rockhampton, for instance, or from Townsville.

The Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: Why should they industriously employ their time reading the papers from Rockhampton?

Mr. DRAKE: If hon. members are going to rely upon the newspapers for their information in regard to this alleged change of public opinion, they should read them all, and not just those papers published in Brisbane. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken at a little greater length than I intended to do, but I have been interrupted a good deal.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Why not answer some of the arguments?

Mr. DRAKE: What are the arguments? The hon. gentleman asks why I do not reply to some of the arguments. If he means the arguments put forward in his manifesto, I may state that the accusation he made of persons going about the country vilifying him and not answering his arguments, fell very far wide of me, because when I was before my constituents I relied to a very large extent upon the hon. gentleman's manifesto. I told my constituents that the facts stated in the hon. gentleman's manifesto were correct, but I disagreed with him in his conclusions. I considered his conclusions were illogical from his premises.

Mr. DALRYMPLE: How?

Mr. DRAKE: I know it will not be considered likely that the hon. gentleman should express illogical conclusions from his premises, but I think that in this case he could not help it, because what he had to do was this: He had to reconcile facts which are the same now as they were five years or eight years ago with the conclusions he has formed now. The facts do not change. The hon. gentleman repeats the facts, and founds on them a different conclusion altogether.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: On additional facts.

Mr. DRAKE: The additional facts are only these: The hon. gentleman states that half the planters would not fall in with his views and cut up their plantations and work them on a different system, and further he says that certain persons have sprung up in the community who call themselves leaders of thought, and while they say they will not work on the plantations themselves they will not allow anybody else to work upon them. Where the hon. gentleman seems to me illogical is here: He says the plantation system is wrong, and should be done away with. The better policy is to cut up the big plantations into small holdings, and put white farmers on them to grow the cane. If I understand the hon. gentleman's manifesto aright, he claims that the policy that has been going on of the gradual conversion of the big plantations into small holdings has been the direct result of his

legislation in 1885. He says, moreover, that those who have adopted this policy, and cut up their plantations for farmers to produce the cane by white labour, have made it a conspicuous success. And now—and here is where I think he is illogical—after showing that to be the result of his legislation of 1885, he says, Reverse that legislation and the process will go on all the same. After giving the planters fully eight years' warning, the hon. gentleman told them that after a certain time they would get no more kanaka labour, and in view of the cessation of Polynesian labour they cut up their plantations as the result of that legislation; and I contend that, if the hon. gentleman now reverses that legislation, instead of that process going on we will go back to the old plantation system. That is what I think and what I fear in this matter. When they know that they can get numbers of kanakas the planters will go back to the plantation system, and instead of making contracts with white men to grow cane for them they will say, "No, we will not do that. We were told by the legislation of 1885 that we would get no more kanakas, and that is why we did that. Now that legislation is reversed, and we will keep the extra margin of profit, whatever it may be, upon the employment of kanakas." That is what I fear and granting the premises as stated by the hon. gentleman, I cannot agree with him in his conclusion that if he now reverses his legislation of 1885 we shall go on in just the same course. I think the effect of reversing that legislation will be a return to the old plantation system. I speak from the information given me by men who have actually worked on the sugar plantations. I cannot admit the statement that white men are unwilling to do the work, and will not allow others to do it. I think that if the process going on had been continued, and the big mill-owners had wanted small white farmers to grow cane for them at a price that would be remunerative, they could get them. I have heard of a contract made as high as 14s. a ton. I heard that mentioned as an extreme price, and no doubt it was; but if the practice was continued of allowing white men to grow the cane for the mills at a fairly remunerative price, I believe there would be no difficulty in getting white labour to do it. I say this most emphatically, in addition to that, that if what the planters want is kanaka labour, because it is so specially fitted for the purpose, they should not be allowed to have any kanakas imported until they have made use of those already in the colony. At the present time, unless all our information is incorrect, there is any amount of kanaka labour available in the colony, and I cannot see what reason there can be for this hurry to bring in a lot more, unless the intention is to revert to the old plantation system, and do away with the little white labour that is employed in the production of the cane. I cannot see any reason for the doctrine that has been spread about, that if the legislation of 1885 is reversed there will be an improvement in the present state of things as the result. I do not see how that can be, and I am borne out in my opinion by the views expressed by a great many people in various parts of the colony. Again I have to go to Mackay, and of course I must quote from the papers, because I cannot be in every place looking up the information for myself. Immediately after the manifesto was published, a short sub-leader appeared in the *Mackay Mercury*, which finished up by saying something to the effect that people must not suppose that there was going to be any boom in consequence of the proposed new departure. In the first place, it was said the Chief Secretary's good intentions might not count for much. Then it was said that perhaps Parliament would

[Mr. DRAKE,

not allow the kanakas to come in. Then, that if they were allowed to do so, their introduction would be hampered by all sorts of restrictions, and finally the article wound up with the statement that people might be perfectly certain that as soon as a revival of trade took place, there would be another agitation to do away with the kanakas.

Mr. NELSON: I understand you to take the whole of your opinions from the Press.

Mr. DRAKE: The remark I made with reference to the quotation should have prevented the hon. member's interruption. I can only get at the opinions of the people of Mackay in two ways—either by relying upon what the Press says, or by going there myself to find out. I cannot be going all over the country to find out these things, and if I am wrong in my statements of the opinions of the people there, the contrary opinion can be expressed by the hon. member representing that district. I think the opinion I have expressed is extremely probable, because I cannot see what reason there is to suppose that people are going to rush into this industry and spend more money upon the strength of the new legislation proposed. I am not quite sure that the people who want black labour are wise in trying to snatch it in this way. The matter will have to be tested by public opinion yet, and a general election is not far ahead. I am told that there are sixty members out of this Parliament of seventy-two who were pledged against black labour on their election. I have heard that stated over and over again. I suppose there will be no question about the fact that the Parliament elected in 1883 was opposed to black labour. It will not be questioned that when the Parliament was elected in 1888 both the present members for North Brisbane came into power on the policy of no kanaka labour. I suppose there will be no doubt that when the coalition Government was formed the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government said in his election address that there would be no black labour.

Mr. NELSON: There was no address after the coalition.

Mr. DRAKE: Yes, there was. I think it was something of that sort. The hon. gentleman said that we might depend upon this, that the Government would not propose any policy contrary to what he had advocated before.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I said it was recognised that the black labour question was settled.

Mr. DRAKE: Yes; that was it. Under those circumstances should a Parliament in its fifth session, a Parliament which has already passed a Triennial Parliaments Act and affirmed the principle of three-year Parliaments, reverse the policy of the country on this subject; and what possible reason is there to hope that the incoming Parliament will not again reverse the policy? I could not help ejaculating a remark when the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government was speaking and when he said, "What is going to restore confidence?" There will be no confidence until there has been a dissolution.

Mr. DALRYMPLE: And none then.

Mr. DRAKE: Does the hon. member suppose for one moment that if a general election is put off for a few months the conditions are going to be altogether different? Is there any gentleman in this House who will venture to predict that at any time during the next twelve months there will occur a more favourable time for a general election than the present?

Mr. AGNEW: It is a much better time now than twelve months ago, and it will be much better twelve months hence.

Mr. DRAKE: I do not think the hon. gentleman has any ground for that supposition. I think the present is just about as good a time as could be chosen for a general election. With regard to the supposed change of public opinion: whereas I find gentlemen who acted on my committee before and were strong supporters of mine have changed their opinions on this subject, and would be in favour of a reintroduction of black labour, and would be glad if I could see my way to vote for it, which, of course, I cannot, I find, on the other hand, a great many expressing the absolutely contrary opinion. While I find these two facts I find no difference of opinion on this subject—that this Government has no right to deal with the subject.

Mr. NELSON: Have you an opinion of your own?

Mr. DRAKE: Yes; my opinion is that the Government have no right, and I have referred to that opinion before.

Mr. NELSON: That is all we want. We do not want the opinion of your constituents.

Mr. DRAKE: I will not detain the House any longer, because I have spoken at greater length than I intended to speak. I have expressed my own opinion with regard to the matter: that the Government have no right either morally or constitutionally to deal with the question; and I say moreover, as I have heard so much about a change of opinion in the country, that, so far as I have been able to ascertain, the feeling in the country at the present time is that there will be no confidence until there has been a general election, and that the proper course for the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, having come forward before the country and announced that he has changed his opinion, is to go to the country, state that he has changed his opinion, and then if the opinion of the country is that which he says it is, he would come back with a strong following to enable him to carry out what he proposes. But if there is such a thing as a political crime, it would be a political crime on the part of the present Government to force this thing through in the last session of a Parliament which is—

Mr. NELSON: Moribund?

Mr. DRAKE: Yes. I don't know that there is another word to more forcibly express the miserable, chaotic, dying condition of this Parliament.

Mr. BLACK said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. member for Enoggera has given us a long dissertation in replying to His Excellency's Speech. The hon. gentleman has confined himself almost exclusively to the subject that he admits he knows nothing about except through the medium of the newspapers.

Mr. DRAKE: Oh, no!

Mr. BLACK: The hon. gentleman says he has taken all his information from newspaper articles.

Mr. DRAKE: I did not say that either.

Mr. BLACK: He admits that the only other way in which he could get information would be by making inquiries on the spot. We have had a long dissertation from him on the one subject he knows little or nothing about, and he entirely ignores the most important matters in His Excellency's Speech on which he might be expected to have better knowledge. Now, I propose to deal briefly with some of the matters contained in His Excellency's Speech. It is not necessary for me to reiterate the sentiments expressed by hon. members on both sides in connection with the severe loss which we have sustained, and also the severe loss which the old country has sustained. It will

be taken for granted that we all equally deplore both those matters. Now, the most important matter undoubtedly contained in the Speech is the altered position which the Government intend taking up, permanently, I hope, in connection with tropical agricultural industry. I believe it will be admitted that on this subject I have been very consistent for the last twelve years in this House, and I am pleased to find that experience has taught those who thought differently some years ago that, at all events, I had some foundation for the arguments which I have reiterated over and over again, and which I do not intend to repeat any more. But I think the Government are quite right in calling the House together at this early stage to take immediate steps to, as far as they can, restore confidence in one of our greatest producing industries, and also to bring about a state of affairs which will not only prevent the loss of an important industry, but will enable those engaged in it to extend their operations, and by that means absorb a very large amount of the surplus population which, I regret to say, we have in our midst. No doubt the colony was never in a more depressed state than it is at the present time. We never had more unemployed. I do not mean to say that Queensland is singular in that respect, because there is just as much distress in Victoria and New South Wales as there is in Queensland. But I will say that no colony has got greater resources than we have got—no colony has better natural resources, which only want reasonable administration and reasonable consideration to make this colony one of the most progressive of the whole group. It is to be regretted that the legislation of the past has not sufficiently recognised the different climatic conditions which prevail in this enormous territory of Queensland. I am glad to see that public opinion is entirely changing in this respect, and that this movement, which has emanated from the South—and not from the North, Mr. Speaker—shows that those in the South are anxious as far as possible to retrieve the errors which have been committed in the policy of the past in connection with this industry.

Mr. DRAKE: Do they know anything of the subject?

Mr. BLACK: A great many do; some do not. Some talk, and know little or nothing about it. In a few brief words I will point out to the House what this industry is at the present time. Of course, hon. members may ask whether the reintroduction of black labour is going to make the colony prosperous at once? It is not, but it is going to prevent the colony drifting into a greater state of depression than it is in at the present time. That is the position. Last year this colony produced 70,000 tons of sugar. We know roughly that it cost £10 a ton to produce that sugar—that is, that £700,000 was expended in the production of that 70,000 tons of sugar. We know also that the kanakas are paid at an average rate of £10 a year. The majority of them only get £6 and their rations, but for the sake of easy calculation we will put it at £10. There are 10,000 of them; so that of the £700,000 which the production cost, £100,000 went to the kanakas, while £600,000 were distributed amongst Europeans—not necessarily to men working on the plantations. They got their share, but every mechanical industry in the colony, and the coal industry, too, benefited from it. There is not an industry in the whole of Australia that distributes more money amongst the working people than the sugar industry does. That cannot be denied, and now we are threatened with the loss of it. I admit that the production of sugar did not fall off last year. That was

because there were plenty of kanakas in the country. But on the 31st December next year those 10,000 kanakas, with the exception of a very few who have exemption tickets, are due to go home to their islands. And we are placed in this position, that without any alternative labour it is impossible for those engaged in the industry to see their way even to plant their cane this year, and most certainly not to plant any cane next year. That is where the urgency comes in. It is absolutely necessary that immediate legislation of some sort should take place. If it is decided that the industry is to perish, I say let it perish, but let it be on the heads of those whose short-sighted policy has brought about the destruction of one of the great-st industries we have got. We have nothing to take its place. Those rich tropical lands are unfit for maize-growing, but they are well fitted for the cultivation of tropical agriculture—for sugar, spices, tea, coffee, and many other industries of a similar description, which all require the same description of labour. It is useless now to talk about the relative merits of white men and coloured men. We all admit that white men are fit to do almost anything that anyone can do, but it must be on conditions that they will readily work under. They must be well paid. You cannot get Europeans to work in a tropical canefield unless you give them a rate of wages which the industry cannot possibly afford to pay them. The hon. member for Enoggera said that, if we go on as we are going on, in course of time the plantations will be cut up into small farms, and he believes that the planters are prepared to give 14s. a ton for cane. As to the price, the hon. member is not far wrong, as I know that a large quantity of cane was bought last year at 13s. 6d. a ton. But why was this good price—and it is a good price—paid for the cane? It is quite true that some small farmers did grow the cane without any kanakas. But who cut and planted the cane, and who manufactured the sugar when the cane got to the mill? It was the kanakas. Take away the kanaka and I will guarantee that not a central mill in the colony would be able to give more than 10s. a ton if the whole of the cane had to be grown and manufactured by white labour. We have had a very important experiment made at the central mill. There is one good thing the central mill experiment has done—it has shown the farmer the maximum price that the central mill can afford to pay for his cane. But it has not done any good thing in proving that cane can be successfully grown in a commercial sense entirely with white labour. When it was decided that coloured labour should cease, the central-mill system was tried; it cost the country just about £50,000. That experiment has not proved a success. Other experiments also have been tried. We found that continental labour was objectionable in many respects. From Germany it was almost impossible to get them, and the opposition to the introduction of Italians was very great. I would ask those who refuse the introduction of Polynesian labour, what do they suggest? I would ask those who profess to be the leaders of men, and who are making a great outcry against the continuation of this description of labour, to make a suggestion. As yet they have made none, and when their men do go on a plantation they say, "We will not do work which is only fit for kanakas." It has been said over and over again that tropical agriculture cannot afford to pay that rate of wages which white men should get for working in the tropics. If any hon. member of the House representing that party will make any tangible, practical suggestion—something which we can really see is likely to prevent the loss of that industry to

[Mr. BLACK,

the colony, I will willingly listen to him, and if it is anything we could safely advocate I would willingly consent to it. It is a matter of too great importance to be trifled over any longer. I hope hon. members will not be alarmed at what may take place at the next general election. I have no fear of what will take place at the next general election. We are here to legislate, and we have just as much right to legislate on this matter as we should have to legislate on the one man one vote question, should it be brought forward. In that case, should we hear the objection raised that this is a moribund Parliament, and that we ought not to legislate upon such an important question? We are here to legislate, and we have as much right to legislate on this Polynesian question as we have to legislate upon any other matter that may come before the House.

Mr. DRAKE: What about pledges?

Mr. BLACK: I know what my pledges are. Hon. members have had ample opportunity to see their constituents. I have seen mine, and I have travelled north, west, and south, and I firmly believe that the opinion of the country is that the legislation on this question in the past was hasty legislation. There is no doubt it was, and I hope the House will, before it is too late, take such steps as will prevent the loss of this very important industry. The Speech says—

"You will therefore be invited to remove the restrictions which now exist upon the importation of labourers from these islands, and also to make such provisions as may be necessary to prevent them from entering into undue competition with European labour in other industries."

I entirely agree with that sentence, but I have heard hon. members speak this evening as if the subject of Polynesian labour was an entirely new one, which had never been discussed before. The hon. member for Enoggera talked about 2,500 Polynesians being actually engaged in competition with white men. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. I do not mean to say that there may not be a few exceptional cases where the Act has not been strictly enforced, but I do give the Government credit for this: That they have strictly carried out, as far as it was possible to do it, the provisions of the Polynesian Act, which are to the effect that the Polynesians shall be kept employed on the plantations and in tropical agriculture.

Mr. DRAKE: Not in the mills.

Mr. BLACK: They are in the mills; they should be in the mills, and they will be in the mills.

Mr. DRAKE: It is contrary to law.

Mr. BLACK: It is not contrary to law. The men are engaged in the cultivation and manufacture of sugar.

Mr. DRAKE: The Act says they are only to be employed in field work.

Mr. BLACK: Make any regulations you like to prevent them from coming into competition with Europeans in the descriptions of work that Europeans undertake, and I shall gladly support it. There is no antagonism to Polynesians as long as they are kept on the plantations; it is only when they come into towns, and if the Government can see their way to prevent them from coming into towns, especially at night, that objection will be removed. I think the House and the country may be perfectly satisfied that the Government will take proper steps to safeguard all the interests of the European population. I hope they will also take into consideration the necessity of some

altered means of recruiting. The Government having admitted the necessity of this description of labour, I consider it their duty to provide it. The planters in future should not be involved in the business of sending down ships, the control of which is entirely out of their hands. Let the Government do the whole business, and let the whole cost be paid by those who employ the kanakas. Another matter in the Governor's Speech which I entirely approve of is the principle of constructing railways, payment to be given in land. It is not spoken of in the Speech as "land-grant railways," from which I understand that it is not necessarily intended to give the land alongside where the railway is going to be constructed. We have arrived at that stage that we are unable to borrow the large sums of money necessary for the continuation of our railway policy. We cannot remain stagnant as we are; our railways will have to be extended by some means. Lines which have been commenced at both ends, like the Bundaberg-Gladstone line, where there is a gap of fifty miles, must be completed, and in various parts of the colony it is necessary that we should have railway extension. How is it to be done? We have no money ourselves; and we cannot get it. If, therefore, we can find any syndicate or body of men willing to construct our railways and take payment in land instead of in money, I consider that the Government would be perfectly right in entertaining such a proposal.

Mr. NELSON: Parliament would.

Mr. BLACK: I say the Government would be right to entertain the proposal and submit it to Parliament for their consideration. It is not at all likely that even for the sake of giving some pet constituency a railway they would rush into a bargain of that description. We cannot remain as we are. I know there are plenty of railways round about Brisbane and elsewhere which people are most anxious to see extended or made, and unless we can construct them by this system, or by putting additional taxation upon ourselves—which I do not think we are very much inclined to do—I do not see how on earth we are going to continue our railway system. With regard to the bonus on the export of stock, of course hon. members have seen a sketch of the Bill, and when it comes before us I think we should do all we possibly can to give effect to it, provided that those chiefly interested, the pastoralists, are agreeable to the terms. It is one of those things the Government may very safely promise, because they are not asked to contribute a single sixpence, and if the pastoralists like to tax themselves to the extent of a quarter of a million sterling, taking the money out of one pocket and putting it into the other, I do not see any objection. One good effect would be to open up a new field of industry, which would give employment to a large number of people. There is a brief paragraph in the Speech on the subject of federation, but in the present condition of things I do not think the country cares two straws about federation. I have noticed also that those hon. gentlemen who have preceded me have said little or nothing about it, and I think we had better set our house in order and get our affairs into a little more prosperous state before we go into that question. I see the southern colonies are not particularly eager about it; and I think, at all events, that it is a matter that we can very well leave the next Parliament to take into consideration. Then we have reference made to the provincial separation scheme—the tripartite proposal which was defeated last session. I understand that the Government intend to reintroduce the question this session in the shape of a Bill, with what success, of course, remains to be seen. We only

know that Parliament defeated it last session, and I should very much have preferred it if the Government had seen their way to bring in a scheme for separation pure and simple of the North from the South. From the debates that took place last session, it seemed to me that the House was more likely to favour absolute separation of the North from the South than the tripartite scheme of provincial government. There is one matter which I am surprised the hon. member for Enoggera did not refer to, as it so closely affects the farmers and people of the South, with whom he is so heartily identified. I mean the proposal to modify the railway tariff. I do not know that there is a more important passage in the Governor's Speech than that relating to the proposed alteration of the railway tariff, and yet it has been passed over by every hon. member who has spoken up to the present time. These are matters the hon. member for Enoggera should devote his attention to, matters that he knows something about—instead of going wandering about the bush and generalising about kanaka labour. I sincerely hope that the Government will see their way to so modify their railway tariff as to give more direct advantages to the farmers than they have at present. I know that at the existing low prices it is almost impossible, with the high railway rates, for farmers to get their produce to market and realise anything out of it; and rather than see produce rotting almost on the farms, I think the Government should do something for those who have done more to benefit the colony by settling the lands than probably any other class. I should also like to have seen some reference to the probability or the possibility of getting some of our naval defence ships manned by our own men. That is a matter I referred to last session.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The correspondence has been laid on the table to-day.

Mr. BLACK: I hope it is favourable. If it is favourable, I certainly think it was entitled to a small paragraph in the Governor's Speech. Nothing would please me more—and I know I express the feelings of a great many of the people of the colony—than to see more of our young men trained up to naval pursuits. I shall regret to see the time when the agreement expires, nine years hence, when we shall be in the same helpless position we were in before. I am very sorry the Bill ever passed, and the only satisfaction it would give me would be to have the assurance that before the ten years during which the agreement is to last have expired we should have amongst us a number of our own youngsters and men in the mercantile marine who would be able to man, at all events, some of the ships. I think, on the whole, that this session, although it is the last of this Parliament, is likely to be one of the most important of the whole five, and I trust that during the debates that may ensue, that courtesy of debate will be pursued which will enable us when we leave this Chamber to meet outside just as good friends as we now are. I think that any remarks which would tend to irritate one side of the House or the other, or any section of the House, should be guarded against. I know some of us hold very extreme views on some subjects, and I will say this, that although the leader of the labour party—I refer now to the hon. member for Bundamba—and I do not always agree, I have never heard him say a word which ever gave any unnecessary irritation to any member of the House. In that respect his conduct is deserving of being followed by some of us. I have transgressed myself sometimes, but I shall not do so any more. I think on the whole the Government are to be congratulated for carrying out in the energetic way which they propose to do the policy which has

always been our policy, and to which Sir Thos. McIlwraith has evidently converted the Chief Secretary.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said: Mr. Speaker,—I think it is due to the hon. member who has just sat down to compliment him to this extent, that while he has been a member of the House, and representing a black labour constituency all the time he has been here, still he has got the debate out of the black labour rut into which it had fallen, and referred to other subjects which are equally as important as that which has been the subject of the debate up to the present time. Too much attention has been given to the black labour question. In fact, up to the time the hon. member for Mackay spoke, we heard very little more than that from any hon. member. But we must take a wider view of the subject to understand the remarks that have been made, especially those of the hon. member for Enoggera. I have risen principally on account of the remarks made by that hon. member. I want to direct attention to the wider view that I take of the subject. Early in the year it was apparent to the Ministry and to the whole colony that we were in a very miserable position. Business was bad; employment could not be got by men; the smaller financial institutions were shaky; and there was a want of confidence all round, not only of ourselves among ourselves, but of people at home whose opinions we are bound to value. The Government were not in a nice position, and I know that if we had simply studied our own comfort we would have been very glad to have been out of it. We were bound to recognise the position, and to face the causes of our condition with remedies, and that is what we have attempted to do. We saw plainly that there was one very prominent point in which we had failed in past legislation, and that we had by our legislation hurt an industry that might have been prosperous now. That was the sugar industry in the North. We saw that plainly. It was plain to any man who went North. He had only to go to the towns to see the effect, not because there were starving blackfellows there, but because he would find starving white men in all the towns, although he would see evident vestiges of the towns having been much larger in past years. That can be seen from Brisbane right up to Cooktown. Then if he went into the interior a little and visited the plantations, he would find that what were formerly the scenes of industry now show a decaying industry, and an industry that is bound to go unless some means are adopted to keep it in existence. We had to face that position, and we did face it, and we came to the conclusion that the first thing to be done, the best remedy at the present time, was under proper restrictions to give them black labour again. We also faced the question that is such a stumbling block to the hon. member for Enoggera and other hon. members, of "What will the constituencies say?" It would have been an easy matter for a weak Ministry to say that they would throw the responsibility upon the constituencies by going to the country. But I ask hon. members to consider the state of affairs here for the last three months, and say whether we would not have put ourselves down as a lot of cowards if we had dissolved Parliament, and left the responsibility upon the country of finding a remedy for the wretchedness of the colony. We determined to face the position, and we are doing that now with the full responsibility that we are quite prepared to go to the country when we see a manifestation that the country desires it. We believe that the country is with us in the policy enunciated by the Chief Secretary. When the Chief Secretary boldly enunciated that

policy the country at once sprang to it. Every important centre in the colony rose and said that that was the proper policy to pursue.

Mr. DRAKE: Chambers of Commerce.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: The hon. member says "Chambers of Commerce." How does the hon. member get his information about the change of opinion in the country? Take, for instance, the city of Brisbane. At the last general election, when I took up the position that in order to let political matters go on we must let the black labour question be dead for the time, there were three daily papers in Brisbane, all of them opposed to black labour, whilst a fourth paper, edited by the hon. member for Enoggera himself, was also dead against it. Now, if we take those four papers as exponents of public opinion in the South—and I think we may safely do that—everyone of them, and more particularly that formerly edited by the hon. gentleman, is now in favour of black labour. Is not that an indication of the change that has taken place in public opinion in the colony? What better indication could we have than that? I will take the hon. member to his own milk and water meetings. The hon. member has conscientiously attended to his duties to his constituency—because I will give the hon. member the credit of being one of the most conscientious members in the House, sparing no pains in attending to the wants of his constituency, and performing whatever they may legitimately call upon him to do—and they would be a very bad lot to please if they quarrelled with him on account of his not working for their interests. That is why they actually stood him at his meetings at all. If he had been another member they would have quietly shunted him, and said, "We have had quite enough of you"; but they would not. They want a member like the hon. member, who will perform the duties of a member well and conscientiously, and work hard for them. At the same time they want a member to be of their opinion. They did not want to tell the hon. member so in plain words, but they did it in fact; and the hon. member knows as well as I do that he will have to change exactly as the *Boomerang*, the *Courier*, the *Observer*, and the *Telegraph* have changed before he has the slightest chance of getting back for Enoggera again. I have said that the position of a Minister at the present time is not a bed of roses. I admit that what we propose is against the opinion expressed at the last general election; but having come to the conclusion that public opinion had changed, and knowing that we ourselves had changed, the first thing to do was to let the country know what we proposed to do. The Chief Secretary did that as soon as arrangements could be made, and we then made arrangements for the meeting of Parliament. That was a much bolder course than drivelling on, getting deeper in debt till the month of June, and then coming helplessly forward and saying "We did not get you into this fix. The only thing is to have a dissolution." We are prepared to fight it out, and do the best for the country, and that is the whole object of the policy indicated in the Speech. The first thing we want to remedy is the depression in the sugar industry. I am not going into the kanaka question, but I will simply state as a fact that the introduction of kanaka labour, or the mere promise of it, will give a great impulse to the colony at the present time. If the hon. member for Enoggera studied public opinion he would see that the labouring classes, who are so much out of employment, are the men who have been converted. I admit that the labour leaders have not been converted. It will take a great deal to

convert them, because they are not out of employment. If the hon. gentleman takes the most legitimate means to find out what the labouring people think on the question, he will come to the conclusion to which I have come—namely, that the more black men are employed on the sugar plantations the better it will be for all the industries in the towns, and in the country too. I speak for the towns from my own knowledge; and with regard to the country, I refer to the meetings held there. Look at Mr. Atkinson's speech at Gin Gin. He is one of the most sensible men I know, and his speech was most eloquent. He said to the farmers, "Look how well we lived while the sugar plantations were going on! They were good customers. And look what a lot of poverty-stricken devils we are now!" That was the gist of his sermon, and its truth is abundantly proved. If the hon. member will ascertain the opinions of such people he will find a better indication of public opinion than he can get from the Barcoo election. Public opinion must not be gauged by the Barcoo election on a question of this sort; and if he thinks we were deceived by the Barcoo election he is quite wrong. I had openly expressed my opinion that the Barcoo election would be lost, simply because the workers had complete control of the rolls. The policy they advocated was to insist on a continual rise in wages without the slightest consideration as to the ability of the employers to pay higher wages; and we can scarcely fancy any candidate opposed to that policy, so successful for the time, being returned at present. A remedy will come in time, however; and the remedy will come, not by employers bringing down wages, but by employees being glad to be employed at wages which the employer can afford to pay. Until then it is likely that the Barcoo will return members pledged entirely to the doctrines supported by Mr. Ryan, whom I am glad to welcome here to-night. His election, however, is no indication of the feeling of the country with regard to kanaka labour.

Mr. DRAKE: How about Mr. Campbell's change of views while the election was going on?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: My private opinion is that it was a very mean thing. I may say that, although I have some influence in the electorate, I would not advise anyone to vote one way or the other; and so far as the opinions expressed by the candidates are concerned, I am just as glad to see Mr. Ryan here as I would have been to see Mr. Campbell; in fact, a great deal more so, because I believe Mr. Ryan got in on principles in which he believes, but I do not think the other man believes in the principles he advocated.

The Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: He has no principles.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: The introduction of black labour was only one of the means by which the Government saw they could, with the sanction of Parliament, improve the condition of the country. It is a deplorable fact that has been forced upon us for the last two years that borrowing money for the purpose of constructing public works in Queensland is, for a long time at all events, at an end; and we had to face that fact, because it involves throwing out of labour a large number of men who have depended on loan expenditure for their living. Having faced that fact we were bound to find a remedy, and that, as is the case with regard to the sugar industry, as quickly as possible. We studied the case with regard to borrowed money; and I may be allowed to digress here in order to show that our position, so far as borrowed money is concerned, is entirely different from the position of the other colonies at the

present time. All the colonies are in a bad position so far as the money market is concerned; but there is no doubt that a good deal of that has been caused by circumstances outside the colony.

The Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: I am sorry to hear you say that we are in a bad position. I do not think we are.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I feel that it is bad, because I hardly know how to pay my way. When the Government saw it was not likely that the colony would be able to obtain much more loan money for expenditure on public works, of course we had to cast about for other means. New South Wales and Victoria are precluded from taking the remedy we propose to take, because their land is gone. They persisted in the system of borrowing, not for the purpose of getting the country out of difficulties, but for the purpose of prosecuting further works; and I wish especially to direct the attention of Queensland and of the home country to the fact that any endeavour we have made to borrow for the last twelve months has not been for the purpose of initiating anything new, but for the purpose of carrying out existing obligations. We have shut down our public works as far as we could; but the persistence of the other colonies in borrowing has kept us from getting the little we want. I hope, however, that the financial horizon is clearing. I think it is; and if we get over this pinch I see nothing to prevent us from going on a long career of prosperity, because our producing industries were never in a better position than they are in at the present time, so far as production is concerned. I shall have something to say about markets another time. We have therefore every reason to look forward with hope. It is absurd to suppose that a colony like this should allow its best lands to lie utterly undeveloped; and therefore the Government, in order to prosecute their scheme, have decided to develop the country by extending railways on the land-grant system. I am not going to discuss the principle at the present time, because that matter will come on in due course; but I mention it as a prominent part of our policy, that will not only be the means of providing labour in different parts of the colony, but also of opening up the land so that industries may be multiplied. That it will have that effect there can be little doubt. These are the two principal things that are mentioned in the Governor's Speech. With regard to the tax upon live stock, I do not think that is a matter worth dwelling on at the present time at all. A Bill will be before the House in a few days, and the reason why it has not been a matter for legislation before is that wise people thought it would not be prudent to deal with it unless they knew that those immediately interested were willing to be taxed. I have always thought it would not be a justifiable thing to force a tax upon the stockowners of the country, and then give it back in the shape of a bonus, unless they thought themselves that it would be to their advantage. I thought they should be consulted first, and now that the stockowners have said they are agreeable to be taxed, there is no doubt in the minds of the Ministry that it will be an unmitigated good to the colony, and it will bestow benefits upon people quite outside of those who will pay the tax. There can be no doubt as to the advantage it will be if we really succeed in that experiment of forcing new markets in various countries, and that is the object of the experiment. Of course, the conditions must have the acquiescence of the stockowners, and I think they will be satisfied that the proposed Act will work to their advantage, and cannot be characterised, as the hon.

member for Mackay characterised it, as taking money out of one pocket and putting it into the other. That will not be the effect at all. It is fostering a new industry altogether, and making those who will benefit, but who will not stand the risk, support it in the only manner possible—namely, by putting down their capital. I believe myself that it will be successful; but the whole matter will be dealt with in due time. I hope that the questions now before the House will not be debated in a reckless spirit. I do not think there is much chance of that. Personally, I may say that I do not fear the advent of labour candidates into this Chamber. I would rather see them inside than breeding sedition outside.

The HON. B. D. MOREHEAD: Why should they breed sedition at all?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: My opinion is that they do so, and I shall be glad to see them inside in small numbers. I have no doubt they are very fine fellows, and know a great deal, but they will learn a great deal here, and will be able to teach better doctrines to men outside. For that, if for no other reason, I shall welcome their presence, and I am sure that the more of them there are here, the more sober will they be in their ideas. It has been too great a strain upon one man. There was only one a year or two ago, and now there are three, and there may be three or four more after the next general election, so that they will be able to form a small party, divide the speaking amongst them, and impress their ideas upon our legislation. I hope the Bills that the Government will bring before the House will have their very best attention. In fact, I believe they will, and that they will be treated without any recklessness. The hon. member for Balonne wished me to refer to the correspondence with the Bank of England. I did not intend to do so now, but I think it is right that I should take the first opportunity of putting myself right so far as I possibly can. In regard to my first criticism upon the Bank of England, except the language which was used, and which I did not like myself, I have nothing to withdraw; but in reference to the second speech, the Bank of England put the facts so very differently that I withdrew and did so at once. Hon. members will see that I took every precaution before I made the remarks I did to see that I was well informed. While the discussion was going on, between my first and second speeches, I telegraphed to the Agent-General and asked him whether the Bank of England had subscribed any of the loan as it ultimately passed, and the answer was that the Bank had not. That reply was followed by a letter in which he said that the Bank had not done so, and in which he gave the actual men who did subscribe, showing that the Bank had not. The Bank of England afterwards saw that correspondence, and did not object to it, and in the letter they wrote in answer to my first speech they said themselves that they had not subscribed, and gave as the reason for it that it had been previously subscribed by others. Now, in the letter in which the Bank of England renounced business with the Queensland Government, they made the statement that as a matter of fact they did subscribe £870,000, and they produced from their brokers a letter to show that they had done so, but that they had sold the stock immediately, so that it was not in their possession. That news only came to me this month, and only in the letter in which they renounced our business. The most severe things I said were in my second speech, and I could not consider the Bank to blame for having done what some London papers blamed them for as a shady thing—namely, to try to raise the price of

a Queensland loan by even promising to subscribe such a large amount. It would have been base ingratitude for me to say they were to blame if I had known the facts, but I took it as true that they had not subscribed at all. Now they tell me that they did subscribe, and as I believe myself that they always had the intention of subscribing if no one else took up the burden from their shoulders, I willingly withdraw everything that I have said. I wished to make that statement as soon as I had the opportunity of doing so. If hon. members will take the trouble to read the wild comments which have been made on this subject they will see what gross ignorance has been displayed by newspapers at home in regard to colonial politics, and I think they will excuse some temper on my part. The *Times*, for instance, in a leader full of abuse, in which it speaks of me as an unmannerly man—I am not, by the way, responsible to the *Times* for my manners; as long as they please this House I am perfectly satisfied—and criticises my action, tells its readers that I was the very man who got the colony into all its present difficulties. The article, referring to the statement that my main object in speaking as I did was to save future Treasurers from falling into the same circumstances into which I had fallen by warning them against putting their trust in banks, said what a pity it was that Sir Thomas McIlwraith did not do that some years before. What was it that threw me out of power in 1883? Was it not doing exactly the same thing? Have I not been called the financial Cassandra of politics because I have insisted continually on putting an end to borrowing, and in place of that, upon obtaining money for building our railways from different sources? Men making such statements make them from pure ignorance, and such criticisms fill me with nothing but contempt.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. STEVENSON said: Mr. Speaker,—I am sure the House and the country must be very well pleased with what has just fallen from the Treasurer. I am perfectly satisfied that there will be a feeling of relief throughout the country such as has not existed for some time past in connection with this matter. I believe that the statement the hon. gentleman has made will do as much good as any discussion on the kanaka question, and I only wish the Chief Secretary had made his apology in the same unreserved way. I am perfectly certain that what has fallen from the Treasurer will have a very beneficial effect in the country, and will be accepted at home in good faith. I am not going to say much on the Governor's Speech, nor to discuss the kanaka question at any great length, although I am not afraid to discuss it. It is pretty well known that I have always been in favour of the employment of kanaka labour, not only on sugar plantations, but also in some work in connection with pastoral pursuits when we could not afford to pay high wages to white men; and I have never given any pledge to vote against the introduction of kanakas. Notwithstanding that the hon. member for Enoggera has said that so many members of this House are pledged against kanaka labour, I do not think that such is the case. At the last general election the kanaka question was looked upon almost as a dead letter; in fact, as the Chief Secretary has said, it was looked upon as settled. But, as the hon. gentleman has pointed out, circumstances have now changed. I do not agree with what the hon. member for Enoggera has said with reference to the Barcoo election; neither do I concur in what was stated by the Treasurer on that subject. I do not think the Barcoo election can be looked upon as a contested election at the finish, because the pastoralists, after their

man, Mr. Budge, went wrong, ceased to take any interest in it. They did not get the man they wanted as a candidate, and did not give even a half-hearted support to Mr. Campbell, who stood against Mr. Ryan. The only people who took any interest in the election were the executive of the Pastoralists' Association in Brisbane, and, just as the election was coming on, the whole of the members, with the exception of one, went to Melbourne, and they then took no further interest in the contest. There was no opportunity, after Mr. Budge retired, of bringing out any other candidate. The pastoralists might possibly have given a kind of half-hearted support to Mr. Campbell, and I believe some of them did; but, as I have already stated, half the squatters in the Barcoo electorate were away in Melbourne at the time. When, however, Mr. Campbell, in his speech at Isisford, distinctly turned round and said he would vote against black labour, they would not support him. The hon. member for Enoggera gives that change of front as the reason why Mr. Campbell got no support at all, but I consider that was the very thing which killed his chances of election, because the squatters saw that he was a man without any mind of his own—neither fish, flesh, fowl, nor good red-herring—and they would sooner have a man who had opinions of his own, and would stick to them, than a man upon whom they could not rely. That was the reason why Mr. Ryan had what may be called a "walk over" for the Barcoo. I noticed that at one polling-place—Wellshot—where there must be fifty or sixty men, there was only one vote given. I suppose that must have been the vote of the manager, because he would probably support Mr. Campbell. I took some interest in the election myself until a certain time, when my interest in the matter ceased. I heard several squatters from the Barcoo district say that they would rather see Mr. Ryan elected than Mr. Campbell, because the latter was not to be trusted as a politician. At any rate, I am perfectly satisfied that, even supposing the feeling in that district was opposed to black labour, it cannot be taken as a criterion of the general feeling in the country, especially in the coast and sugar districts. The fact that the Barcoo returned a member opposed to black labour does not prove that the people in the sugar districts entertain the same opinion. The hon. member for Enoggera will persist that this Parliament has no business to deal with the kanaka question, but the Chief Secretary has clearly pointed out that if we wait for a dissolution and leave the matter to be settled by a new Parliament it will then be too late. By that time many of the plantations would be shut up altogether, and the industry would be completely destroyed. The hon. member for Enoggera said he heard of only one mill that was likely to be shut up and removed to Fiji, and that was the Colonial Sugar Company's mill; but I know very well, and I am sure the hon. member for Mackay, Mr. Dalrymple, will be able to tell this House that there are many mills, not only in the Mackay but in other districts, that have been shut up for a long time.

Mr. DRAKE: Yes; but that is because the bigger mills are doing the work.

Mr. STEVENSON: I do not belong to a sugar district, and I cannot say that that is not so; but I am satisfied that many mills have been shut up and more will be shut up if the extension of the Act is not agreed to. That is all I have to say on that subject. I congratulate the Chief Secretary upon having had the courage to change his opinions on the subject when he saw that the circumstances of the colony demanded it. I for one—and I believe a good many of the members

of the House will do so, too—will give him all the help I can to extricate the sugar industry from the trouble it is in now. I need not now enter upon the subject of land-grant railways, but I am glad to find that the Chief Secretary has also changed his mind on that subject. The Colonial Treasurer has said we will have an opportunity to consider the stock tax in the future, so I need say nothing about it now. I congratulate the country on the stand that has been taken by the Chief Secretary, and I hope we shall all work together to get the country into a more satisfactory state than it is in at present. With regard to the bugbear held up in certain quarters concerning labour trouble and labour members, I am not at all frightened to see labour members in this House. So long as we get common-sense and intelligent men from the working classes I think labour ought to be represented in this House. What we want is to get rid of the cunning schemers who mischievously mislead men. Those are the men we want to keep out of the House and to prevent them from influencing the working men. So long as we get common-sense intelligent men, who have the good of the country and the good of the workers at heart, we need not fear to have labour members of that class in this House.

Mr. SALKELD said: Mr. Speaker,—I move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

On the motion of the CHIEF SECRETARY, the resumption of the debate was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of a letter from the Auditor-General upon the subject of the investment of the funds and the condition of the securities of the Government Savings Bank.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said: Mr. Speaker,—I move that the paper be printed.

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at five minutes to 10 o'clock.