

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 5 OCTOBER 1898

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

WEDNESDAY, 5 OCTOBER, 1898.

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

THE LATE PREMIER.

FURTHER MESSAGES OF SYMPATHY.

The SPEAKER: I have to announce to the House that I have received the following communication from the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia :—

I am desired to forward you the following resolution passed this day by the Legislative Assembly of this colony :—" We, the members of the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, having learnt with sorrow of the untimely death of the Honourable T. J. Byrnes, Prime Minister of Queensland, desire to express to the Parliament and people of that colony our sympathy with them in the sad loss they have sustained."

JAMES J. LEE-STERE,
Speaker.

I have also received the following from the Speaker of the House of Assembly, Tasmania :—

By a unanimous vote of the House of Assembly I am desired to convey to you, and through you to the people of your colony, the profound regret of this House for the lamentable death of the Honourable Thomas Joseph Byrnes, Premier of Queensland. His too early decease is sincerely mourned both on account of his high personal character and attainments and the disappointment of well-founded hopes that the cause of Australian federation would receive valuable assistance from his able and influential advocacy.

NICHOLAS J. BROWN,
Speaker.

THE SEAT OF THE LATE PREMIER.

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received from the Registrar-General a certified copy of the registration of the death of the late Hon. Thomas Joseph Byrnes, member for the electoral district of Warwick, which I now submit for the information of the House.

The PREMIER: I beg to move—

That the seat in this House for the electoral district of Warwick has become and is now vacant by reason of the death of the Hon. Thomas Joseph Byrnes, late member for the said electoral district.

Language, Mr. Speaker, is wholly inadequate to convey the heartfelt sorrow which we all experience at having to accept this motion.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!
Question put and passed.

QUESTIONS.

CAUCUS OF GOVERNMENT SUPPORTERS.

Mr. LEAHY: I wish, without notice, to ask the Premier whether his attention has been called to reports appearing in the Brisbane daily

papers of to-day—the *Courier* and *Telegraph*—of a meeting of members on this side of the House held yesterday on public business, and whether the information contained in those reports, as intimated in the papers, was conveyed to the representatives of the said journals by the hon. gentleman, or under his instructions?

The PREMIER replied: I have read the report in the papers. I cannot say who gave instructions for its publication, but at the same time I do not know that the report is substantially incorrect or inaccurate.

Mr. LEAHY: I did not ask that question.

Mr. DAWSON: You implied it.

The PREMIER: I am not responsible for its publication; that is my answer.

SALE OF RAILWAY WHARF AT CAIRNS.

Mr. DAWSON asked the Secretary for Railways—

1. Is it true that the Government are advertising the sale by auction of railway wharf at Cairns on indefeasible lease for twenty years?

2. Is the proposed sale in accord with the wishes of the people of Cairns?

3. If not, will the Minister consult the people's wishes before proceeding any further?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

1. Yes.

2. I cannot say, beyond the fact that the mayor of Cairns has asked that a clause providing for resumption at six (6) months' notice be inserted in the lease.

3. No; as the sale of the lease is being made in the interests of the Railway Department.

PETITION.

CAIRNS GAS COMPANY BILL.

Mr. DRAKE presented a petition from the Cairns Gas Company, Limited, asking for leave to introduce a Bill to enable the company to supply gas and other light to Cairns and its suburbs, and for other purposes.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

The PREMIER (the Hon. J. R. Dickson): With the permission of the House I desire to make a Ministerial statement. Since this House rose we have all attended the funeral of our late Premier, and I am sure that the feelings of sorrow which filled us at his decease have not subsided even by this time, nor will they for a very long period. The demonstration which took place on that occasion shows how profoundly moved was the whole heart of the people of Queensland, because I think I may safely assert that at no previous event in the history of Queensland connected with the decease of a public man or statesman has any such demonstration of public sympathy been evoked or exhibited by such a concurrence of real and sincere mourners as was manifested on that occasion.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Since that event took place, I have been summoned by His Excellency to form an Administration, and having offered seats in the Cabinet to my hon. colleagues under the late Administration, and those gentlemen having honoured me with their offer of most loyal and cordial support, I felt myself in a position to place my services at the disposal of His Excellency, and thereupon I was sworn in as Vice-President of the Executive Council, and as Chief Secretary of Queensland, which office I now hold in connection with my former Ministerial portfolio of Home Secretary. My hon. colleague, the Hon. W. H. Wilson, formerly Postmaster-General under the late Administration, has also been sworn in as Minister for Justice in connection with his previous portfolio, and I

now lay on the table of the House the *Queensland Government Gazette* containing these announcements.

Mr. DAWSON: Where is your Attorney-General?

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker,—I am fully sensible of the many—the very many—deficiencies in my character which would make me apprehensive of supporting the weight of such great responsibilities as attach to the Premiership of Queensland, and possibly more especially at the present time. I feel also, Sir, that I, or any other man of normal character and ability, must suffer very markedly by contrast with such an illustrious man as has just passed away from us; and therefore it requires no small amount of moral courage and determination to accept the great and serious and solemn responsibility attaching to the Premiership at the present time. But I feel—and I say it with all sincerity—that God being my helper, and with the loyal support and assistance of old and experienced colleagues, who each and all have made their mark on the political history of this colony in connection with their public career—supported by them, supported also by what I conceive to be a loyal, solid phalanx on this side of the House who have hitherto shown an amount of loyal solidity in supporting my predecessors—relying upon such support; relying upon the experience of my colleagues; relying also upon my own determination to face all obstacles and with a firm hand to do that which is right regardless of consequences in the high and elevated position of Premier of Queensland—relying on that determination, I have no fear or hesitancy in accepting the responsible duties imposed upon me.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: In assuming the administration of the country, the Government of which I have the honour to be the head intend to proceed with the business of the country at the point where it was arrested by the untimely death of our late lamented Premier. I see no reason, with a united party and the wisdom of my colleagues, why we should hesitate to proceed with such legislation as was approved by the late Premier, and was in fact inspired by him; and my determination is to submit to the House and to proceed at once with such measures as were temporarily arrested by the event to which I have referred. I desire to pass through the Estimates in the usual form. I desire to submit to the House and to proceed with those measures of legislation which have been announced by our late Premier, and which have been held in abeyance in the hope of having the benefit of his presence to enable us to carry them to a satisfactory conclusion. I see no reason why the present session should prove a barren or wholly unfruitful one, or that we should be deterred from proceeding with those measures already announced, and which the country awaits with hopeful expectancy. Under these circumstances I hope the wisdom of the House will determine how many—it is not for me to forecast what the House will determine; it is for me to inform the House that I intend to place these matters before them for consideration, and I must throw upon hon. members who may resolutely oppose them the responsibility of the position in which they will stand at the conclusion of the session. I give, therefore, to the House the intimation that I desire to press through the business of the country. In fact, I should like and I should hope that hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly seeing the unfortunate position of public business delayed by the sad event which we all deplore, will assist Parliament to, at any rate, make this session more fruitful. Let us have by all means full and

searching criticism. I invite the fullest criticism, but I hope that the criticism of the Opposition will be of a generous character, and that they will consider the embarrassing circumstances in which the Government have been placed at the present time. I think it would be unwise and improper in the present position of affairs to introduce any new features of policy. Doubtless when we approach the dissolution of Parliament a policy will be submitted to the country on which we will stand or fall. In the meantime we take up the reins where they were suddenly dropped, and I trust to the generous forbearance of hon. members to assist the Government in carrying through those measures—many of which hon. members on the other side have approved of—and to assist in making the session more fruitful.

Mr. McDONALD: Why not go to the country at once?

The PREMIER: I have already expressed the determination of this side of the House to proceed with public business.

Mr. McDONALD: You are afraid to meet the people.

The PREMIER: The Government are not at all afraid to meet the people. They rely on the confidence and support of the people. They would not hold office if they had any apprehension that they did not represent the people, and as leader of the Government I emphatically assert that we believe and know that we at the present time possess the thorough confidence and respect of the people, and will not be afraid to appear before our constituents when, in our opinion, a suitable time arrives.

Mr. McDONALD: You are only there on sufferance.

The PREMIER: I think I need say no more on this occasion. I may say that if by our counsels in legislation, and by our administration, we are able to extend the welfare of every dweller of this land, our services to the public at the present time will not be regarded as wholly vain.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GLASSEY: I may claim the indulgence of the House to make a few observations. I am sure every hon. member fully shares the sentiments expressed by the hon. gentleman with regard to the death of the late Premier, and I think we must congratulate the hon. gentleman for the amount of courage he has displayed on the present occasion.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GLASSEY: Courage which is worthy of emulation by younger men. He already tells us that he represents a united Cabinet, and a solid and compact party. That, of course, is information that we were not prepared to hear. Nevertheless, I presume the hon. gentleman is fully armed and equipped, and is authorised to make the statement he has just made. I must confess that I am somewhat disappointed at the statement made this afternoon, knowing the sentiments expressed by the hon. gentleman some little time ago with regard to this continuous Ministry; yet he is not slow to come forward on the present occasion with all the boldness imaginable and tell us that he is quite prepared to continue that same continuous Ministry with he himself at the head. I should have expected, considering the circumstances which exist at the present time with regard—not to the compactness or solidity of the hon. gentleman's party, because that is a matter on which there is very little room for doubt—but seeing that we are within ten or twelve weeks of the close of the ordinary parliamentary session, and seeing that not a single measure of importance has yet been placed on the statute-book,

although we have been in session for nearly three months, I should have expected a very different statement from the hon. gentleman. He has told us that we are about to enter on a session of vigour, and a session, he hopes, of usefulness—a session which he hopes will prove fruitful and beneficial to the people of Queensland.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Hear, hear! Why not?

Mr. GLASSEY: Considering the present state of affairs, considering the uncertainty which exists, considering, too, the opportunity for usefulness which the Government has had, the time has come for them to seek for the endorsement or otherwise of the constituencies of this country.

MEMBERS of the Labour party: Hear, hear!

Mr. GLASSEY: The Government are bound in the course of a short time to seek the suffrages of the people—to ask for that endorsement of their policy to which I have alluded, or to allow the people an opportunity of saying that the time has come when the present state of affairs should be brought to an end.

Mr. DAWSON: They are a united party—there is no difference of opinion.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: So are you.

Mr. GLASSEY: The Premier hopes that he will be able to pass some useful measures. I presume one of the measures to which he alludes is the Mining Bill.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GLASSEY: Does the hon. gentleman allude to the Mining Bill?

The PREMIER: I hope so.

Mr. GLASSEY: I believe I am right in saying that that Bill, which has not yet been introduced, contains some 256 clauses. Now, I ask any hon. member who has had experience of this House during the last few sessions is it possible in ten short weeks, or even in twelve weeks, to place a measure of such magnitude and importance—dealing as it does with one of the greatest industries of the colony—on the statute-book with any degree of satisfaction?

Mr. McDONALD: They do not intend to.

Mr. GLASSEY: The hon. gentleman also stated that he hoped he will be able to get through the Estimates. I tell the hon. gentleman that, so far as my opinions go, and so far as my weight goes, whatever it may be worth, he will not get through with the Estimates.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is now exceeding the bounds allowed on occasions like the present. There is no question before the House, and I trust the hon. member will conform to the parliamentary usage on such occasions.

Mr. GLASSEY: I have no desire to prolong the discussion, as there will be full opportunity to deal with the question on some other occasion. Briefly, I may say I am disappointed at the statement of the Premier. I thought he would have told us that, considering the present unhappy circumstances, he would ask the House to pass two or three measures of some urgency, ask for temporary Supply, and then wind up the session and go to the country. I hope that will be done.

MEMBERS of the Labour party: Hear, hear!

Mr. GLASSEY: That is the policy of the party sitting on this side. We are not desirous at this late period of the session of prolonging the agony which, unfortunately, has existed for some length of time, and of perpetuating this continuous Ministry. I have nothing more to say on the present occasion. Perhaps on another occasion I may have a good deal to say.

JURY BILL.—INTESTACY AND INSANITY (LOCAL ADMINISTRATION) BILL.

MESSAGES FROM THE COUNCIL.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of messages from the Council returning these Bills without amendment.

CORRESPONDENCE—RAILWAY TRAFFIC DEPARTMENT.

On the motion of Mr. DAWSON, it was resolved—

1. That there be laid on the table of the House copies of all correspondence between the District Traffic Manager and the Railway Department, referring to the exercise of discretionary powers by District Traffic Managers, or conferring, or repudiating, or commenting upon, the exercise of any such powers by him.
2. Also copies of instructions issued to the Northern and Central district traffic managers with reference to enlarged powers.

BISHOPSBOURNE, ETC., BILL.

SELECT COMMITTEE.

On the motion of Mr. GROOM, it was resolved—

1. That the Bishopsbourne Estate and See Endowment Trusts Bill be referred for the consideration and report of a Select Committee, with power to send for persons and papers, and leave to sit during any adjournment of the House.
2. That such committee consist of Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Stumm, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Jenkinson, and the mover.

SLAUGHTERING BILL.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE moved—

That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to provide for the licensing and inspection of slaughter-houses, and to regulate the slaughter and sale of meat.

Mr. McDONALD: I think the hon. gentleman, in dealing with this matter, ought to give us some information about it, for the reason that owing to the present state of affairs we have been led to believe that these Bills are merely brought in to be laid on the table and have no further action taken upon them.

The PREMIER: Who said so?

Mr. McDONALD: Would the hon. gentleman like me to tell him why I come to that conclusion?

The PREMIER: That is not my question.

Mr. McDONALD: With the consent of the House, I will tell the hon. gentleman. These Bills are not intended to be passed simply because the hon. gentleman has not got the support of his own party.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Oh, oh! You try it.

Mr. McDONALD: The hon. gentleman is only in his present position on sufferance.

MEMBERS on the Government side: No, no!

Mr. McDONALD: When the hon. gentleman talks about upholding the dignity of the position I can tell him—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. gentleman is wandering from the question before the House.

Mr. McDONALD: I quite grant that, but the hon. gentleman invited an answer. I asked the consent of the House, and I took it that the other side assented to me making an explanation. I then immediately proceeded to inform the hon. gentleman of his exact position. I do not make any bones about this matter.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What about the meat?

Mr. McDONALD: There is supposed to be meat on it, but I maintain there is only bone. I am going to take up the position that I will obstruct any business that the Government brings on until they go to the country.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That is intelligible.

Mr. DAWSON: It is honest.

The PREMIER: Why does not your leader say so?

Mr. McDONALD: You are not leader on that side, and you know it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. gentleman must address the Chair.

Mr. McDONALD: I quite recognise that. The day is long, and this is a very important Bill now before us. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has introduced it for the purpose of getting the inside running of the hon. member for Wide Bay, who has a Bill before the House dealing with the dead meat trade. It appears that there is a kind of competition between the two hon. gentlemen, but I feel quite confident that the hon. member for Wide Bay will hold his own. This Bill is purely intended to take the wind out of the sails of the hon. member for Wide Bay, and it would only have been a matter of common decency to have waited until the Bill of the hon. member for Wide Bay was introduced. As far as I understand this matter, it is likely to need a very big Bill to deal with it—probably a Bill like the Mining Bill, containing over 200 clauses. Is it at all likely that we will be able to deal with such a large measure before the end of this session? Owing to the general state of politics it is most unlikely, and it is a mere waste of time. It appears to me that this Bill is introduced for the express purpose of wasting time. The best thing under the circumstances would have been for the hon. gentleman to have allowed his leader, Mr. Philp—I mean Mr. Dickson—to announce that the Bill would be introduced but not proceeded with, and that it would be embodied in the policy for the next general elections. This motion requires a great deal of consideration, and I therefore propose to move the omission of all the words after the word "That," and later on I shall propose to insert other words. I have been, like the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, a good many years in politics, and I therefore do not think it wise to show my hand all at once. Perhaps, therefore, it would not be wise or politic to tell the hon. gentleman what words I proposed to insert. Seeing that the Premier is so anxious to go on with business, perhaps it would be wise to hold the matter in abeyance until the words have been struck out.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Is the House going to suffer this tomfoolery much longer?

Mr. McDONALD: We have suffered the hon. gentleman and his crowd long enough, and he will have to suffer us for a little while. I can assure him that it is not a bit of use his losing his temper at this stage of affairs. It is quite possible he may lose his temper a little later on, but if he takes my advice he will not lose it now. I tell the hon. gentleman distinctly what my ideas are, and of course the leader of the Government—with his strong majority—knows exactly what to do. If they want to sit me down, they have the power in their hands to do it with their splendid majority. I am quite prepared to take all the responsibility and risk for my action, but when the hon. gentleman talks about tomfoolery I would ask him to remember the caucus meeting of yesterday, and ask whether there was any tomfoolery there.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. McDONALD: I think the hon. member lost his temper a great deal more upon that particular occasion than there is any need for now, and it would be wise for him to hold his tongue on this occasion. If he has anything to say, he can wait and speak on the motion the same as any other hon. member.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It went home all right.

Mr. McDONALD: Yes, I believe you did go home yesterday, and that some hon. members got home very strongly. This is one of the measures that the Government should have asked us to consider some time ago. We all know that in this colony, which is one of the largest exporters of meat, there is a great deal of slaughtering done, but the Government made no attempt to deal with the matter until the hon. member for Wide Bay took it up, although it has been referred to several times within my own knowledge. The moment an hon. member on this side had the courage to grapple with the question we find the Secretary for Agriculture comes down and attempts to introduce a similar Bill.

Mr. KEOGH: It is never too late to mend.

Mr. McDONALD: Yes; but in the present state of affairs I do not see any possibility of amendment. It is a well-known fact that some of the meat that has been slaughtered in this colony has been unfit for human consumption, and a great deal that has been exported has been landed in London in a very bad state. In fact one of our late Premiers, Sir Thomas McIlwraith, I think, stated in London that the meat sent from this colony was of a very inferior character altogether, and he advised that all the meat exported should be inspected—a course which would very much further the interests of the meat industry. It is only a few days ago that we heard that, through the very insufficient inspection, a whole shipload of meat sent from here was condemned, and had to be destroyed, which resulted in an enormous loss, and risked the reputation of the colony. We have known of cancerous cattle being slaughtered for human consumption, the result of which must be the spread of various obnoxious diseases right throughout the colony. It is very well known in the medical world that a great many diseases society is subject to are contracted by eating diseased cattle, and there have been very injurious results to the people where there has been an absence of inspection. I think there should be very strict rules in regard to the licensing and inspection of slaughter-houses, and I advise the hon. member to look seriously into the matter, and see whether sufficient protection is given by the Bill he seeks to introduce. I believe he has an open mind, and is always ready to accept suggestions, and I am sure that he will accept a suggestion from me and see that proper provision is made in the direction I have indicated. At present the hon. member seems to be looking up "May," instead of listening to my remarks upon this interesting subject, but I hope he will take notice of what I have said, and when the Bill is introduced he will deal with these matters in an effective and statesmanlike way. I should like the hon. member to state what he means by the "sale of meat" —

The SPEAKER: Order! We are now simply dealing with a motion that the House will on a certain day go into committee for the purpose of introducing a Bill, and the hon. member's remarks are not relevant to that motion.

Mr. McDONALD: I quite concur in your ruling, Sir, that members should confine themselves to the strict terms of the motion. At the time I mentioned the matter I thought I was slightly erring from the strict rule of the House, and I shall not pursue that course any further. I hope that the hon. gentleman in replying to the various arguments which will probably be adduced in the course of this debate during the next few hours will give us some idea of what this Bill is likely to be. I have no real objection to the introduction of such a Bill. Of course

the general idea is that there should be no opposition at all to a motion like this, but I could quote several cases in which similar Bills have been defeated on the motion to go into committee. However, I have fairly explained my particular ideas on this motion, and the Government understand pretty well why I objected to it going as "formal." I think that motions of this character ought not to go as "formal," but that in proposing them the Minister should tell us distinctly what is the tenor of the Bill and why it is introduced. The hon. gentleman did nothing of the kind on this particular occasion, and therefore I beg to move that all the words after the word "that" be omitted.

Mr. DUNSFORD: I am given to understand that the hon. member for Wide Bay desires to speak upon this most important matter, and I think it would be a pity to rush the motion through the House. The motion proposes that we shall do something on the next sitting day in Committee of the Whole. I am one of those who believe that there should be no next sitting of this House, but that this sitting should terminate the business as far as this Government or this Parliament is concerned; and honestly believing that, I hope the House will not give the Minister the opportunity he asks to do something at the next sitting. I hope that neither the few remarks made by the hon. member for Flinders, nor the few remarks I shall make, will be taken by hon. members as meaning that we are opposed to a Bill such as it is proposed should be introduced. I am sure that all sensible people will agree that the time has arrived when such a Bill should be passed, but the question arises whether this House is in a fit condition to pass that Bill at the present time, whether the time is appropriate for the introduction of such a Bill, or whether the matter should be deferred until we have fuller information on the matter and until members of the House are in a better position to carry such legislation. If this Bill is a comprehensive measure—as it certainly should be—then we have not the time this session to carry it in conjunction with other necessary legislation. As has been truly said this afternoon we have only some few weeks now before Christmas, and we have very important matters to consider in the Estimates and Ways and Means, so that I think members must come to the conclusion that now is not the time to bring forward important legislation such as this, when we are at the tail end of the session and the tail end of the Parliament, and members themselves do not know what they want. All some members know is that they want to cling to their seats and their salaries, and that they intend to do as long as they can. I am one of those who believe that we ought to go to the country before any further legislation is introduced—after, of course, we have passed an Appropriation Bill, giving supply to, say, January. After that we should at once go to the country, and get the opinion of the electors on this and other important legislation. Do the constituencies desire that we should deal with legislation of this sort? If they do, and tell us so, then we shall be armed with authority to pass the legislation, but at the present time we are not in that position. The Premier cannot say that he is armed with such authority, nor can the Secretary for Agriculture say that he has any authority from his constituents or any other portion of Queensland.

The SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. member is entirely out of order in the remarks he is now making.

Mr. DUNSFORD: While I bow to your ruling, still I think that if I can prove that the present is not an appropriate time to introduce this Bill; that the Minister has no authority to introduce it, and that it is introduced to kill time, no business being meant or possible in the motion—I think if I prove that, I shall be giving good reasons why this House should not continue to waste time in that direction. We are paid agents of the people, and I, as one of those paid agents, protest against wasting time in this way while we continue to draw our salaries. It is proposed here to introduce a Bill to regulate the slaughter of meat. I want to know what meat the Minister is going to slaughter. It strikes me that this is more like slaughtering the Queen's English. I can understand the sale, ticketing, and inspection of meat, but the slaughter of meat is a puzzle to me. We have for a long time now been inspecting meat which is exported and consumed by people outside the colony, but with rare exceptions we have never in anything like a full manner inspected meat which is consumed by our own people. That is a very foolish course to pursue. I am pleased to say that on Charters Towers they have a pretty efficient system of inspection, owing to the municipality and divisional board having taken up the matter, but that is not anything like general in the colony, and the fact that only one or two towns have taken it up is a proof of the necessity for a comprehensive measure. If we consider this matter from the health point of view—

The SPEAKER: The hon. member appears to me to be anticipating discussion on the merits of the Bill. He must confine himself to the terms of the motion, and I warn him that if he proceeds in this unparliamentary manner it will be my duty to call upon him to resume his seat.

Mr. DUNSFORD: I clearly cannot be speaking on the merits of the Bill, because I have not yet seen the Bill. Of course I do not know whether you yourself know that I am anticipating a Bill whose contents not one member of this House really knows. Be that as it may, the motion before us certainly does not deal with the merits or details of any particular Bill, but it does deal with the desirableness of introducing a Bill having for its end an avowed object, and I think I should be justified in speaking on the merits of that object. Is it a good object?

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is whether the House shall, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole or not, and I must ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to that.

Mr. DUNSFORD: I again say that while I believe legislation in this direction is desirable, still I do not think the House should go into committee to deal with this matter, because I think, from a business point of view, that it is not possible to carry out the object of this session. The unsettled condition of members, the unsettled condition of the country and of things generally, teach me that now is not the time when legislation such as this should be introduced; and with the hon. member for Flinders and others I avow my intention to block, in a constitutional manner, all legislation which may be introduced if the Government refuse to go to the country and get the wishes of the country on this and other matters.

Mr. JENKINSON: I do not care about defaming the House long, but I would like to say a few words with regard to this motion and the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is under a misapprehension. There is no amendment.

Mr. JENKINSON: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker. I left the Chamber for a few minutes, and I understood that there was an amendment.

Perhaps being a new member, I can hardly understand the treatment accorded to me with regard to this particular question. Either the Government look upon it as presumption on my part in attempting to introduce a Bill with regard to this question or they are so much at variance that there is no cohesion amongst them at all. On the 8th September I asked the Premier—

1. Is it the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill during this session to provide for the inspection of slaughter-houses and meat intended for human consumption; and also to make provision for the establishment of public abattoirs in the colony?

2. If so, when?

The answer I got to those two questions was—

Not this session.

I also asked this question—

3. If not, will the Government afford assistance to a private member introducing such a Bill?

The reply of the Premier was—

All assistance will be given in the preparation and discussion of such a measure.

Acting on the reply then given to me, when speaking on the Estimates of the Home Secretary's Department on the 15th September, I intimated that it was my intention some time during the session—I hoped at an early date—to introduce a Bill dealing with the matter of diseased meat intended for human consumption. I said the answers I had got to my questions had opened the way for me to prepare a measure, and I informed the Committee that I was then engaged upon it. Following up those remarks, on the 22nd September I tabled these resolutions which I proposed to move on Thursday, the 29th September—

1. That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to make provision for the establishment of public abattoirs in the colony, and for the inspection of slaughter-houses and meat intended for human consumption.

2. That an address be presented to the Governor, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to recommend the necessary appropriation to give effect to such Bill.

On the day previous to the 29th September, when my motion was to be discussed, the Minister for Agriculture came to this House with the resolution that has been moved this afternoon, evidently intending to cut the ground from under my feet with regard to the Bill I intend to introduce. I do not mind the Government taking up the matter. I think it is a matter they ought to have taken up long ago. It is a matter of vital public importance, and there is nothing small, mean, or contemptible about me with regard to this. I am quite willing to give them support as to the Bill they are introducing, as what I want to see is the affirmation of the principle. As the senior member for Drayton and Toowoomba interjects, they should have told me—it would have been only a matter of courtesy had the Minister for Agriculture approached me with regard to the matter, and he would have found that I would have met him in as reasonable and conciliatory a spirit as he could have wished. Instead of that he treated me apparently with contempt. He ignored me, ignored the resolutions I intended to move in this House, and came down intending to cut the ground from under my feet. The Premier in speaking this afternoon has mentioned that the measures about to be introduced were those inspired by the late Premier. I think it would be a great stretch of imagination to say that the first measure the Government intend to introduce was inspired by the late Premier, in the face of the answers he gave to the questions I put to him the other day. But, as I said before, I do not intend to oppose the Government with regard to this; I shall be only too willing

to help them to get the matter placed on the statute-book, but I shall exercise my right of introducing amendments in the Bill when it comes before us. I think it is right that I should inform the House that I made application to the Home Secretary—owing to the Premier's illness I could not consult him—for legal assistance with regard to drafting the Bill. I understood that it was customary to grant a private member such assistance, but it was refused to me.

Mr. GROOM: It is the first time.

Mr. JENKINSON: First I had a verbal communication from the Home Secretary, and then I sent him a letter asking if I would be permitted to have legal assistance in drafting such a Bill, and the reply I got was that the Premier could not attend to any business at that time, and Mr. Dickson did not think it was customary to allow a private member legal assistance in the drafting of a Bill. I think it is quite right that the House should understand this matter, and let us once for all know whether a private member is going to get any assistance in such a matter as this. It is impossible for a layman to draft a Bill and submit it in proper form to this House, and I maintain that it is only right that we should have the same courtesy granted to us this session as has been granted to private members in sessions in the past.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE, in reply: I only wish to say a few words in reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Wide Bay. So far from the hon. member feeling aggrieved, he should feel complimented at the Government introducing a Bill the tenor of which is in accordance with that of the Bill the hon. gentleman intended introducing. Every hon. member who has had any experience in this House, however, knows that no private member would have the slightest chance of getting through the two Houses a Bill of such a character.

Mr. JENKINSON: But why ignore me?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I took what I considered to be the proper course, and showed the Bill some time ago—and I believe the Bill was drafted long before the hon. member spoke of introducing a Bill—to the leader of the hon. member's party, the hon. member for Enoggera.

Mr. DRAKE: Hear, hear!

Mr. McDONNELL: I quite agree with those hon. members on this side who have spoken on this question, although I take up somewhat different ground. I take it that the Bill is to be administered by the Government. A few years ago an enormous sum of money was spent on a Royal Commission to inquire into the local government laws. Among other subjects with which that commission dealt was the inspection of slaughter-houses and meat, and the evidence given on that subject was the most reliable that could be obtained. To quote from that evidence will not be out of place on the present occasion—to show that it would be unwise to proceed with this Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will be entirely out of order in going into that question.

Mr. McDONNELL: I was going to quote from the evidence of Mr. Gordon to show that the present law, which is administered directly by the Government, has been a failure.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will be entirely out of order in doing so on the present occasion.

Mr. McDONNELL: Well, I am opposed to the introduction of this Bill unless it is to be administered by the local authorities.

The SPEAKER: Order, order! That is not the question at present before the House. The hon. member must confine himself to the question.

Mr. McDONNELL: I am opposed to the motion because it should be dealt with in the Local Government Bill which we have been promised this session. This is one of the most important questions that could be dealt with in such a Bill. I believe the Royal Commission was unanimously in favour of the matter being placed in the hands of the local authorities. But there is another point. I am quite at one with those who have spoken on this side, that it is not a far thing for this side of the House to allow the Government to get through even this early stage of the Bill. It is our duty in the present circumstances—believing that the Government have not the confidence of the people—to prevent them passing any legislation until they have received the verdict of the country upon it. I should not be disposed at another time, and under other circumstances, to oppose a measure like this; but the strongest possible argument why the Government should not be permitted to deal with this question has been given by the hon. member for Wide Bay. What that hon. member said indicates that the Government are not sincere in their desire to pass this legislation.

The TREASURER: You have no right to say that.

Mr. McDONNELL: I have the strongest right to say so, in view of the answer given to the hon. member for Wide Bay by the late Premier. That hon. gentleman said that it was not the intention of the Government to introduce any legislation this session dealing with the question, and yet in the face of that reply the Secretary for Agriculture now asks for leave to introduce a Bill. That is most conclusive evidence that there is no sincerity on the part of the Government in the matter. We have allowed this sort of thing to go on for too long. It is undoubtedly our bounden duty to prevent the motion being entertained by the House. That is one of my principal reasons for opposing the introduction of the Bill, and I believe that in taking up that position I am representing the views of the majority of those whom I represent. We have to take advantage of the rules and forms of the House, and, if the Government are not spirited enough to recognise things as they should, it is our duty, in the interests of the people, to force them to do what I believe is to-day the desire of the people of Queensland, and that is to go to the country at once. I rather regret, Mr. Speaker, that you ruled me out of order, because I am sure that had you allowed me to quote the evidence given by Mr. Gordon—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is again transgressing, and I must warn him that if he persists in his course I shall call upon him to resume his seat.

Mr. McDONNELL: I shall not refer any further to the subject than to say that if the Bill reaches a further stage I shall have an opportunity of referring to the valuable evidence which was taken by the Local Authorities Commission. I hope that this side of the House, and those on the other side who are dissatisfied with the present state of affairs, will, however, put their feet down and force the Government to take up a proper position. At all events I am determined to do my share to bring matters to that conclusion, and I hope those who are dissatisfied with the present Government, and who wish to compel them to go to the country, will show their sincerity on this occasion and vote against the motion.

Mr. FITZGERALD: I thoroughly agree with the opposition to this motion, not because I object to the Bill itself, but because circumstances do not justify us in proceeding with legislation. It was only recently the leader of the Opposition pointed out that the present leader of the Government was in a perfectly unique position. He happens to be leader under most unfortunate circumstances; but no one who believes in democratic legislation will support the introduction of important new legislation introduced by a new head of the Government who has no mandate from the people. If the hon. gentleman is sincere in his desire to do good for the country he will, having a large majority at his back, ask for two or three months' supply and go to the country, coming back perhaps with increased strength, and a large and grateful following.

Mr. KERR: Servile.

Mr. FITZGERALD: I do not say "servile." I object to that word. I am prepared to give any man credit for his courage when he faces the constituencies and tries to fight his way back here with a majority. I give hon. gentlemen opposite credit when they get on the platform—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. gentleman is wandering entirely from the question.

Mr. FITZGERALD: I was just answering an interjection, and will not go further into that matter. I submit that this is not a time to bring forward further new legislation, and I would point out to the Chief Secretary, whom I very much respect, that he really does not represent this House as it was returned by the constituencies in 1896. We all believe in Government by the people, but the present Premier cannot show us that he obtained a mandate from the people in 1896. In 1896 the hon. gentleman was not in the Ministry who were then carrying on the business of the country. Our late lamented Premier, Mr. Byrnes, could say that he was returned as a member of the Nelson Administration, and when Sir Hugh Nelson retired it was perfectly open for him to take the position of leader; but the hon. member for Bulimba is in an entirely different position. He said at his election meetings in 1896 that he was an independent oppositionist, and he would not ask anyone to vote for him under the impression that he was going to support the then Government.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. FITZGERALD: My argument is that the hon. member for Bulimba did not happen to be amongst those who were sent here to govern the people from the front Government benches, and therefore he has no right to ask us to pass legislation of this description at this late stage of the session. The Bill which it is proposed to introduce is a very important one. I presume the Secretary for Agriculture has before him the idea of conserving the public health. We on this side have always argued strongly in favour of legislation which had that end in view. Here is a Bill brought before us when the heat is getting annoying to hon. members, dealing with a matter that I have fought for in this House last year and the year before, and I would urge upon the Minister that it should be allowed to stand over till the cooler months next session. Hon. members know that cattle are slaughtered when they are in such a condition as to be dangerous to the public health, and great numbers have been done away with so as to prevent them from going into general consumption. The matter ought to be left alone until we have got a fresh mandate from the people, and then those of us who survive the troubles of a general election will be able to tackle it sincerely and earnestly. Many diseases have

spread through the consumption of diseased meat, and in looking up the reports of the hospital I find that a great number of deaths have taken place through tuberculosis contracted through drinking milk from diseased cows, and Lord only knows how many other people are suffering from that disease now. The health of the community is a most important matter, and therefore I think this subject ought to be considered most seriously. I should like to know from the Secretary for Agriculture what this health board is?

The SPEAKER: Order, order! I must ask him to confine himself to the subject matter of the motion.

Mr. FITZGERALD: I do not intend to speak at any great length, but I should like to know something about this health board. I appeal to the Minister to withdraw the motion; but before I sit down I should like to say a word in favour of the people out West. It may be all very well in the city where there are so many doctors—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is again out of order.

Mr. HOULAN: I think a discussion upon the question of diseased meat is very appropriate upon the present occasion, because I think our politics are diseased also; and the sooner the present Parliament, myself included, are buried or resuscitated into some brighter life, the better for the Parliament and for the country. In saying this I certainly think I am stating the opinions of a majority of the people. This motion, which asks that the House should go into committee to introduce a Bill dealing with certain ills that people suffer from at present is a very laudable one, and would be very proper upon a more fitting occasion, but the present is not a fitting time, and therefore the request made should not be acceded to. This is not the only measure that we may be asked to deal with, because there are a great many more valuable measures, but under the present circumstances it is not to be hoped or expected that Parliament can do anything but what is absolutely necessary—such as providing the ways and means to pay the public servants and our public debts. It is no use shamming with each other, trying to bamboozle the country, and make fools of the electors who sent us here. It is no use trying to draw wool over the eyes of the electors, even though there is to be a wool market established in the city of Brisbane. It is not being established for the purpose of drawing wool over their eyes, much as politicians, particularly those on the other side, might desire it. It is time that politicians should speak plainly. It is time that plain speaking should be indulged in from the Treasury benches, and I certainly am surprised that on the present occasion the Secretary for Agriculture should have moved this motion. I think it is his duty to withdraw it, because it is ridiculous to go on with it. The Government, if they are aware of their position, must know that they are not in a position to bring forward any legislation that will require elaborate discussion and careful consideration at the hands of this House, and that being so, they are very unwise—not to use a stronger term which I might do—to bring forward this measure now or even to ask for leave to introduce it. I have no wish to hamper the Government, because experience has taught me that that is not a good game to follow. Life is too short to sit here, and try to prevent any legislation that may be good for any individual or set of individuals being passed, but upon this occasion I think that it is necessary to get up and assist, so far as I can, those who were my former companions.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Oh, oh!

Mr. HOOLAN: Although I have not been on friendly terms with them upon many things, I shall not hesitate to assist them upon the present occasion, or at least take part with them in what I honestly believe to be an honest action, and that is to try to bring about a dissolution of Parliament in a proper and peaceful way without any friction or disagreement or slur or insult between party and party. There is no need for me to talk about what has taken place, because I should only be anticipating a discussion that will come on later. It is well known that the Government are not in a position to go on with business, and they should not attempt to do so until they have been before the country and have reinstated themselves in the good graces of their supporters and of the electors generally. I hope to have to say something later on as to their position, but upon this occasion I shall only ask them to consider their position. I consider that they have not the confidence of Parliament at the present time. If their position in the House is not discreditable, it is on the verge of it; and that being so it is their place to at least assure us that their position is creditable, or take steps to make it creditable in the eyes of all men.

Mr. CRIBB: The matter before us is a motion to go into committee at our next sitting to consider whether leave should be granted to introduce a certain Bill, and I think hon. members opposite must agree that at this stage it is inadvisable to offer opposition to the introduction of the Bill. They say they object to the motion because the Premier does not possess the confidence of members on this side of the House, and also on the ground that it is expedient that the country should express its opinion on the constitution of the Government before we proceed with any new legislation. If hon. members opposite are so anxious to know what is the opinion of members on this side with regard to the Government, why do they not move a direct vote of want of confidence in the Government, and call for a division on the question? If they do that they will soon see whether the party on this side are prepared to give the Premier their loyal support or not; and until they do that, and until we have some evidence before us that the Premier is not supported by his party, I decidedly object to the tone of the remarks which have been made this evening, and to the waste of time by this discussion. We are sent here to do business, and to act in the interests of the colony. I have come here for that purpose, and not to play at politics, or to become a professional politician; and I contend that, instead of discussing the matters which have been introduced into this debate, we should consider whether the proposed legislation is in the interest of the colony. With regard to the remarks made by the hon. member for Mitchell, and the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. McDonnell, I would point out that this motion was on the paper before the late Premier died, and that the measure is one which he approved of, so that hon. members cannot call this a new measure. The motion has been several days on the paper, and I think we should proceed with the business of the House.

Mr. DANIELS: There are two very good reasons why this motion should not be carried. The first is the discourtesy shown by the present Premier—when he was only acting in that capacity, in refusing, or practically refusing, legal assistance to the hon. member for Wide Bay to draft a Bill which the House had really given him permission to introduce. Another reason, which to my mind is a far more important one, is that the introduction of this measure is in direct opposition to a statement made by the late Premier, who said that the Government were not

going to bring in a Bill of this sort; and the present Premier announced, only an hour or two ago, that he was only going on with the business enunciated by the late Premier. But the principal reason why we should not proceed with this measure is that, until the Government can show that they have the confidence of the electors, they have no right to go on with the business of the country. The Premier has told us that he is fully assured that he has the confidence of the country. If that is so, the Government would be returned by a majority if they appealed to the country, and if it is not so they have no right to hold office or bring in legislation of any sort. I do not object to some measures of the Government as other hon. members do, but I say they have no right to go on with any legislation until they know that they have the country behind them, and as one of the members of this Chamber, I feel degraded at being twitted in the streets time after time with the statement that there is no fear of members on either side putting the Government out of office, as they want to stick to their £300 a year. I think it is only right and just at the present juncture that we should go to the country as soon as possible, and I therefore object to the motion.

Mr. STEWART: I certainly agree with those members who claim that the Government ought to go to the country before taking any business. We have a most extraordinary position politically speaking. Three years ago Sir Hugh Nelson appeared before the country as the leader of the Conservative party, and was returned with a very large majority. Subsequently he left this Chamber and went to another place, transferring his authority to a successor. Now, that successor has unfortunately passed away, but the continuous Ministry still goes on, the authority having been handed down to the hon. gentleman who now occupies the position of Premier. There might have been some excuse in the case of the late Mr. Byrnes. At the last general election and before it he was a member of the Nelson Government, he was associated with the Conservative party, but the hon. gentleman now at the head of the Government stood, not as a follower of Sir Hugh Nelson, but as an opponent of Sir Hugh Nelson. If I remember rightly, I read that upon one occasion the hon. gentleman said, in answer to a question somewhere in his electorate, that if the electors of Bulimba thought he claimed their suffrages as a supporter of the Ministry he would rather go without their votes. Afterwards, however, he was taken into the Ministry by Sir Hugh Nelson. There was no occasion to consult the electors when the hon. gentleman was merely being dealt with in an inferior capacity, but seeing that the hon. gentleman has attained to the supreme office in the State, and is the virtual ruler of the colony, he ought to appeal to the constituencies and find out whether they are in favour of him continuing in that capacity. With regard to the particular motion before the Chamber, I would rather congratulate the Government because it is a measure which is urgently necessary, and one that will be of very great benefit to the people. Some mention has been made of the action of Mr. Byrnes, but it seems to me—judging by the action of the present Government in regard to this particular matter—that the Government of Mr. Dickson is going to be more progressive than the Government of Mr. Byrnes. Whilst I believe that a measure of this kind is urgently needed and would be of very great benefit, I think that the Premier before going on with any legislation should dissolve the House and appeal to the electors for their mandate.

Mr. BATTERSBY: I have only been in the House a few minutes, but I think the best thing

hon. members on the other side can do is to hold their tongues and let us go to a division and see whether the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government should dissolve the House or not. I say that as far as the inspection of slaughter-houses and the slaughter of meat is concerned, the sooner the Bill is passed the better. The best thing we can do is to go to a division before tea, and let us get on with the business of the House.

Question put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 41.

Messrs. Dickson, Foxton, Philip, Chataway, Dalrymple, Murray, Anner, Fraser, Hamilton, Toth, Lord, Moore, Castling, Bridges, Sim, Keogh, Petrie, Bartholomew, W. Thorn, Newell, Corfield, Stumm, Battersby, Story, Drake, McGahan, Fogarty, Boles, Curtis, Groom, Leahy, Jenkinson, Bell, Collins, Cribb, Callan, McMaster, Thomas, Grimes, Armstrong, and O'Connell.

NOES, 16.

Messrs. Glassey, Fitzgerald, Dunford, McDonald, Hoolan, Kerr, King, Turley, Dawson, McDonnell, Kidston, Daniels, Jackson, Hardacre, Maughan, and Stewart.

Resolved in the affirmative.

PASTORAL LEASES EXTENSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS moved—

That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Pastoral Leases Extension Acts, 1892 to 1897.

Mr. FITZGERALD: The Secretary for Lands will not say that a question like this is something old. It appears something altogether new. I come from a district where the Pastoral Leases Extension Act is in operation, and ever since the last Act was passed in 1895, every *bona fide* settler has been chewing the cud. Seeing that the motion has been called "not formal," the Secretary for Lands should have given us some explanation as to what it really means. The Act passed in 1895 brought in a very dangerous principle—that was, it granted an extension of lease for erecting rabbit-proof fencing. I do not know whether this Bill may not do the same thing, only extending the areas.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Hadn't you better defer your remarks until you see the Bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD: It is all very fine to ask me to postpone my remarks until I see the Bill, but the hon. gentleman must remember that the motion has been called "not formal," and that the House naturally expected some argument from the hon. gentleman, but instead of that he simply moved the motion. I do not like to say that the hon. gentleman was discourteous.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It is generally considered discourteous to call "not formal" to a motion of this sort.

Mr. FITZGERALD: I do not know whether that is so or not, but my little experience in this House teaches me that when an hon. member calls "not formal," it is because he desires some argument, and that if there is any discourtesy it is on the part of the Minister in charge of the motion when he simply gets up and moves what we all see in black and white. How many times last year did the leader of the Government call "not formal" to private members' business? What did that mean?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Never to a Bill like this. Quote an instance.

Mr. FITZGERALD: We do not know what this Bill is.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Quote me an instance.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FITZGERALD: I cannot quote an instance, because I do not know what the Bill is. There is no Bill before us—only a motion to introduce a certain Bill. I do not say that the

hon. gentleman has done it personally, but hon. gentlemen on the Treasury bench have frequently called "not formal" to private members' business.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Well, quote a case.

Mr. FITZGERALD: Well, Sir Hugh Nelson last session time after time called "not formal," and almost the last occasion on which the Hon. T. J. Byrnes was in the House he called "Not formal" to the motion appearing on the paper in the name of the hon. member for Port Curtis. I believe there are two motions on the paper now which were treated in that way.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: A Bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD: A motion.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is a different thing altogether.

Mr. FITZGERALD: The motion proposing to repeal the Land Grant Railways Act was an instance. The hon. gentleman asks if the motion of the hon. member for Port Curtis deals with a Bill. No, it does not; but this is not a Bill either. There is no Bill before the House. It is simply a motion for leave to bring in a Bill, so that I do not see any difference between it and the motion of the hon. member for Port Curtis. They are both motions at the present time. Ministers ought to be the most courteous people in the House, because they are supposed to have learned in the school of experience how to treat other people with courtesy; and, when hon. gentlemen on the front Treasury bench call "not formal" to motions, surely to goodness the Secretary for Lands will not say that when other hon. members do the same thing they are acting discourteously?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Yes; in preventing the Bill being brought in.

Mr. FITZGERALD: When a member calls "not formal" it means that he is not going to let the matter pass as formal and that information is wanted. The Minister has brought forward a motion to go into committee at a future date to consider the desirableness of introducing a Bill, and I fail to recognise any discourtesy in calling the motion "not formal."

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It is generally so interpreted.

Mr. FITZGERALD: Then the next time "not formal" is called from the Government bench I shall remind the hon. gentleman of the fact. I should not take it as a piece of discourtesy if anyone called "not formal" to any business I was introducing.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It would be discourtesy on the introduction of a Bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD: The Secretary for Lands has not responded to what was practically an invitation to give information. The hon. gentleman has not told us what is in the Bill, and, of course, I cannot argue on a Bill the contents of which I do not know. A very important measure of a similar nature was passed through the House at the tail end of the session of 1895, and the contents of that measure will be remembered against supporters of the Government for years to come. As a matter of fact I may tell the Minister that in my district he need never expect to get any person returned to Parliament supporting the same principles as the Government who passed that measure. It is the biggest possible curse to selectors, and under it the very finest lands have been locked up for a further term of seven years. If there is going to be an extension of the Pastoral Leases Act of 1895, or an extension of the area over the eastern side of the Thompson, then it will be a very grave matter indeed. If I had an idea, even at this preliminary stage, that anything of that sort was intended I would move that the

consideration of this motion stand an Order of the Day for this day six months. There certainly was no discourtesy intended in calling "not formal" to the motion.

The SPEAKER: I think that is the fifth time the hon. member has made a similar statement, and I must ask him not to continue repeating himself.

Mr. FITZGERALD: If I have repeated myself it was only because the hon. gentleman turned his back, and engaged in conversation with his supporters.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I listened to you saying it three times.

Mr. FITZGERALD: If the hon. gentleman had been listening to me it would not have been necessary to repeat the same idea five times. My objection to this motion is that we do not know what the Bill means. I should be the last to object to anything fair and square towards the old pastoral tenants. I do not believe in repudiation, and I am sure no member of this side does. The Government have at times made contracts which really are not fair to the people, but when those contracts have been made fairly, although we might regret them, we do not wish to repudiate them. In reference to these pastoral contracts we do not know what effect they may have in future.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member has no right to assume what may or may not be in the Bill, and build up an argument upon that.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member for Mitchell has asked for information, and as I, too, represent a pastoral district, I should be glad to have the Bill explained.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I will explain it at the proper time.

Mr. KERR: If there is any idea of extending the boundaries or the term of the leases I should be very much opposed to it. There is a great feeling of dissatisfaction in the country over this matter, and it is the duty of those who represent the dissatisfied persons to watch legislation on this subject very closely.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It is neither an extension of boundary nor an extension of the term of lease.

Mr. HARDACRE: If this measure dealt with an extension of boundary of the leases we should consider it our duty to strongly oppose it, but of course if there are only to be amendments in minor directions there will be no objection. We shall see the Bill to-morrow, and when we get it in committee the Minister will no doubt give us the fullest information.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Of course he will.

Mr. HARDACRE: Seeing that we have an assurance that there will not be any attempt to extend the boundaries, we might as well let the matter go now; but with regard to the general position of the business, I agree with what has been said, that it is not right or proper in the present state of parties that the Government should go on with business. I do not intend to indulge in any obstructive tactics in the sort of guerrilla fashion such as has been attempted this afternoon, because if there is to be an attempt to force a dissolution of Parliament it ought to be done in a properly organised manner. It is, to a great extent, unconstitutional for the Government to attempt to go on with business now. We have lost the principle of responsible government, because the Government are not responsible to the people or even to Parliament, but only to a caucus of their own side. The Government have degenerated into a sort of Spanish Junta, which is a most disastrous state of things, and I for one should very much like to see them go to the country and obtain a fresh mandate from the people. I do not intend to say any more

upon that subject now, because we shall perhaps have an opportunity to express our opinions on a more distinct and definite resolution.

Mr. McDONALD: I quite agree that this is a very important Bill, and am sure that the Secretary for Lands would not have moved this motion if he had not thought so, but I still contend that he should not have moved it at this stage. I understand that overtures were made to the Government to adjourn until to-morrow, and the least they could have done would have been to agree to such a request after the important statement made by the Premier concerning the position of affairs, in order that a motion of some sort could be made dealing with it. Until this afternoon we really did not know how things were going to be dealt with, and the ordinary practice has been for the Government to ask for an adjournment so that somebody else might be able to have a say. At present we think the Government have not the confidence of the country, or the confidence of this House either; and because we think that, we say that the Government should not proceed with any further legislation until such a time as they have a mandate from the country. However, the Government have decided not to go to the country, and the Premier has come down in a high-handed manner and has refused even an adjournment until to-morrow, and under such circumstances, we are justified in taking up the position we have this afternoon. I am sure that no hon. member has any objection to any of these Bills. Under ordinary circumstances I do not think it is a good thing to object to the introduction of a Bill; but circumstances have compelled us to take that course this afternoon. I object to any business being undertaken until a direct vote has been taken regarding the position of the Government. As the Premier is not in his place I should like the Treasurer to give us some assurance that he will not proceed further with these Bills, but will give us an opportunity of dealing with the position of public affairs to-morrow. That is only a reasonable question to ask, and I should like to have a reply. There are certain things that should be gone on with, and in the first place the House should be asked to grant Supply until, say, January, and then the Government can go to the country in the meantime. I understand that it was the custom in this House when a Bill was introduced upon a motion like this, that the mover should give some explanation.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member's argument would be in order if he had got to that stage, but we have not arrived at that yet.

Mr. McDONALD: I only wanted to show what was the practice, even in asking leave to introduce a Bill.

The SPEAKER: But we have not reached that stage. The motion asks leave to go into committee on a certain day.

Mr. McDONALD: I want to show a reason why we should not go into committee. I do not think it would be a good thing to go into committee either to-morrow or any other day, and it is a direct insult to the House to ask it to do so. I hope the House will never resolve itself into a committee to consider this Bill under the present circumstances. I think it would not be desirable in the interests of the country. The Government ought not to ask us to go into committee to-morrow, when they know the present uncertain state of politics, especially on their own side of the House. The people ought to have some say as to whether we should go into committee to consider the desirableness of introducing this Bill, and until they have a voice in the matter it

ought to be deferred; but seeing that you are determined to favour the other side I shall resume my seat.

The SPEAKER: Order, order! I call upon the hon. member to withdraw that remark immediately.

Mr. McDONALD: I will not. It is after 6 o'clock now, and you have deliberately done it.

The SPEAKER: Will the hon. member withdraw?

Mr. McDONALD: No.

SUSPENSION OF MEMBERS.

The SPEAKER: Then I have no course open to me but to name the hon. member. I therefore name the hon. member for Flinders, Mr. McDonald, to the House for insulting and disregarding the authority of the Chair.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: It was four minutes past 6 o'clock.

Mr. HOOLAN: Then you can name another, for I think your conduct is most unfair. It is past 6 o'clock. Name me, too.

Mr. DAWSON: It's five minutes past 6 o'clock.

Mr. HOOLAN: It is open and palpable partisanship.

Mr. McDONALD: It was four minutes past 6 o'clock when I made the statement.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. McDONALD: He refused to look at the clock.

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker.—The hon. member having subjected himself to your censure, I move that the hon. member for Flinders, Mr. McDonald, be suspended from the service of the House for one week.

Mr. DUNSFORD: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! This motion must be put without debate.

Mr. DUNSFORD: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Question put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 23.

Messrs. Dickson, Chataway, Foxton, Philp, Dalrymple, Murray, Annear, Tooth, Hamilton, Collins, Lord, Cribb, Bridges, Stephenson, Armstrong, Corfield, Moore, Bell, Story, Grimes, Thomas, Callan, and G. Thorn.

NOES, 18.

Messrs. Dawson, Fitzgerald, Keogh, Glassey, Hoolan, Dunsford, McDonald, Kerr, Sim, Curtis, Boles, King, Battersby, Jenkinson, McDonnell, Hardacre, Maughan, and Turley.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER: I now call upon the hon. member for Flinders, Mr. McDonald, to leave the House.

Mr. McDONALD: I won't go. You will have to carry me out.

The SPEAKER thereupon instructed the Sergeant-at-Arms to remove the hon. member. The Sergeant-at-Arms, with the assistance of the Chief Messenger, proceeded to carry out this instruction; but their endeavours were resisted physically by the hon. member, who was aided in his resistance by the hon. member for Burke, Mr. Hoolan, the latter saying, "If it is to be an ejection, let it be in proper form." Several members interposed, apparently with the view of restoring order.

The SPEAKER: Order, order! I call upon the hon. member for Burke to desist from his unseemly conduct.

Mr. HOOLAN: You can call away as much as you like. I will not desist at the bidding of a nigger-driver like you.

Mr. DAWSON: It was four minutes past 6 and you never adjourned for tea.

Mr. SIM: It is ten minutes past 6 now.

Mr. KEOGH: Dissolve the House!

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the hon. member for Burke desist—

Mr. HOOLAN: Never!

The SPEAKER: And let the officers of the House do their duty?

Mr. HARDACRE: I move that this House do now adjourn.

Mr. KEOGH: Mr. Speaker,—I would like to throw oil on the troubled waters.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HARDACRE: I think in the present state of the House—

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. McDONALD: Out of respect to the messengers I will go out, but not to you Mr. Speaker.

The hon. member then left the Chamber.

The SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member for Burke to withdraw his insulting remarks to the Chair.

Mr. HOOLAN: I won't!

The SPEAKER: Then I have but one course, and that is to name the hon. member for Burke, Mr. Hoolan, for insulting language to the Chair and for disregarding the authority of the Chair.

The PREMIER: It is with great regret—

Mr. FITZGERALD: You have no regret.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Bosh!

Mr. DAWSON: Better be honest!

The PREMIER: It is my duty to move a resolution to support your authority and maintain the respect due to the Chair. My motion is that the hon. member be suspended from the service of the House for one week.

Question put; and the House divided:—

In the division,

Mr. DAWSON: Everybody else has moved twenty-four hours, and you know it.

Mr. DUNSFORD: You waited till some of our men went to tea and then took advantage of their absence.

Mr. DAWSON: It was nearly five minutes past 6; the Minister for Mines pointed to the clock and the Speaker wouldn't adjourn for tea.

Mr. SIM:

Oh! for the touch of a vanished hand,

The sound of a voice that is still!

Mr. BATTERSBY: I hope it will be taken into consideration that what has been done was done in a fit of temper.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the hon. member remain silent?

AYES, 23.

Messrs. Dickson, Chataway, Foxton, Philp, Murray, Dalrymple, G. Thorn, Grimes, Thomas, Callan, Story, Bell, Moore, Corfield, Stephenson, Bridges, Lord, Tooth, Collins, Hamilton, Annear, Cribb, and Armstrong.

NOES, 18.

Messrs. Dawson, Fitzgerald, Keogh, Glassey, Hoolan, McDonnell, Dunsford, Kerr, Leahy, King, Turley, Sim, Jenkinson, Battersby, Hardacre, Maughan, Boles, and Curtis.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER: I now ask the hon. member for Burke to leave the Chamber.

Mr. HOOLAN thereupon proceeded to the table, and, filling a glass with water, said, "Here's luck all round." The hon. member then left the Chamber, raising his coat-tails as he retired.

At twenty-one minutes past 6 o'clock,

The SPEAKER said: I shall resume the chair at a quarter-past 7 o'clock.

At a quarter past 7 o'clock,

The SPEAKER was proceeding to put the question, when

Mr. TURLEY said: Mr. Speaker,—Just on the stroke of 6 o'clock, my friend, Mr. Dawson, and myself walked through the door on the left side of the chair. I said to Mr. Dawson, "There is no necessity for us going in." I stood outside the bar and watched the clock, and it went on minute after minute—

The SPEAKER: Order, order! I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the question before the House.

Mr. DUNSFORD: There is another question before the House—two constituencies have been disfranchised.

Mr. TURLEY: I want to lay before the House what is the position now. A friend of mine—the hon. member for Flinders—made certain statements in this House which I endorse—emphatically endorse.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the question before the House. I sincerely trust that he will debate this matter in an orderly manner. For the information of the House—I should have said it before had Mr. McDonald, the hon. member for Flinders, withdrawn the accusation he made—I may say that I have on more than one occasion—

MEMBERS of the Labour party: Never!

The SPEAKER: On more than one occasion I have allowed hon. members to proceed, believing that they would finish their speeches before five minutes past 6 o'clock.

Mr. DAWSON: I have been here six years, and have never seen it.

Mr. DUNSFORD: Never heard it before.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. DUNSFORD: Two constituencies have been disfranchised.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have also on more than one occasion, when hon. members have risen to speak at five minutes to 6 o'clock, rather than that their speeches should be interrupted by the tea hour, left the chair—in both cases for their convenience. I should have made this statement before if the hon. member for Flinders had withdrawn his charge against the Chair, but as he refused, it was impossible for me to make any explanation of my action. My sole object was to enable the hon. member to conclude his remarks before tea. I trust that hon. members will now confine their remarks to the question before the House.

Mr. TURLEY: I have been a member of this House for some years, and have very little recollection that what you now state are facts. I have been stopped a number of times almost in the middle of a sentence when the time arrived for adjourning, and I recognised that it was in accordance with the Standing Orders. I made it my duty to find out the exact words used by the hon. member for Flinders, and I say now that there was no charge but what was absolutely true contained in his remarks.

The SPEAKER: Order, order! Am I to understand that the hon. member upholds the hon. member for Flinders in the statement he made when he accused the Chair of gross partiality?

Mr. TURLEY: Yes, I absolutely endorse every word the hon. member for Flinders said on the floor of this Chamber.

The SPEAKER: Then I have no other course open to me than to name the hon. member for South Brisbane, Mr. Turley, for insulting language towards the Chair.

Mr. GLASSEY: I must crave the indulgence of the House—

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. GLASSEY: By permission of the House I desire to say a few words.

The PREMIER: I trust this disorderly conduct will not be persisted in.

Mr. GLASSEY: Will you allow me to make a few observations?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The PREMIER: I will draw a distinction between the offence committed by the hon. member for South Brisbane, Mr. Turley, and the offences of previous speakers, because I think the hon. member has addressed you, Sir, in a moment of temporary passion. I move that the

hon. member for South Brisbane, Mr. Turley, be suspended from the service of this House for twenty-four hours.

Mr. TURLEY: Why don't you make it seven days?

Question put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 34.

Messrs. Dickson, Foxton, Chataway, Philp, Dalrymple, Murray, Corfield, Smith, G. Thorn, Grimes, Thomas, McMaster, Callan, Collins, Leahy, Story, Bell, Stumm, McGahan, Castling, Petrie, Moore, Battersby, Newell, Bartholomew, Armstrong, Bridges, Stodart, Cribb, Stephenson, Lord, Hamilton, Tooth, and Annear.

NOES, 24.

Messrs. Glassey, Maughan, Keogh, Fitzgerald, Kerr, Stewart, Hardacre, Dunsford, McDonnell, Dawson, King, Sim, Turley, Jenkinson, Curtis, Boles, Drake, Groom, W. Thorn, Fogarty, Dibley, Jackson, Daniels, and Kidston.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER: I now call upon the hon. member for South Brisbane, Mr. Turley, to leave the Chamber.

The hon. member thereupon retired from the Chamber.

Mr. GLASSEY: I avail myself of this opportunity to say a few words on the question before the House.

Mr. DAWSON: You are not going to apologise, are you?

Mr. GLASSEY: I am not going to apologise to the Government. The Government, I presume, are strong enough and vigorous enough, and, by all appearances, determined enough to do a lot of things, and I hope this difficulty may end at the earliest possible moment. Might I be permitted, in speaking to this question before the House, to ask the head of the Government whether he does not think that something might be done to end this matter? I should respectfully suggest that the House wants adjourning, and in the meantime I hope the hon. gentleman will alter the motion which he moved some little time ago. I think the motion was rather harsh in its terms, but I make no apology and hope that hon. members will pardon me for a few moments if I digress.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order in characterising a motion passed by this House as harsh.

Mr. GLASSEY: I hope the hon. member at the head of the Government will reconsider the position, and will at any rate reduce the term of one week, for which some of our friends upon this side have been suspended, to twenty-four hours. I am sorry that it is a single hour. I hope also that the hon. gentleman will agree to the suggestion that this House should adjourn, and that the decisions come to in regard to the seven days' suspension will be reviewed, in order that things may go on in a more amicable manner than they are likely to do now. I feel sure that to-morrow we shall be much cooler, in a better frame of mind, more temperate, and more fit to do the business we may be called upon to do. I make these observations without attempting to humiliate either my friends or myself, and I trust that if the Premier does not see fit to accede to my request it will not be because he thinks he will be humiliating himself, or lowering his dignity, or inflicting an injury upon his character. I have no desire to humiliate anyone, but offer the suggestion for what it may be worth, hoping that it will be met in the spirit of conciliation in which it is made.

The PREMIER: No one more thoroughly deplores than I do the spectacle which has been witnessed this evening, and the episode which has been unfortunately introduced, I do not know under what circumstances, and which really could not be anticipated. When we met this afternoon there was a spirit of obstruction—

I can hardly accuse the leader of the Opposition of having instructed his followers to carry it on—distinctly displayed to the progress of an ordinary amount of business, which I consider quite unwarrantable. I was therefore compelled, out of the respect due to the Chair, to move these sentences which have been recorded, and which at the present time I decline to review.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I shall not review those sentences, but if there be any regret expressed by those gentlemen who have committed such unwarrantable breaches of the Standing Orders—

MEMBERS of the Labour party: No, no; likely not.

The PREMIER: I shall be prepared, as leader of the House, to give every reasonable and lenient consideration to such representations. If I erred in the first instance—and it is possible that I did, although I do not admit it, because I really was not present when the hon. member made use of the expressions, which I believe were offensive to you, Sir—

MEMBERS of the Labour party: What were they? What are they?

Mr. DAWSON: You don't know anything at all about it.

The PREMIER: I was summoned from a conference in the Ministers' room, and came upon a scene of confusion, and was informed that words had been used which I understood were exceedingly offensive to the Chair. I may say that it is quite possible that in the sentences I asked to be recorded I may not have fully considered the whole of the circumstances, but I do not admit that they were too severe, because, after all, it only means absence from the sittings on to-morrow and Tuesday. We are all absent from the House on the intervening days, and therefore the sentence of seven days' suspension is a mere nominal one, so to speak. I do not think the sentence passed upon the hon. member who has so severely exercised the patience of the Chamber this afternoon, and prevented the Government from going on with work at a time when every moment and every hour is of considerable importance, was unusually severe. And with regard to Mr. Hoolan, I may say that I have never during my twenty-five years' experience in Parliament witnessed such a disreputable scene—not only in regard to the language used to you, Sir, but in regard to insubordination to the officers of the House. If such things were tolerated this House would become a regular bear garden.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: It would be dishonourable to those with whom he is associated, dishonourable to this side of the House, and discreditable to me—as Premier—if I tolerated or allowed such disgraceful procedure to take place. It would show that I was unfit for the high position to which I have been called, and therefore I distinctly decline to review the sentences which have been pronounced.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I regret that there should be a feeling amongst hon. members opposite not to proceed with business at the present time. I do not ask the House to proceed to any unreasonable extent, but I must vindicate my authority, and we must do some business. After we have done that, if hon. members will allow it, we will gladly adjourn the House in the hope that by to-morrow, in cooler moments, we will be able to go on with business. I also hope that those hon. members who have been more severely

punished will show their sense of responsibility to the country as representatives in Parliament. They have forgotten the dignity of the position they hold, and are only discrediting themselves, and dishonouring the constituencies they represent. It is only due to me that I should vindicate the credit and the honour of Parliament, which has been sadly trampled upon by the dishonourable proceedings which have taken place this afternoon—proceedings which were never before witnessed by the older members of the House, and which I feel strongly impelled to denounce as discreditable, and in regard to which it was my duty to invoke the powers vested in me to repress. I am quite willing to accept the olive branch if it is held out, and if we do reasonable business I am willing to adjourn until to-morrow, when we can consider the sentences which have been passed upon these men; but I shall make no condition of adjourning the House or reviewing those sentences now.

Mr. FITZGERALD: You will not do any business.

The PREMIER: I shall not be moved by threats. We shall endeavour to do business, and I appeal to the leader of the Opposition to assist me in maintaining the dignity of the Chamber, which he may hereafter have to maintain. I should be sorry if I allowed a discreditable Parliament to descend to my successor in office through a want of firmness and determination to prevent it. I hold the reins of administration, and I therefore say in reply to the hon. member, with emphasis, though not in an aggressive tone, that it is my firm determination to proceed with some business to-night. After that we shall adjourn the House, and to-morrow, in, I hope, a cooler frame of mind, we may arrive at a more conciliatory attitude than exists now. I am sure hon. members upon this side will approve of the position I have taken up.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: It was rather instructive to hear the hon. gentleman telling the House that he was not fit to lead the Government, for that is practically what he said. If we needed any evidence of his unfitness we have it in the way he behaved himself this afternoon. The hon. gentleman said by way of confession that he was not aware of any offence committed by the hon. member for Flinders.

The PREMIER: Not at all.

Mr. DAWSON: The hon. gentleman came here absolutely ignorant of what had transpired; he was challenged to say in what way the hon. member for Flinders had offended, but he did not know. I challenge the hon. gentleman now to repeat one offensive thing the hon. member for Flinders made use of. The hon. gentleman is entirely ignorant of the matter, and yet he comes along as leader of the House, and moves a sentence of seven days on the hon. member for Flinders.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is out of order, and I must ask him to confine himself to the question before the House.

Mr. DAWSON: Yes?

The SPEAKER: I admit that the Premier digressed from the question before the House, but in doing so he was answering the leader of the Opposition, who asked the permission of the House to refer to the matter he discussed.

Mr. DAWSON: He did not.

The SPEAKER: Order! I distinctly understood the leader of the Opposition to ask permission to refer to the subject, and the Premier replied to his remarks.

Mr. DAWSON: He did nothing of the sort.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the hon. member not to further persist on those lines, but to confine himself to the question before the House.

Mr. DAWSON: I have simply got this to say about the matter, that I point blank refuse to sit down under the persistent snubbing that we receive from you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the hon. member to withdraw those words.

Mr. DAWSON: I will not withdraw them.

The SPEAKER: If the hon. member refuses to withdraw them, I have no other course left to me, painful as it is, but to name the hon. member for Charters Towers, Mr. Dawson, to the House for grossly disorderly conduct in disregarding the authority of the Chair.

Mr. DAWSON: You are the most disorderly member of the House yourself.

The PREMIER: I move that the hon. member for Charters Towers, Mr. Dawson, be suspended from the service of the House for twenty-four hours.

Question put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 34.

Messrs. Dickson, Chataway, Foxton, Philp, Dalrymple, Murray, Collins, Lissner, G. Thorn, Grimes, Thomas, McMaster, Story, Bell, Stephenson, McGahan, Casling, Petrie, Moore, Bridges, Newell, Bartholomew, Stodart, Cribb, Corfield, Lord, Smith, Hamilton, Tooth, Stumm, Armstrong, and Annear.

NOES, 24.

Messrs. Glassey, Keogh, Maughan, Kerr, Dunsford, Sim, Fitzgerald, Dawson, King, Boles, Jenkinson, Curtis, Battersby, Drake, Groom, W. Thorn, Fogarty, Dibley, Jackson, Daniels, Stewart, Kidston, Hardacre, and McDonnell.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER: I now call upon the hon. member for Charters Towers, Mr. Dawson, to withdraw from the Chamber.

The hon. member thereupon left the Chamber.

Original question put.

Mr. DUNS福德: It seems very clear that the Government intend to disfranchise a number of constituencies in Queensland and then go on with legislation. It seems also clear that the Government depend upon their partisan Chairman—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must call upon the hon. member to withdraw that expression.

Mr. DUNS福德: I refuse absolutely to withdraw it, because I believe it is the truth.

The SPEAKER: Order! As the hon. member refuses to withdraw the expression, I have no option but to name him for disorderly conduct in disregarding the authority of the Chair. I therefore name the hon. member for Charters Towers, Mr. Dunsford, to the House.

The PREMIER: I have endeavoured by leniency to bring hon. members to their senses. But now I will not be trifled with.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I therefore move that the hon. member for Charters Towers, Mr. Dunsford, be suspended from the service of this House for one week.

Mr. HARDACRE: I rise to a point of order—

The SPEAKER: Order! There can be no debate on this question.

Mr. HARDACRE: I submit I have a right to rise to a point of order. I object to your ruling.

The SPEAKER: If the hon. member wishes to raise a point of order I will hear him.

Mr. HARDACRE: The point of order I wish to raise is this: It has never been decided that a member shall be suspended without at least an explanation and a hearing of the circumstances by the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member's point of order is entirely beyond the question. The course now taken has been the repeated practice of this House, and it has been upheld by the Supreme Court. Therefore, I must rule that the hon. member's point of order does not apply.

Mr. HARDACRE: I move that your ruling be disagreed to, and call your attention to Standing Order No. 117—

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the hon. member resume his seat? The question is that the hon. member for Charters Towers, Mr. Dunsford, be suspended from the service of the House for one week.

Mr. SIM: It doesn't matter! Government by gag!

Question put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 34.

Messrs. Dickson, Chataway, Foxton, Philp, Murray, Dalrymple, Collins, G. Thorn, Grimes, Thomas, Callan, McMaster, Story, Bell, Stephenson, McGahan, Castling, Petrie, Moore, Bridges, Newell, Bartholomew, Stodart, Armstrong, Corfield, Lissner, Cribb, Lord, Smith, Tooth, Hamilton, O'Connell, Stumm, and Annear.

NOES, 22.

Messrs. Sim, Curtis, Maughan, Keogh, Glassey, Kerr, Kidston, Dunsford, McDonnell, King, Fitzgerald, Boles, Jenkinson, Drake, W. Thorn, Fogarty, Dibley, Daniels, Battersby, Jackson, Hardacre, and Stewart.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The hon. member thereupon left the Chamber.

Mr. KERR: Mr. Speaker,—

The SPEAKER: The hon. member has spoken.

Mr. KERR: Not on this question.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member has spoken. Will the hon. member resume his seat?

Mr. KEOGH: No one in this House regrets more than I do what has just taken place in this Chamber, and whatever feelings may predominate here to-night I am sure that to-morrow everybody will regret what has taken place. I know I am digressing from the subject before the House, but I may be allowed to say that I think it would have been better if the leader of the House had not been so extreme in his motions of suspension against some of those hon. members, and I would now ask the hon. gentleman, seeing the feeling that exists in the House at present, not to go on with any more business but to adjourn the House until to-morrow, when a better feeling will prevail. A number of members on this side have been put out—they are some of our best men—and I am sorry that such has taken place, and I trust that the Premier will act on the suggestion I have made.

Mr. BATTERSBY: I do not see why the House should not pass this resolution, and let us see the Bill, because there will be three or four opportunities afterwards for hon. members to express their opinions on the subject.

Mr. KERR: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member spoke before tea.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BATTERSBY: If so I will drop it; but when I get up I take pretty good care not to put myself into the hands of either you or the Chairman. I am sorry that this little disturbance has been caused in the House to-night. It is not because they do not want to carry these resolutions; it is to my mind because they have got their backs up on the other side—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the hon. member to speak to the question.

Mr. BATTERSBY: I am trying to do that. I am trying to show why I think hon. members ought to let these resolutions pass and let the Bill be introduced. This is the first meeting of the House since the Premier has been accepted as leader of the House by the Governor, and

though I voted against him three times to-night, and I am going to vote against any suspension—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must confine himself to the question before the House.

Mr. BATTERSBY: I will put it in another way. I think these Bills ought to be introduced so that we can see what they are, and then if hon. members on both sides think they should not be carried they can deal with them in the proper way; but I hope this bickering will end, and that any ill-feeling that has been created since the House met to-day will pass away by to-morrow.

Mr. McDONNELL: I am very much obliged to the hon. member who has just sat down for his very valuable advice. We have had a lot of friendly advice to-night, and a lot of friendly treatment. At all events it will call the attention of the country to the present condition of things. I have to congratulate the Premier on this his first day as the head of the Government in this House upon a career which is in keeping with his outrageous action here to-night. You, Mr. Speaker, I have to congratulate upon having upheld the prestige that you have earned for a long time as being the most partial, the most unfair—

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Order, order! Chair!

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. McDONNELL: Speaker who has ever sat in that chair.

The SPEAKER: Order, order! Will the hon. member withdraw the words?

Mr. McDONNELL: No, certainly not. I am perfectly certain that every word I say is true.

The SPEAKER: Then I have no option but to name the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. McDonnell, to the House for disregarding the authority of the Chair, and disorderly conduct.

The PREMIER: I can clearly see that there is a determined defiance of the proprieties in this House, and an intention, I am sorry to say, to dishonour the Chair. Now I give hon. members notice—

Mr. KIDSTON: Mr. Speaker is that in order? Is it in order for the Premier to make a statement?

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order in speaking to the motion.

Mr. DANIELS: He has been doing it all along.

Mr. FITZGERALD: Making remarks.

The PREMIER: It is my desire to give hon. members information.

Mr. FITZGERALD: Move your motion.

The PREMIER: My motion is—"That the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. McDonnell, be suspended from service in this House for a period of seven days."

Mr. McDONNELL: Thank you.

Question put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 32.

Messrs. Dickson, Foxton, Philp, Murray, Dalrymple, Chataway, Macdonald-Patersom, Annear, Hamilton, Stuma, Tooth, Smith, Lord, Cribb, O'Connell, Corfield, Stodart, Armstrong, Newell, Bridges, Castling, Moore, McGahan, Story, Bell, Lissner, Grimes, Collins, Thomas, McMaster, Callan, and G. Thorn.

NOES, 22.

Messrs. Glassey, Keogh, Stewart, Kidston, Maughan, Hardacre, Jackson, Daniels, McDonnell, Kerr, Dibley, W. Thorn, King, Fitzgerald, Sim, Boles, Curtis, Drake, Jeakinson, Groom, Fogarty, and Battersby.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The hon. member thereupon left the Chamber.

Mr. SIM: "Friend after friend departs."

Original question put.

Mr. DANIELS: I do not like the way things are going, and when I say that I do not refer to the members who, unfortunately, have been turned out, but to the fact that the Government are trying to legislate without the sanction of the people. If they went to the country to-morrow I believe they would be absolutely defeated in every electorate. The Premier has told us that he has confidence in the strength of the Government in the country. Why, then, does he not go to the country? No one would object to that, but instead he has adopted the expedient of expelling from this Chamber, without any real cause, a number of members on this side.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member cannot speak in that strain; he must confine himself to the question before the House.

Mr. DANIELS: Well, then, I will say there was not sufficient reason for expelling those members. I heard the Premier himself make the same statement as the member for Flinders several days ago, and without as much justification. I am quite prepared to let the Government deal with what legislation they please if they get authority from the country for doing so, but under present circumstances they simply hold their positions under false pretences. If I hire a man to look after horses—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is the proper place for you.

Mr. DANIELS: I should hire the Secretary for Lands to look after asses, because he would be more at home.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Yes, I have my eye on you.

Mr. DANIELS: As I was saying, if I hire a man to look after horses, and he wants to leave, what right has he to hand on his position to another man unless I approve of his successor? That is the position the Government are in. Sir Hugh Nelson was returned here by the people. So was the late Premier returned to support Sir Hugh Nelson, and he had a right to assume the leadership, but the present Premier, during his election address, said that if he were elected as a Ministerial supporter entirely without opposition he would refuse to stand. The Government could get an election over in a month, and then we could have a good long session and enter upon useful legislation. But it seems that they intend to hold on at any price. Even the *Brisbane Courier*, the great supporter of the Government, says that they and their supporters are afraid to go to the country because some of them would lose their £300 a year. I look with contempt upon any member who simply supports a Government through fear of losing his £300 a year. I would like to go to the country to-morrow. The sooner the better; and if I am not returned then I shall know it is because the electors think they have got a better man.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member's remarks are not at all relevant to the question before the House.

Mr. DANIELS: Well, I have given my reasons for refusing to support this motion, and I fancy they are good reasons. I shall vote against the motion.

Mr. KING: It is under cover of this motion that I must say what I have to say, and I shall confine myself to a very few words. So far as the mover of the motion is concerned, I have the greatest respect for him, and I am not going to say a word as to whether the Government have the confidence of the country or not. But I will say that I do not think this House has any confidence in you, Sir; at any rate I have not. I would be a mean contemptible individual if I did not say what I am going to say. After seeing my friends and colleagues shifted from the floor of

this House one after the other, I would be as mean and contemptible in my own eyes as I hold you, if I did not say that the cause of all this trouble is, I will not say the Government, but yourself. If am suspended I do not care if the head of the Government suspends me for six months. At any rate if I am suspended it shall be with great reluctance and regret that I have been compelled to say what I shall say. I feel very strongly on this matter. As a rule I do not trouble the House very much. My friend and colleague, the senior member for Charters Towers, has been removed from the House, possibly with some cause, but so far as the hon. member for Flinders was concerned I distinctly say that he was not guilty of any offence.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order. The only question before the House is the one on the notice-paper.

Mr. KING: The question before the House is the motion introduced by the Secretary for Lands. I have no objection to the introduction of the Bill. I do not mean to say that the hon. gentleman leading the Government and his colleagues have not got the confidence of the country. It is sufficient for me to know that those who sent me here have confidence in me. So far as I am concerned, I respect every member of this House. I also respect my position as a member of this House, and therefore it is with feelings of deep regret that I have to say that I have no confidence in you, because you are a partisan Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order, order! I call upon the hon. member to withdraw that remark.

Mr. KING: I shall not do so.

The SPEAKER: Then I have no option left but to name the hon. member for Maranoa, Mr. King, for disorderly conduct and insulting the Chair.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Withdraw, withdraw!

Mr. KING: I have no intention of withdrawing.

The PREMIER: It is with regret that I have to move that the hon. member for Maranoa be suspended from the service of the House for one week.

Question put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 31.

Messrs. Dickson, Foxton, Philp, Dalrymple, Murray, Chataway, Collins, Lissner, McGahan, G. Thorn, Grimes, Thomas, McMaster, Callan, Story, Bell, Armstrong, Cribb, Stodart, Corfield, Battersby, Lord, Tooth, Stumm, Annear, Hamilton, O'Connell, Bridges, Newell, Petrie, and Macdonald-Paterson.

NOES, 20.

Messrs. Glassey, Keogh, Jackson, Kerr, King, Sim, Fitzgerald, W. Thorn, Curtis, Boles, Drake, Groom, Jenkinson, Fogarty, Dibley, Daniels, Kidston, Hardacre, Stewart, and Maughan.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER: I now call upon the hon. member for Maranoa to withdraw.

Mr. KING: Out of respect to the Chair I bow to it, but not out of respect to you.

The hon. member thereupon left the Chamber.

Original question put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 41.

Messrs. Dickson, Foxton, Philp, Dalrymple, Chataway, Murray, G. Thorn, Macdonald-Paterson, Lissner, Leahy, Grimes, Thomas, McMaster, Callan, Story, Collins, Bell, Cribb, Groom, Jenkinson, Fogarty, McGahan, Boles, Curtis, Drake, Petrie, Stephens, Battersby, W. Thorn, Newell, Armstrong, Fraser, O'Connell, Bridges, Stodart, Corfield, Lord, Tooth, Stumm, Annear, and Hamilton.

1898—2 v

NOES, 12.

Messrs. Glassey, Hardacre, Kidston, Keogh, Jackson, Kerr, Fitzgerald, Sim, Dibley, Daniels, Stewart, and Maughan.

Resolved in the affirmative.

MINING BILL.

FIRST READING.

The House having in committee affirmed the desirableness of introducing this Bill, it was presented and read a first time; and the second reading was made an Order of the Day for Wednesday next.

DISEASES IN STOCK ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

COMMITTEE.

Clause 1—"Short title and construction"—put and passed.

On clause 2—"Amendment of 60 Vic. No. 1, s. 3"—

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE moved that the clause be negatived.

Mr. BELL said there must be some reason for the omission of the clause, and it would be just as well if the hon. gentleman would give it.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE said he foreshadowed the omission of the clause on the second reading, and fully explained the reason then. It had been pointed out that the definition of disease in the Bill—namely, that when any ticks known as *Ixodes boris* were found on any stock such ticks should be deemed a disease—might seriously injure meat in the outside market; and it was not really required.

Clause put and negatived.

On clause 3—"Amendment of 60 Vic. No. 1, s. 15"—

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE moved the omission of the second paragraph with the view of substituting other words of which he had given notice.

Amendment agreed to.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Section 15 of the principal Act, to which that clause applied, provided that every owner, when disease in a malignant form appeared in stock upon his run or in his travelling stock should, before the expiration of one week from the time of his discovering the fact, give notice thereof to the "nearest inspector." The wording of that section had given rise to some confusion, and had not been found to work well. While the inspector of the district was a man who was known, the "nearest inspector" was a doubtful item. He moved the insertion of the words "and in the same section the words 'nearest inspector' are repealed, and the words 'inspector of the district' are inserted."

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. W. THORN: The inspectors he had seen were not to his mind competent to do their work. He was told some time ago that inspectors were to be put on the tick line on the Darling Downs on the range. People there who earned their living with bullock-teams and horse-teams suffered great hardship in connection with the tick line, and he trusted that the Minister would see his way to shift some of the inspectors from the North to the South. The ticks had been brought from Bundaberg, Rockhampton, and Gladstone to South Queensland, and the people of Darling Downs were blocked from shifting cattle from clean country to clean country.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: In a portion of his electorate there was a large area of land used by the people of Toowoomba for running their dairy herds, and if cattle went below the range there was no chance of getting them back to Toowoomba. He agreed with the hon. member for Aubigny that inspectors should be brought from parts of the colony where they were of very little

use, and stationed in such places as those he had spoken of, where they might give permits to allow cattle to pass backwards and forwards. It seemed absurd that within a mile of a town a man might have a paddock, and that if his cattle crossed a line on the range there was no chance of his getting them back, and he hoped the Minister would take notice of the question raised by the hon. member for Aubigny. He could not congratulate the Minister for Agriculture on the first Bill he had introduced. He knew as much about the subject as most men, but he could not carry in his head the alterations proposed. He thought further information might have been given. Coming as it did after an afternoon's work which they all deplored, it was very difficult to follow the Bill without more information.

Mr. GROOM: Only for what occurred last week, a deputation would have waited on the Minister for Agriculture from the constituency he represented and also from the adjoining one of Camuloys in the neighbourhood of Greenmount, in regard to the matter spoken of by the hon. gentleman who had just sat down. There were 16,000 acres of land on the eastern slope of the Main Range known as "the Drayton common," on which from 100 to 150 dairymen grazed their cattle, and as the law stood if the cattle went over the quarantine line on the eastern slope of the Main Range they dare not bring them back. Greenmount was probably one of the largest dairying settlements on the Darling Downs, and the dairymen there were exactly in the same position, and did not know what to do. It had been suggested that a deputation should wait on the Secretary for Agriculture, and see whether he would station an inspector below the range, about Helidon or Murphy's Creek, to give permits to dairymen to take their cattle across the line. The present state of affairs was causing perfect stagnation in dairying enterprise in the districts to which he had referred, and some means might suggest itself to the Agricultural Department by which difficulties of this kind might be arrested. The hon. member for Aubigny reminded him that the same thing applied to the timber-getters turning out their teams at Crow's Nest. If they went across the line on the eastern slope of the range they could not be brought back without violating the law. He trusted that the Minister would consider the matter, and make some concessions in the direction he had indicated.

Mr. DANIELS said that a lot of dairymen took up small eighty-acre farms in the olden times about Eron Vale with the view of being able to take up larger paddocks for their dairy herds below the range; and the effect of running the present tick line on the range was to render those farms absolutely useless, because there was not sufficient land on the western side of the range for the cattle, and on the eastern side the country was too rough to build dairies or anything else.

Mr. FOGARTY: On Thursday week he had interviewed the Minister in connection with this matter, and the hon. gentleman then expressed his sympathy, but pointed out that the law prevented him giving any relief. He had asked that inspectors should be appointed to give permits to enable dairymen to take their cattle to Toowoomba. Not a single second of delay should take place in giving relief. The cost of appointing the necessary inspectors would be small compared with the benefits it would confer. Another difficulty was in connection with fat stock. He knew of one man who had some forty fats. Fat stock were very scarce in Toowoomba just now, but although that man's boundary was only 150 yards over the tick quarantine line he was unable to take his fat stock to Toowoomba. He had interviewed the Minister on the subject this afternoon, but the hon. gentleman expressed

his inability to do anything, as it would be in contravention of the law. Some relief might also be given in that direction.

Mr. LEAHY supposed the clause was all right and that all the clauses in the Bill would be found all right, but owing to the recent unfortunate period they had passed through, hon. members had come to the House to-day in ignorance of what business would come on. He did not think that any of them expected that that Bill would come on for consideration, and he hoped that if the Bill passed through committee this evening the hon. gentleman would not insist on proceeding to the report stage, but would give them an opportunity of considering it at a later stage if necessary. He had risen for the purpose of asking what the meaning of "district inspector" was. He had hurriedly turned up the principal Act, but there was no definition in it of the term. In fact, there was no definition of "district" in the Act, and from his hurried investigation he could not find that there was power in the regulations to deal with the subject. It was likely to make "confusion worse confounded."

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE did not know what a "district inspector" was under the Act. He knew that the inspectors had districts, for they had the boundaries of those districts. Those boundaries were very clearly defined in the office, and, generally speaking, they were familiar to the owners of cattle; but under what circumstances district inspectors would be appointed he did not know. He would like to say a few words with reference to what had been said by the hon. member for Lockyer, the two hon. members for Toowoomba, and the hon. member for Aubigny. The hon. member for Lockyer regretted that he had not been more explicit. Without repeating everything, he might say that the Bill dealt with two subjects. Clause 3 dealt with the notice required to be given when travelling stock were found to be tick-infested, and clause 4 extended the impounding powers. With regard to the matter which was troubling the four hon. members, he wished to say that the quarantine boundary on the top of the range had been under consideration for months, and was fixed after consultation with people who knew, and was probably the best boundary that could be obtained. When the quarantine had been fixed there, and the line beyond, very strong representations were made to him that the Darling Downs were being cut off from any market, and the hon. member for Aubigny pointed out in that Chamber that clean cattle could not go into clean country. With regard to the fat stock on the Darling Downs, concerning which personal representations had been made to him, it appeared they were non-existent, for they were told that Toowoomba could not supply itself with fats unless it got them from below the range. With regard to the other statement that clean cattle could not go into clean country, since the second reading of the Bill he had made arrangements with New South Wales whereby the breeders of pure-bred bulls, who were so inconvenienced and who made such a loud outcry about that temporary quarantine, would be enabled to truck their bulls to the Western districts, where they would find a market. One of the hon. members said that the inspectors were no good. It was quite possible that they might get some inspectors who were no good, but the hon. member who made the statement wanted inspectors appointed to give permits to cattle on the eastern side of the range to travel to Toowoomba. If the inspectors were not capable men, there was very considerable danger to the dairymen of the Darling Downs in allowing cattle within fifty or sixty miles of known ticks—and

they might be very much nearer—to cross the range. The dairying industry on the Downs was growing, and would be of great magnitude and of the utmost importance to the whole colony, and the board of Stock Commissioners were only doing their duty in recommending that the most strenuous efforts should be made to protect that industry from possible infection by ticks. He was not prepared to say that even the most strenuous efforts would be successful in preventing that infection, but it was clearly their duty to make the attempt. He was bound to confess that while he believed quarantine had delayed the progress of the ticks, he was not confident that quarantine lines could prevent them being spread further south. He could not hold out hope that he could give immediate relief of his own power, and without consultation with any other power, to the gentlemen who were now in some trouble in Toowoomba. The House had distinctly pronounced an opinion adverse to the granting of permits, and when he administered the quarantine line in a manner as he thought conducive to the best interests of all concerned, he was taken to task by the House, and it was clearly intimated that he had exercised more power than he ought to have done. The opinion of Parliament had been so clearly intimated to him that he was not prepared to flout the House, and give permits to travel over the quarantine line.

Mr. GROOM: Surely the hon. gentleman could see that the matter to which attention had been drawn was not identical with the case he referred to. It was not the town of Toowoomba they were particularly speaking about, but the vast dairying herds on the Darling Downs and the men who had settled on the range. Those men were practically being deprived of a living. It was not his place to suggest a boundary. The hon. gentleman had stock commissioners who were practical men who ought to make all the suggestions he required. It was not only in the neighbourhood of Toowoomba that the difficulty had occurred. Take the instance of Greenmount, one of the most comprehensive settlements on the Downs, with an enormous output of butter and cheese. The industry there was absolutely paralysed by the boundary being fixed on the top of the Main Range, and when the cattle came down to feed on the eastern slopes they dare not be brought back again for fear of the penalty imposed by the regulations. It was never intended that anything of that kind should occur. It was the desire of everyone to prevent the ticks getting among the large dairy herds of the Downs, but there was a medium in all things. For the protection of the few surely it was not desirable to ruin the many!

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Do they not bring their herds backwards and forwards?

Mr. GROOM: They did, but it was a breach of the law. The inspector recently appointed had fallen a victim to the prevailing epidemic, but when he recovered probably he would see that those men were prosecuted.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You should not draw my attention to it. You are an informer.

Mr. GROOM: By no means. If a tick inspector was appointed in some given locality below the range he could give permits for the dairy cattle to travel, so that there would be no fear of their owners being fined for breaches of the regulations. He did not think any action the hon. gentleman had taken on a former occasion should influence him at the present time. He should take a more broad-minded view of the case.

Mr. ARMSTRONG wished to emphasise what had fallen from the hon. member for Toowoomba. The House had taken strong

objection to the permits granted by the Minister with regard to cattle leaving Esk and passing through clean country, but that was not the case under review now. All the country west of his electorate was grazed over by cattle which were sent up to Toowoomba. The inhabitants of that part of the country did their business with Toowoomba. If it was necessary that the Minister should take the action he had taken to allow high-class bulls to be sent there, it was equally necessary that he should take some action to give relief to the small people. Round about Greenmount was the largest dairying district on the Downs. The whole of the cattle were grazed below the range, and that was very little further than Glengallan. There was very little difference between there and where the ticks were known to exist—Brisbane, Riverview, and Esk. The question of putting men on to see that infected stock did not pass on to the Darling Downs was an easy one and not expensive, and it was worthy of consideration. He should like the Secretary for Agriculture to confer with those who had to deal with the matter, because it was very serious.

Mr. BATTERSBY thought the best thing to do would be to declare the whole colony to be tick infected, and let the New South Wales people do as they liked about letting cattle go over the border.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The Secretary for Agriculture is quite right in protecting clean country.

Mr. BATTERSBY: New South Wales wanted cattle, and if they would not admit them alive they could be frozen, and the industry here would profit by it. The sooner they took a stand the better, because New South Wales and Victoria were trying to "run" them now, and it was quite time there was no more of it.

The CHAIRMAN: I would remind the hon. member that the question before the Committee is that clause 3, as amended, stand part of the Bill.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: He would be very glad to meet the representatives of Lockyer and Toowoomba, and see if they could not make some arrangement by which relief would be given to a class of men who laboured under very serious difficulties. He was anxious to do what he could, and now that the warm weather had set in they would soon find out where the ticks were.

Mr. KERR had listened attentively to what had been said by the hon. members for Toowoomba and Lockyer, and it appeared to him that people in the South were treated very differently from those in other districts. Carriers in the Central district were prevented from crossing from Blackall to Jericho, and from Blackall to Barcaldine; but it seemed that the inspectors were not so strict in the neighbourhood of Toowoomba. Some tick-infested cattle from Brighton Downs were trucked from Barcaldine, and some ticks were found there, but none had ever been seen afterwards; but still carriers were prevented from earning a living through not being allowed to cross over the boundary, while at the same time dairy cattle in the Southern district were allowed to cross.

Mr. BELL: What about the Mount Cornish cattle?

Mr. KERR: That was not near Barcaldine. If the regulations were going to be strictly enforced in the Central district they should be in the Southern district also.

The Hon. G. THORN thought there was a great deal of force in the contention of the hon. member for Moreton with regard to proclaiming the whole colony tick infested. He was surprised that hon. members seemed so anxious to introduce ticks into their districts. The grass was very succulent under the range, and it would be a breeding-ground for ticks in hot weather.

He was astonished at the Secretary for Agriculture yielding to the demands of the hon. members for Drayton and Toowoomba, and exceedingly regretted his action, because the quarantine line on the Main Range was a good one, and ought to be maintained. He was also astonished at the hon. member for Lockyer being so anxious to introduce ticks on the Darling Downs. The Stock Board was to be commended for keeping the ticks off that country as long as possible, and if the department was to go on breaking the line fixed, the Minister would do well to adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Moreton, and proclaim the whole colony tick-infested.

Mr. BATTERSBY should certainly oppose any quarantine line unless the whole colony was included.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure the hon. member must see that his remarks do not in any way apply to the clause before the Committee.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE moved that the following new clause be inserted after clause 3:—

In section 16 of the principal Act, the words "nearest to the run where the stock are located" are repealed, and the words "of the district" inserted.

Clause 16 of the principal Act required that the owners of travelling stock should notify the inspector "nearest to the run where the stock are located," and it was now proposed that they should give notice to the inspector of the district. He hoped that he would be able, before proceeding with the rest of the Bill, to be in a position to inform the hon. member for Bulloo under what authority district inspectors were appointed.

Clause put and passed.

The House resumed; the CHAIRMAN reported progress, and the Committee obtained leave to sit again to-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: I move that the House do now adjourn. The first business to-morrow, after the time devoted to private members' business, will be the resumed consideration in committee of the Diseases in Stock Act Amendment Bill, and after that Supply.

Mr. GLASSEY: I think before the House adjourns it might be well to make a few observations with regard to the rather unpleasant occurrences which took place earlier in the sitting. Of course if I am trenching on debatable ground, and it is contrary to the Standing Orders, I have no desire to refer to the matter, but I think we should consider if something cannot be done to bring about a more amicable state of affairs.

The SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is not in order in raising that question now. He can only do so by leave of the House.

Mr. GLASSEY: I have no desire to refer to it except by leave of the House.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member be heard on this question?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GLASSEY: The occurrences to which I have alluded must be regretted by all, and I think it is rather to be regretted that the head of the Government took the course which he did. It cannot be denied that hon. members were perhaps provoked into action, which doubtless was unpleasant both to themselves and the House, but I cannot help thinking that the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government might have exercised a little more judgment in the matter if he had taken more time to reflect and had consulted with his colleagues before rushing into the breach, and taking, what I may

be pardoned for calling, inconsiderate action, which he would no doubt not have taken in his calmer moments. Is it not possible that something could be done before the House rises towards lessening the period for which some of those members were suspended? I would ask the Premier to make the period twenty-four hours all round, and I hope that some consideration will be given to the matter with a view to establish a more amicable relationship in the House generally, and to prevent the continuance of any little feeling of bitterness which must rankle in the minds of those hon. members if the period of their suspension is not reduced. It may be thought by some that I am anxious to apologise for the action taken by the other side of the House, but I take up no such position. I do say, however, that if amicable relations can be established, it will be better, not only for one side of the House, but for all sides and for all parties. I again make that appeal before the House rises, and ask the hon. gentleman to take counsel with his colleagues with the view of arriving at a decision to make the uniform suspension twenty-four hours instead of a week. Also, as I am reminded by the hon. member for Barcoo, I make the appeal on behalf of the electorates concerned, and more particularly in view of the House going into Committee of Supply, when those members may have matters appertaining to their constituents to bring before the Chamber.

The PREMIER: I desire to treat the remarks of the leader of the Opposition with respect, and to reply to them. With regard to his request, I should wish to defer it to a more convenient opportunity. I am not at present prepared to make any promise, but if, on a future occasion the hon. member, or any of his friends, desires to offer apologies to the House for what has transpired to-night—

Mr. KERR: You will have to wait a long time for that.

The PREMIER: At present we had better adjourn the House without any further reference to those most unfortunate proceedings. At the same time it is due to hon. members on this side to say that whatever has occurred has not been their fault. A spirit of insubordination, of resistance to constituted authority, has been shown, which it was my duty, and the duty of hon. members on this side, to oppose. While I am not prepared to-night to make any promise to the hon. member, yet when we meet to-morrow in a calmer mood, if the hon. member will show that those on whose behalf he speaks regret their action, I shall be willing to take his appeal into consideration.

Mr. BATTERSBY: Before the House adjourns I should like to ask again when the Bill, to which I have three or four times before referred, is likely to be introduced?

The TREASURER: I understand that the Bill referred to by the hon. member will be tabled next week.

Mr. STEWART: Before the House adjourns I should like to say that the circumstances of this afternoon and evening have been rather unfortunate—unfortunate upon both sides. The greatest offence that has been charged against members was an offence against the decorum of the House. But what is the punishment that has been visited upon them for the offence, if it is one? The punishment, I maintain, even if it is in accordance with the Standing Order, is altogether out of proportion—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is altogether out of order.

Mr. STEWART: Following the line taken up by the leader of the Opposition, I would ask the Premier whether he has fully considered the gravity of the step he has taken this evening?

The SPEAKER: Order! By the permission of the House the leader of the Opposition was permitted to make a reference to the subject, and his remarks were replied to by the Premier. Any further remarks in that direction will be out of order.

Mr. STEWART: I think we are entitled to have some discussion on the subject—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is entirely out of order. The question is that the House do now adjourn.

Question put and passed.

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