

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Council**

**TUESDAY, 10 OCTOBER 1899**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

TUESDAY, 10 OCTOBER, 1899.

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

## PAPER.

The following paper, laid on the table, was ordered to be printed:—

Annual report of the Department of Agriculture for the year 1898-1899.

## GRAMMAR SCHOOLS.

## MOTION WITHDRAWN.

On the following notice of motion being called:—

That, in the opinion of this Council, all grammar schools receiving pecuniary aid from the State should be brought under the direct control of a Minister responsible to Parliament—

HON. A. H. BARLOW said: By the permission of the House, after the statement of Ministers made to the deputation, I propose to withdraw this motion, and not to move it.

Motion withdrawn accordingly.

## FEDERATION.

## ADDRESS TO THE QUEEN.

\* The POSTMASTER-GENERAL, in moving—  
“That this Council agrees to the following Address to the Queen, praying for the establishment of the Commonwealth of Australia, and authorises the President to sign such Address on behalf of the Legislative Council and present it to His Excellency the Administrator of the Government, for transmission to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, with a request that the Right Honourable Lord

Lamington, K.C.M.G., Governor, may be permitted to personally submit the Address to Her Majesty:—

“To Her Most Gracious Majesty Victoria, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland Queen, Defender of the Faith, Empress of India, &c., &c., &c.

“We, Your Majesty's most faithful subjects, the members of the Legislative Council of the colony of Queensland, in Parliament assembled,—

“Humbly represent to Your Majesty:—

“1. That we approach Your Majesty with the assurance of our devoted loyalty to Your Majesty's Throne and Person.

“2. That, pursuant to legislation passed by the Parliaments of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Tasmania, and Western Australia, a convention of representatives of the colonies named met, during the years 1897 and 1898, and framed a draft of a Federal Constitution for Australasia.

“3. That in the beginning of the present year the Prime Ministers of the colonies named, and the Prime Minister of Queensland, in conference assembled, amended the said Draft Federal Constitution in certain respects.

“4. That subsequently the Parliaments of New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, and Tasmania severally passed a Federal Enabling Act, which provided for the submission of the Federal Constitution, so drafted and amended as aforesaid, to the electors of the said colonies respectively for acceptance or rejection.

“5. That the electors of New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, and Tasmania have accepted the said Federal Constitution so drafted and amended as aforesaid.

“6. That the Australasian Federation Enabling Act (Queensland), 1899, being the Federal Enabling Act passed as aforesaid by the Parliament of Queensland, contains the following provision:—

‘If two colonies, of which New South Wales shall be one, in addition to Queensland, accept the Constitution, the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly may adopt Addresses to the Queen, praying that the Constitution may be submitted for enactment by the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland subject to the adoption of similar Addresses by the Parliaments of such two colonies.

‘When such Addresses have been adopted they shall be transmitted to the Queen with a certified copy of the Constitution.’

“7. That the Constitution in the next preceding paragraph mentioned is the said Federal Constitution so drafted and amended as aforesaid.

“8. That the Parliaments of the said colonies of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, and Tasmania have adopted Addresses to Your Majesty of a similar nature to those mentioned in the provision set out in the sixth paragraph hereof.

“We therefore humbly pray, that Your Majesty will be graciously pleased to take the premises into your Royal consideration, and to cause the said Constitution, of which the accompanying is a certified copy, to be submitted for enactment by the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and that Your Majesty will be graciously pleased to cause all other necessary

steps to be taken for the establishment of an Australian Commonwealth under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and under the said Constitution, consisting of Queensland and all those other Australasian colonies whose Parliaments similarly pray Your Majesty.

"And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

"On behalf and in the name of the Legislative Council."

said: That is the Address which we propose now to send to Her Majesty the Queen in furtherance of what has happened in connection with the matters contained in the Federal Enabling Bill. The great question of federation has occupied the attention of this colony for a considerable time, and this House will be called upon now to perform the very last act in connection with federation. It will be called upon to pass an Address which has been passed by every House in the Australian colonies which has passed the Federal Enabling Bill—namely, Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia, and Tasmania. It has been passed not only by the legislatures of those colonies but by our own Legislative Assembly by a very large majority. Therefore it remains for this House to put the coping stone upon the federal edifice. I think that this House, under those circumstances, occupies a very distinguished position. It has the opportunity really of saying the last word, and I am sure—at any rate I hope—that the House will, as a body, support this Address, and complete that work which has been before the Australian colonies now for such a considerable time. I was glad to find that in another place, as well as in the other Australian legislatures, men who had violently, I may say, opposed the Bill when before the people, had come now at last to the conclusion that the minority would not be justified in offering further opposition—that under the present circumstances they would accept the verdict of the people as given by such a large majority in all the colonies. I trust that hon. members of this Council, some of whom are against this Constitution, now that they know the circumstances, will cease further opposition. We have expressed freely our individual opinions. Members of this House and members of the other House largely contributed to the discussions which took place upon the great question of federation. There were members on both sides who honestly and conscientiously endeavoured to do their duty, as they conceived it, to the public by showing from their point of view what ought to be done. Some were on the side of the Constitution; others were against it. All, I venture to believe, acted according to their lights, according to their ideas of what was right, and according to their ideas of what was best for the colony of Queensland; and the result is before us. The referendum was taken, and the result in this colony was as follows:—Metropolitan constituencies: For, *nil*; against, ten; majority against, 4,028 votes. In the Southern district, fifteen constituencies voted for and twelve against; majority for, three, with 371 votes. In the Central district the constituencies for were eight, and the constituencies against were three, being a majority of five for, with 2,156 votes. In the Northern district the constituencies for were thirteen, and the constituencies against *nil*; the majority for being thirteen constituencies and 8,993 votes. The total vote for of those constituencies was 11,520, which, less the 4,028 votes of the metropolis, leaves a grand total of 7,492. As far as the constituencies are concerned, the summary is: For, thirty-five; against, twenty-five; neutral, one; total, sixty-one. With regard to the full number connected with those returns, I need only remind hon. members that I

have laid on the table a statement by the returning officer showing the result of the poll in Queensland on the 2nd September last. As that return is before the House, I do not wish to quote from it further because it is at the disposal of hon. gentlemen if they choose to make use of it. With regard to the other colonies I have a return here which is authentic. Victoria voted on the 27th July, 1899. The number of votes recorded in the affirmative was 152,653, and the number of votes recorded in the negative was 9,805, giving a majority for of 142,848. In New South Wales the number of votes recorded in the affirmative was 107,420, and the number recorded in the negative was 82,741, the majority for being 24,679. In South Australia the number of votes recorded in the affirmative was 65,990, and the number of votes recorded in the negative was 17,053, the majority for being 48,937. In Tasmania the number of votes recorded in the affirmative was 13,437, and the number of votes recorded in the negative was 791, the majority for being 12,646. Queensland comes last with her referendum taken on the 2nd September last, with a total vote recorded in the affirmative of 38,488, and in the negative of 30,996, leaving a majority for of 7,492. The total number of votes polled in the Australian colonies was 519,374. I think all hon. gentlemen who reflect upon the figures I have just read will see that the electors who had the privilege of voting for or against federation were thoroughly seized of the main question, and that they exercised their votes with very great intelligence. Seeing that for years and years this question had been before them, if ever any people were educated up to a question upon which they had to decide, I think the people of Australia were thoroughly educated up to this. Those who actively took a part in the campaign, for and against, were so earnest, so conscientious, and so thoroughly determined to convert the people to their views that no stone was left unturned to enable the people to give a correct decision. I think they have given a right decision, and seeing that we are the very last Legislative House to deal with this question, I do not think hon. gentlemen can have any very great difficulty in the matter. This is now the position: By section 11 of the Australasian Federation Enabling Act (Queensland), assented to on the 21st June last, it was provided that if the Parliaments of two of the Australian colonies, of which New South Wales should be one, should adopt Addresses to the Queen praying that the Federal Constitution might be submitted to the Imperial Parliament for adoption, the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly of Queensland might adopt similar addresses. As I pointed out before, discretion was thus left to the various Parliaments to say whether they would or would not transmit the necessary Addresses to the Queen. With the exception of this Legislative Council the Houses of the various Colonial Parliaments have already considered the matter, and have come to the conclusion that such addresses should be forwarded to the Queen, and they have been forwarded accordingly. They have been, as a matter of fact, adopted almost unanimously by every colony in the group. Both Legislative Chambers have adopted the addresses after full discussion. Of course, those opposed to the Commonwealth Bill had their little say, at the same time the general consensus of opinion was throughout in favour of federation—in favour of the Commonwealth Bill and in favour of the Addresses being sent to Her Majesty. That is the position we are in now, and surely we in this House cannot now say that this Address should not go to the Queen! Surely we cannot stand up and say that

the Legislative Council of Queensland, of all the Legislative Chambers of Australasia with the exception of those of Western Australia and New Zealand, is still to be against it! We cannot, I think, afford now to say that we will not agree to this Address. I am quite sure from what I know of the unqualified patriotism of this House, their known representation of the whole colony, having no constituencies specially to represent, but having the good of the colony as a whole at heart. I am quite sure from what I know of them that they will join in the motion which I have proposed. Another thing I may mention is that if we pass this Address—as I believe we will—it will be presented to the Queen in person by our esteemed Governor, Lord Lamington. He has left the colony for private reasons, and it will happen that he will be in London at the time this Address from the Parliament of Queensland will be received. I think it will be felt to be exceedingly nice that Lord Lamington, our Queensland Governor for a considerable time, and whom we very much respect and esteem, should have the pleasure and privilege of presenting this Address personally to Her Majesty. This is, perhaps, only a small matter, but at the same time it is, I think, worthy of mention. With regard to the proportion of voting I would remind the House that the majority that has been obtained for the Bill in Queensland is really quite on a par with that obtained in New South Wales—quite 56 per cent. of the voters in favour of the acceptance of the Constitution. I have given these details and figures because I consider it my duty to do so, for reference, for the use of hon. members, and to let them see exactly the state of matters in connection with this question. I would also like to allude to the fact that in connection with this question of federation the Government gave every facility, and went out of their way to give special facilities, to electors to be put on the rolls. They had nothing to fear, and they were only too desirous that the people should be enabled to give the largest vote that could possibly be procured. It is not as if the Government were trying to run this thing. They were thoroughly in earnest in believing that federation was the proper thing for these colonies, and the result of the voting has shown the wisdom of their views. They placed every facility in the way of electors voting in all parts of the colony, facilities which I dare say will be incorporated in our legislation at some future time, because it stands to reason that it is considered hard by men resident in Brisbane, who may have business in Townsville, Normanton, or other parts of the colony, that they should lose their votes because they have to be on the trot. That difficulty was in this instance met by the Government in a way that has proved entirely satisfactory, and the envelope votes returned increased the federal vote by a large majority, and showed that the efforts the Government had made to give facilities to the people of Queensland to vote on this great question were a great success. Then, it comes to this: That this matter has been referred to the people of Queensland and they have given their verdict. What can hon. gentlemen say other than that they will accept that verdict—that they will accept the decision given by the people as final? What can they do otherwise? Surely this House cannot set itself up against the people! Hon. gentlemen cannot say that, notwithstanding that the people have voted by a substantial majority of nearly 7,500, they think this federation should not come about, and there is some reason why federation should not be accomplished. I do not think it would be right for hon. gentlemen of this House to place themselves in that position. I do not

think I should, but rather that I should bow, as an hon. member said in another place, to the wish of the majority, bow to the decision come to, bow loyally, straightforwardly, honestly, honourably, and uprightly to the decision given. I certainly think that is the proper course to pursue, and I am confident that members of this House will take that view. Then I would like to say also that any argument now for or against the Constitution is utterly beside the question. The time for that is gone. I could not have told that before, because I did not know what the result of the voting would be. Now I know the result of the vote, and I say the time for discussion has really gone by, and we are here only to register the mandate of the people.

Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: We are only recording clerks?

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: The hon. gentleman may put it in whatever way he likes, and he is pretty clever at that sort of thing.

Hon. B. D. MOREHEAD: You have told us so, anyway.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: I say that the people have spoken and it is our

[4 p.m.] duty to obey. I conceive that to be my duty, and I believe hon. gentlemen

of this House will look at their duty in the same light. When the Speech from the Throne was read to us His Excellency asked us to deal with this question, however it might be decided—and it had not been decided then—in a broad and enlightened spirit. I ask hon. gentlemen now to deal with it in that broad spirit of enlightenment. The time for contention on the question of federation has really passed. We are now called upon by the people of the colony to pass this Address. There is nothing else left for us to do. I am quite sure the House will rise to the occasion, and act as I have suggested. I would further say that this being an Address to Her Majesty, hon. gentlemen will look upon it not as if they were discussing a Bill but that being an Address to Her Majesty, and especially an Address common to all the colonies, they will receive it with the respect which is due to it. Under all the circumstances and considering that this House is the last to deal with it, and the last House to put its seal upon the federal compact, I confidently appeal to hon. gentlemen to agree to the Address I have moved. I do not think it necessary for me to say anything further. I have endeavoured to the best of my ability to show that this House should pass this Address and with unanimity. Of course if there are members here who wish to ventilate their opinions and to offer further opposition to the action we are taking they are at perfect liberty to do so. There is freedom of speech in this House, and perfect liberty; at the same time I do not think any efforts those hon. gentlemen are likely to make, especially if they propose to go further than this Address, will redound to the credit or to the honour of this House. I think this House, if it rises to the occasion, will pass this Address without any discordant note, and it will be doing honour to itself by giving effect to the people's verdict in favour of this great federal compact. I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

HONOURABLE GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear!

\* HON. A. H. BARLOW: There are reasons why, in the matter of this debate, my hon. friend, Mr. Gregory, who might have been expected to follow the Minister, has not taken up the running. He will probably address the House at a later time. I can only assure my

hon. friend opposite that I am over here from no spirit of antagonism to him or his colleagues, but simply to be in consultation with my hon. friend here upon this one subject upon which I differ from my late colleagues, and upon which I have severed my political connection of many years' standing in order to be where I am. I am glad now that I know what the position and what the functions of this Legislative Council are. I have understood from my hon. friend opposite—and it was put into an epigrammatic form by my hon. friend, Mr. Morehead—that this Council is a place of registration, and we are invited to bow and pass in silence and with acclamation these things that are put before us. For my own part I was sent here by virtue of a slip of parchment to give advice and consent to the making of laws for the peace, welfare, and good government of the colony. Now, I oppose the presentation of this Address to Her Majesty because I believe it is neither for the peace, nor the welfare, nor for the good government of this colony. I believe it is not for the peace of the colony, because I believe it has raised antagonisms which will never be allayed, or will not be allayed in the lifetime of hon. members now present—antagonisms which will divide themselves into political parties, acting over large spaces of country, as in the case of the federation of the United States of America, and which will prevent that close watchfulness over the affairs of government which under our home rule we have hitherto enjoyed. I do not think it is for the welfare of the colony, because I believe, as has been stated by many other speakers, the representation which we shall have in the southern Parliament is not only insufficient, but is a mere burlesque. I say it advisedly—an absolute burlesque. It will further not be for the welfare of the colony that its affairs should be relegated to a legislature sitting many miles away from our own borders, in which we have scarcely any effective voice whatever; and I should be the most hopeful, sanguine, and most credulous of mankind if I believed that this measure would even produce good government. I will not weary the House by going over all the ground I covered in previous debates. I cannot persuade myself that this is going to be for the welfare or good government of this country, and I can only assure my hon. friend opposite and other hon. members that I do not approach the question in a spirit of obstinacy. I approach the question as I do because I believe in my innermost soul that the step is a wrong one, fraught with terrible disaster and ill in the future to come for us. Now, my hon. friend told us that the constituencies had voted in favour of this. All the most populous, or the greater part of the most populous, if we except Townsville and Charters Towers, have voted against this measure. When it suits the federationists to quote constituencies they quote them. I have no doubt when it suits me to quote the unwritten political divisions of the colony they will say there is nothing in it; and as to the argument of the large majorities in the southern colonies it is only a support to my own argument—because I believe, and it is the belief of a large number who think with me, that those colonies saw in federation a great opportunity—a great opportunity by which Queensland would suffer to a large extent and New South Wales in a lesser degree. Hence we see the enormous majorities in Tasmania, Victoria, and South Australia. As we get to the colonies that are likely to be injuriously affected by federation—New South Wales and Queensland—we find the majorities dwindling. We find that the majority was never either large or overwhelming in New

South Wales, and that it was a comparatively small, and—I say it advisedly—an insignificant majority in Queensland. Therefore, that disposes of that portion of the hon. gentleman's argument. Now I propose to add to the Address an addendum which I have circulated for the perusal of hon. members. It may or may not be carried. If not, I shall have the satisfaction of knowing to the last day of my life that I endeavoured to do my duty to this country; that I endeavoured to set before the authorities of Great Britain and the Parliament of that great country some facts in connection with this matter which are not disclosed in the Address, and it is because I approach Her Majesty with an assurance of devoted loyalty to Her Throne and Person that I do this. I conceive that if I were to tamely sit down and vote in an abject spirit for this measure at the request of my hon. friend I should not be showing a devoted loyalty to the Throne and Person of Her Majesty. It is the duty of those who think with me to inform Her Majesty officially and respectfully of all the bearings of this case as far as they commend themselves to our minds. Therefore, it is in pursuance of the very first section of this Address, formulated by my hon. friend, that I take the action I do. I propose to add to the Address, following the word "Majesty," and before "And your petitioners, as in duty bound," these words. I will not read the whole addendum, but will deal with the clauses of it seriatim—

But while thus humbly praying Your Majesty, we feel it to be our duty to submit to Your Majesty that we do so because the electors have technically accepted the said Federal Constitution.

That the electors have technically accepted the Constitution there cannot be a shadow of doubt. I do not impugn the accuracy of the returns. I do not impugn the fairness and the manner in which the vote was taken. There may have been plural voting, or there may not have been. I have no evidence. I am content to take the returns as they are.

But under the following circumstances peculiar to this colony of Queensland, which circumstances we believe to be worthy of Your Majesty's most gracious consideration when submitting the said Constitution for enactment by the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

Her Majesty is entitled to know, and the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland is entitled to know, that there are circumstances connected with this colony which are not common to or parallel with the circumstances existing in the other colonies. The circumstances are not parallel in South Australia; they are not parallel in Tasmania; they are not parallel in Victoria; and they are not parallel in New South Wales; but there is a special state of affairs in this colony of Queensland which it is essential that Her Majesty and the British Parliament should be informed of—

That this colony is not a homogeneous community, but is in reality, though not in law, composed of three separate districts.

Now, I do not think anyone will dispute that proposition. If hon. members will go into the library of this building or into any Government office and look at a map of Queensland he will find it is printed in three colours—yellow, blue, and red, I think. There are three great dividing lines across the map. There are also enactments such as the financial separation enactment for the keeping of separate accounts. There is a Supreme Court at Townsville; there is a Supreme Court at Rockhampton. There is no Supreme Court in Newcastle that I know of or at Launceston, and every one of these enactments point to the fact that cannot be gainsaid that

this colony is in reality composed of three separate divisions. My amendment goes on to say—

Two of which, the Central and the Northern, have for many years past been antagonistic to and striving for political separation from the South.

I think that is a position which is not exaggerated or untrue. When I say "antagonistic," I do not mean warlike or hostile, but I say the avowed interests of those districts have been antagonistic to the Southern division. That state of affairs has existed as long as I can remember or have taken any active interest in Queensland politics. The question of separation has always been uppermost. The question of the Northern party and Central party in another place has always been a live and burning question—

Which is the most populous, and is the oldest and most thickly and permanently settled portion of the colony, which contains its metropolitan city of Brisbane, and by far the largest proportion of its cultivated lands.

In the South the cultivated lands amount to 290,000 acres; I do not think the cultivated lands in the Northern division reach 5,000 acres.

Hon. A. J. THYNNE: The sugar lands cover more than that.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: We will give the hon. gentleman the benefit of the doubt, and we will say 10,000 or 20,000 acres if he likes. At any rate the South has nearly 300,000 acres under cultivation. I have taken those figures from a paper lying alongside me, and perhaps I may have misquoted. However, I will rest on the general case. The proportion of cultivated land in the Southern division is very visibly larger than that in either of the other divisions.

Hon. W. APLIN: No.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: Does anybody say "No?" Is it asserted that there are more cultivated lands in the Central and Northern division than in the southern?

Hon. W. APLIN: Including sugar lands.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: I will verify that by statistics, and let the hon. gentleman know at a later period what the proportion is. But even if it were as he states, it would make no difference to my argument.

And that therefore the majority was to a large extent a victory of the consumer over the producer.

I do not want to raise any question that may be considered offensive, but I think that commends itself to the common sense of the House; that the miner and the shearer and those persons who have no fixed location in the colony have certainly gone to a large extent in favour of this measure.

Of those who have but a comparatively transient interest in the colony over those who for generations past have made it their home, and who have become permanently fixed and settled residents in it.

That, I think, also is unassailable—that the great proportion of the fixed and settled residents of this colony are settled in the Southern part of this quasi-political division of Queensland.

That the general majority of votes in favour of the acceptance of the Federal Constitution was 7,492, made up of a majority—

	Votes.
In the Central district of ... ..	2,156
In the Northern district of ... ..	8,993
	11,149
Less a majority against the Constitution	
in the Southern district of ... ..	3,657
	7,492

That is to say, that in this community, which is not a homogeneous community, the question of federation and the asking of this House to pass an Address to Her Majesty is being carried by the votes of the two northernmost divisions of the

colony. That is, in my opinion, a fair statement of the case. The interests of the Southern division are being subordinated to the will and to the votes of two districts or two sections of the colony which for years past have been displaying conflicting interests, and which have repeatedly endeavoured to separate themselves from the colony as a whole.

That, in our opinion, the questions of the acceptance of the Federal Constitution and of the results of such action were not fully and fairly placed before the electors, or were perverted and distorted by interested persons and newspapers, and that the electors had not sufficient time given to them to enable them to form a deliberate opinion.

Now, I think it will be admitted that the time during which this question of federation was a live question before the electors of Queensland was a very short one. It is true that federation had been, as we are told, "in the air," and I wish to goodness it had remained there. For some years federation was in the air, but it was only looked upon by way of a sort of joke, which first came into a state of reality after certain gentlemen went down to the southern parts of Australia and held conferences, and talked, and manufactured *Hansards* and so on. But as for it having been a live question for any length of time, hon. members who have watched the course of events know that the people of this colony never had sufficient time to make up their minds. Arrayed against those who believe as I believe were all the forces of the Government. I will not impugn the action of the Government. I dare say I should do the same thing if I were head of the Government. I will not find fault with the action of a Government of which I was a member, and which perhaps I should have left when the Premier made his declaration in reference to this matter.

Hon. P. MACPHERSON: You could never tell what the Government were driving at.

Hon. A. J. THYNNE: I can give you those figures now.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: If my hon. friend has looked up the statistics I shall be glad to have them.

Hon. A. J. THYNNE: For 1897 the total cultivation in the Southern district was 385,947 acres; for the Central district, 6,226 acres; and for the Northern district, 74,086.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: I am obliged to the hon. gentleman, but that does not weaken my argument. There must have been some mistake in the figures. However, my object is only to elicit the truth, and I am glad to be corrected by anyone.

Hon. A. C. GREGORY: I will give you the figures taken out for 1898. In the Southern division, 384,700 acres under cultivation; in the Northern division, 4,386 acres under cultivation, exclusive of sugar plantations.

Hon. A. J. THYNNE: That is the way in which the anti fed.'s facts have been worked up.

The PRESIDENT: The interruptions of hon. gentlemen are somewhat out of order.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: This does not in the slightest respect weaken my argument that the vast quantity of cultivated land is in the Southern division. When hon. gentlemen gave me their valuable information in reference to the amount of cultivation, I was speaking of the forces which were arrayed against us. Promises were made which amounted to an absolute abandonment of political faith. I will put it that way, for I do not want to be offensive. Promises were made that a particular measure should be introduced into another place which had always previously been resisted and voted against by the Government. My hon. friend the Premier promised, or is said to have promised—and he has not denied it—the introduction of this particular

measure, and promised to give it his support. That was one of the tremendous forces arrayed against us.

HON. W. F. TAYLOR: And fourteen special trains.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: That is a little matter of detail. I do not think the special trains did particular harm. I say that with all these tremendous forces arrayed [4.30 p.m.] against us—the forces of metropolitan newspapers—

HON. B. D. MOREHEAD: What about the *Telegraph*?

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I will say nothing about the *Telegraph*. The *Telegraph* did its best. I was saying that with all these tremendous forces arrayed against us, and with the promise of the Premier that he would introduce into the Assembly a measure against which the party to which he and I have belonged have contested—in spite of all those tremendous efforts, the Southern part of the colony voted against the Bill by 3,657 votes. I do not want to unnecessarily apologise to my hon. friend opposite, but I feel in a somewhat difficult position. I was a member of the Government at the time this occurred. However, I never concealed my opinions, and as far as I could I made them public. Well, in spite of all these tremendous influences, the Southern part of the colony voted by 3,657 votes against the Bill. And yet we are asked—we are being told by my hon. friend that we are to submit to the vote in the Northern and Central districts, lest a worse thing come upon us. That is really the veiled threat of the newspapers, and my hon. friend has held it up to the Council this afternoon. He has invited us to pass this motion in a very honourable way, but the veiled threat that is concealed in all that is that this Council shall have no real power to do what is for the peace, welfare, and good government of the colony. I say in my amendment that the Legislative Council "is supposed to be the guardian of the liberties of minorities of Her Majesty's subjects." In this case it is a very substantial minority of over 30,000 voters, yet for reasons which our Standing Orders will not allow me more particularly to refer to, we have been plainly told in the columns of the newspapers of the colony, and particularly the Brisbane paper, that the very constitution of this House is at stake—that the very roots and foundation of this House are at stake if we do not pass this little and apparently harmless document, which is to take away the liberties and the power of self-government of this colony. I am not exaggerating the case. Every hon. gentleman must feel certain in his own mind that that is what the hon. gentleman means when he talks about our bowing and our graceful acceptance and all that sort of thing. I for my part am prepared to take the consequences. I shall vote for the insertion of this amendment, and if the amendment is inserted I shall vote against the Address, and will do so regardless of consequences. Whether other hon. gentlemen will take the same view or not I cannot say. I go on to say in my amendment that while admitting that the acceptance of the Federal Constitution has been assented to by a legal and technical majority of the electors, the Council is still of opinion that the minority includes the votes of many thousands who believe they will suffer serious loss and damage by its enactment, and that they have had no voice in the framing of it. Hon. gentlemen have only to go into the farming districts of the colony; they have only to go into the manufacturing districts of the colony; they have only to go into any place which has not been under the influence of this federation glamour, for I can call it nothing else,

to find that the people believe and have signified by their votes that they will suffer serious loss and damage under this Constitution. And I am certain they will.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: They are entirely mistaken.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: The hon. gentleman may say what he pleases, but I am as certain that the interests of large numbers of Her Majesty's dutiful subjects will suffer by the enactment of this Federal Constitution as that I am standing here. However, the Council is told that it must not stand in the way, and I for one do not wish to influence the vote of anybody beyond that of myself in the matter. The fact that the people of Queensland have had no share or voice in framing the draft Federal Constitution raises an important question. In the framing of that Constitution we have not had the slightest voice. I stood there where the Hon. Mr. Gray is sitting two or three years ago, and I besought the Council to negative the amendment of the gentleman from Rockhampton, the Hon. Mr. Buzacott. I implored them to make such provision that Queensland should be represented in the Federal Convention; but the efforts that hon. gentleman put forth prevented our being heard. I say again, without fear of contradiction—and I hope my words will reach the eye of the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he does us the honour to peruse this debate—that the people of this colony have had no share or voice in the making up of this Federation Bill that has been brought before them. It has been presented to be swallowed, as it were, at the point of the bayonet. We have never had a share in the election of delegates to the Convention for the framing of the Bill which the other colonies have had, and we have never been allowed to discuss it. When my hon. friend was carrying that Bill through the Legislative Council last session the answer always was, "It is a schedule; it is a sacred thing you must not disturb; a sacred thing you must not debate." We were told we could not alter a line of it. In short, as I said, we have had no hand in framing this wonderful Federal Constitution which is now sought to be imposed upon us. Then I go on to say—

Who have never, by the votes of their representatives in the elected House of the Parliament of Queensland, authorised or directed the Prime Minister of Queensland to confer with the Prime Ministers of the other colonies.

Who authorised the Prime Minister of Queensland to go down there? I am not aware that either this or the other branch of the legislature authorised any such conference. It may have been his colleagues.

HON. B. D. MOREHEAD: His colleagues could not direct a Prime Minister.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: Of course they could not. I do not want to be offensive to my late chief, but I say nobody sent him down there to confer with the Prime Ministers of the other colonies, and that the interests of this colony were not protected at that conference. The interests of Western Australia were protected there by a special enactment. Our interests were not protected at all, and with the exception of one or two trifling matters nothing was done to protect them. Lastly, I say the people—

Have never had the opportunity of voting, at the election of members of the Legislative Assembly at which the question of the surrender of the collection of the whole of the Customs revenue and of a large portion of the powers of legislation of the colony, in obedience to the will of the Central and Northern districts of the colony, has been even mentioned.

I think that of all the stupendous pieces of impudence ever put before a people, to ask them to surrender their Customs revenue is the greatest. By way of analogy let us take the

case of the Brisbane Bridge Board—a joint local authority appointed to manage the Brisbane bridge. I wonder what would be thought if they said to the city of Brisbane or to the municipalities of Booroodabin or Toowong, and so on, "We are going to collect your revenue; we will pay the bridge expenses out of it, and what we have after that we will give you back." That is the stupendous piece of impudence I fought against in the Federal Council. I asked repeatedly in that deliberative body why the expenses of the Federal Government could not be collected by precept, as in our joint local authorities. The answer I got was that there was no means of enforcing that except by war. And yet we are asked to federate with people who would not have the common honesty to pay their debts! I say this is the most stupendous piece of impudence that was ever imposed upon a people—the collection of the whole Customs revenue and the giving back of whatever they think fit. I have spoken my honest, candid, and sincere convictions on this matter. If I was a place-hunter or a place-seeker I should probably say nothing. But I feel I am, as it were, on oath in this place, that I am sent here to do my duty, and I feel it my duty to vote for what will promote the peace, welfare, and good government of the colony; and I feel I cannot, for what is left of life to me, rest under the reflection that I voted for this thing which will take away the liberties of the colony in which I have lived so long. I beg to move my amendment as follows:—That after the word "Majesty" and before the words "and your petitioners as in duty bound," etc., the following be inserted:—

But while thus humbly praying Your Majesty, we feel it to be our duty to submit to Your Majesty that we do so because the electors have technically accepted the said Federal Constitution, but under the following circumstances peculiar to this colony of Queensland, which circumstances we believe to be worthy of Your Majesty's most gracious consideration when submitting the said Constitution for enactment by the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland:—

1. That this colony is not a homogeneous community, but is in reality, though not in law, composed of three separate districts, two of which, the Central and Northern, have for many years past been antagonistic to and striving for political separation from the Southern, which is the most populous, and is the oldest and most thickly and permanently settled portion of the colony, which contains its metropolitan city of Brisbane, and by far the largest proportion of its cultivated lands, and that, therefore, the majority was to a large extent a victory of the consumer over the producer—of those who have but a comparatively transient interest in the colony over those who for generations past have made it their home, and who have become permanently fixed and settled residents in it.

That the general majority of votes in favour of the acceptance of the Federal Constitution was 7,492, made up of a majority—

In the Central district of ...	2,156 votes
In the Northern district of ...	8,993 votes

11,149

Less a majority <i>against</i> the Constitution in the Southern district of ...	3,657 votes
---	-------------

7,492

2. That, in our opinion, the question of the acceptance of the Federal Constitution and of the results of such action were not fully and fairly placed before the electors, or were perverted and distorted by interested persons and newspapers, and that the electors had not sufficient time given to them to enable them to form a deliberate opinion.

3. That while the Legislative Council of Queensland is supposed to be the guardian of the liberties of minorities of Your Majesty's subjects, which minority in this case numbers 39,996 against the majority of 34,483, we feel difficulty in this instance in exercising this function, because the departure from Queensland, at this most important juncture, of Your Majesty's representative, the Right Honourable Baron Lamington, K.C.M.G., has placed every executive authority, which includes the power to appoint new members to this Legislative Council, in other hands.

4. That while we must admit that the acceptance of the Federal Constitution has been assented to by a legal and technical majority of the electors, we are still of opinion that the large minority of 39,996 votes includes the votes of many thousands of Your Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects who believe that they will suffer serious loss and damage by the enactment of the Federal Constitution—who have had no share or voice in framing the Draft Federal Constitution—who have never, by the votes of their representatives in the elected House of the Parliament of Queensland, authorised or directed the Prime Minister of Queensland to confer with the Prime Ministers of the other colonies—whose interests have not been sufficiently protected in any such conference—and who have never had an opportunity of voting, at any election of members of the Legislative Assembly at which the question of the surrender of the collection of the whole of the Customs revenue and of a large portion of the powers of legislation of the colony, in obedience to the will of the Central and Northern districts of the colony, has been even mentioned.

Amendment—That the words proposed to be inserted be so inserted—put.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: The address which has just been delivered to us by the Hon. Mr. Barlow indicates undoubtedly his thorough sincerity in the views he has put before us; and in anything I say I have no desire to question in the slightest degree the earnestness with which he is actuated with regard to this question of federation. At the same time it is impossible to sit and listen to his address without being reminded of hundreds of similar addresses that have been offered to audiences in every part of Queensland during the last two months. The statements he has made to us are simply a repetition of a mass of arguments that have been considered and answered over and over again throughout the different parts of the colony. He takes certain remarks of the Postmaster-General as indicating some veiled threat against this House. I fail to see any indication of that character in what the Hon. Mr. Wilson said, and I fail to see any ground for the supposition of the existence of such a threat in any shape or form in his words. There is undoubtedly the responsibility attached to every individual and to every association of men if they do not do what is the right thing, and I have the feeling that this House would not be doing what was right in going directly against the clearly expressed wish of the people of the colony, and would therefore incur the responsibility which rests upon everybody who does what is wrong. There is no word or any indication of any threat. Something was said by the hon. gentleman that the threat was against the very constitution of this House. Well, this House, as hon. members are aware, has already acknowledged openly that its constitution is capable of very considerable improvement. I remember some few years ago securing the second reading, the favourable consideration by a select committee, and almost the third reading of a Bill providing for the alteration of this House from a nominative into an elective House. That is a fact recorded in our proceedings indicating the opinion of the members of this House that its constitution ought to be altered. That first movement for the reform of the House originated within itself. I hope to see the constitution of this House so altered and reformed that it may have greater responsibilities thrown upon it, and that it may become what it ought to be, an elective House exercising a more efficient power in the affairs of the colony than a nominative House ever can do. There is one paragraph of the amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. Barlow which to my hearing the hon. gentleman has failed entirely to support. That is the 2nd paragraph, in which he states—

That, in our opinion, the questions of the acceptance of the Federal Constitution and of the results of such action were not fully and fairly placed before the

electors, or were perverted and distorted by interested persons and newspapers, and that the electors had not sufficient time given to them to enable them to form a deliberate opinion.

Hon. gentlemen, is that a statement which this House is prepared to accept as a statement of fact—as a true statement? Is this House going to pronounce in a formal Address to Her Majesty that the affairs of this colony have been conducted in such a way that a matter of this character has not been fairly or fully put before the people, or that it has not been honestly put before them? Why does anyone ask an Australian Parliament to pronounce such a judgment upon its own people as is involved in that sentence? I may ask, and I think with good reason—where was the Hon. Mr. Barlow when these misrepresentations were supposed to have been made?

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: In the Ministry, where he ought not to have been.

HONOURABLE GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear!

HON. A. J. THYNNE: I am very glad to hear the hon. gentleman acknowledge that; but I do not think that even his acknowledgment justifies me in omitting to refer to that fact when a statement condemnatory of the whole of our governmental institutions is proposed in this House by the hon. gentleman to-day. I am sorry that my friend, Hon. Mr. Barlow, did not take the suggestion I made last session when he opposed the Federal Enabling Bill—that he was not in his right place in the Ministry opposing his chief. I am sorry for that. I gave the suggestion to him in all good feeling and kindness of feeling, although he may not have taken it as such at the time. I am sorry for his own sake he did not accept the hint I gave him at the time.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: Oh, no, not from you.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: My hon. friend says he would not take it from me. I am sorry he has that sentiment in his mind, that he would not take a hint—if it was a good one—from me or from anybody else. The source from which a suggestion comes does not matter so long as it is a true, correct, or right one. I do not think we can safely distinguish between an individual who takes upon himself the somewhat unpleasant task of giving a suggestion which is often not very agreeably accepted. However, even though a suggestion of that kind has not been accepted from me in a kindly way, or may not be again, it will not stop me from taking similar action on another occasion—if such an occasion should occur—whether with respect to my hon. friend, Mr. Barlow, or to any other hon. member of this House.

Hon. P. MACPHERSON: There are other Ministers who should have resigned as well.

Hon. J. COWLISHAW: Yes, there are other Ministers who should have resigned on your suggestion also.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: I am astonished to read this commentary upon the action of the Government, when I remember that the Hon. Mr. Barlow was then a Minister.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: Let me say that it was never made a party question, and you were repeatedly told it was not.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: I am fully aware of the fact that it was not made a party question, but holding the views the hon. gentleman expressed in this House I questioned then the propriety of the hon. gentleman remaining a member of the Ministry, and he acknowledges now that he made a mistake in not retiring. I am sure if he had gone out and had taken a part in discussing this question at only one or two public meetings, he would probably have given those in favour of federation a somewhat harder task in one or two localities in Southern Queens-

land, but not much harder anywhere else. My hon. friend has opposed this measure because he thinks it is "against the peace, good government, and welfare of this colony." As regards the "peace," I really cannot understand the allusion that the adoption of this proposal is against the peace of this country. I am not aware in what danger the peace of this country is or is likely to be by reason of federation; but I rather think the peace of these colonies will be very largely secured, now, and for the future, by the acceptance and adoption of a system of federation.

HONOURABLE GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear!

HON. A. J. THYNNE: The hon. gentleman has described the proposed representation of this colony in the Federal Parliament as a "burlesque," but has he indicated, or has anybody else indicated, what they would consider a fair or proper principle or system of representation of this colony? Has any practical basis for a different system of representation been put forward by the hon. gentleman or by anybody else? There is representation according to taxation, according to contribution to Government expenditure, and according to population—three things as equivalent to each other as it is possible to provide for in any one system of federation. I do not wish to refer specially to the Hon. Mr. Barlow, but he is here as the champion of the party opposing the federation movement, and I now speak as regards the people who have been opposed to it. They now fall back upon the fact quoted in this amendment to the Address, that the total number of votes recorded in the metropolitan districts and in Southern Queensland gives a majority—a small majority—against the adoption of the Constitution. But taking the whole of the constituencies, and including those far removed from the large centres of population, there is admittedly a very large, a very considerable, and a very satisfactory majority in favour of it.

HONOURABLE GENTLEMEN: Hear hear!

HON. A. J. THYNNE: In this climate, according to our experience of the last few weeks, the weather is capable of blowing hot and cold—but not both at the same time. I think some people take that habit from the climate of blowing hot and cold upon the question of the representation of the people in Parliament. At one meeting I had the honour of addressing, I was tackled by a very bareheaded and a very determined listener, who considered that Queensland ought to have a very much larger representation in the Federal Parliament than the mere numbers of her people would entitle her to. It should be, as he said, on the principle on which they gave a constituency away out in the West or in the extreme North a representative in the Legislative Assembly for a smaller number of electors than was required to return a member in one of the largely populated constituencies of the South. If that principle is a just one—and it is one of the reasons urged by those opposed to the abolition of plural voting—they say, if that principle is accepted, you must have all members elected by an equal number of votes.

AN HONOURABLE GENTLEMAN: Hear, hear!

HON. A. J. THYNNE: That is an argument that has been used; but if in this case it is argued that all the votes in the colony should have an equal value and equal weight, have we not got a majority in favour of federation now? If you take it in the other way and give the greater weight to the smaller number of voters in the far distant constituencies, we will have a still larger majority of influence and weight in favour of federation.

HONOURABLE GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear!

HON. A. J. THYNNE: Because it is only in the thickly populated parts of the colony—about

Brisbane and in some of the Southern constituencies near the coast—that the opposition to federation has to any extent been successful.

[5 p.m.] Seeing that we have had at this referendum a considerable majority, and that that majority is most pronounced in the furthest outside constituencies, the more you look into the question the stronger becomes the claim of the people of this colony to have this Address passed and federation initiated as they have approved of it.

HONOURABLE GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear!

HON. A. J. THYNNE: In this amendment reference is made to the fact that the metropolitan areas have shown themselves against the Constitution by a majority of 3,657 votes; but it also shows that the people in the districts far distant from the metropolis—and who really should have greater weight attached to their votes according to the system of representation at present in force in the colony—have expressed themselves so clearly in favour of the Constitution that the more we consider the figures the stronger becomes the claim of this Address for our acceptance. There is another paragraph in this amendment which strikes me as a very peculiar piece of composition. It is said in paragraph 3—

That while the Legislative Council of Queensland is supposed to be the guardian of the liberties of minorities of Your Majesty's subjects which minority in this case numbers 30,996 against the majority of 38,488—we feel difficulty in this instance in exercising this function, because the departure from Queensland, at this most important juncture, of Your Majesty's representative, the Right Honourable Baron Lamington, K.C.M.G., has placed every executive authority, which includes the power to appoint new members to this Legislative Council, in other hands.

What is the object or meaning of that paragraph?

HON. A. H. BARLOW: It is clever, rather.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: What is the object?

HON. A. H. BARLOW: Ah! That is the question. Her Majesty will find that out.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: My hon. friend has spoken of veiled threats, but he certainly has put a veil over his own intention in this paragraph so far as any practical or reasonable meaning can be given to it. Why the fact that His Excellency the Governor happens to be absent should affect the members of this House in exercising their duty in dealing with a matter which is stated to affect the liberty of the people of the colony—why the mere absence of the Governor from the colony should interfere with the exercise of their duty, I am unable to understand. I say this paragraph of the amendment contains the expression of a principle or a sentiment which cannot be too strongly condemned.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: Hear, hear!

HON. A. J. THYNNE: I say this House is not to be affected in its action by the presence or the absence of one or of another Administrator of the Government, and the sentiment uttered here is one which I utterly and entirely repudiate. All through this, however, there is the acceptance of the Bill admitted and the attention of hon. members is drawn to the fact that there has been a technical majority of the electors in favour of it. Now, when we had the Enabling Bill before us last session, what was our idea in passing that Bill through the House? Did we make any mental reservations as to where we would expect to get a majority or a minority, or as to what we would do? Did not Parliament—this House consenting—refer this question of the acceptance of the Commonwealth Bill to the whole of this colony as one electorate?

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: Hear, hear!

HON. A. J. THYNNE: And have we not got the answer from the whole colony in the most distinctive terms? Is it possible after our action

at that time, and after the full discussion that has taken place—and I claim that there has been a full discussion of the measure before the electors—how is it possible that it can now lie in the mouth of this House to say, "You have given your answer, but we do not think you knew what you were doing. We know a great deal better than you what is best in your own interests, and we will not do as you say. We set ourselves up in opposition to you, the electors of the colony of Queensland, and we will not allow you to do what you want to do." That is asking of this House a somewhat tyrannous exercise of its functions, a course of action which I think this House will not seriously consider, and which if it did would not be tolerated by the people of this country, or by any reasonable people in it. I am sorry there is a reference in this amendment to the fact that Queensland had no share in the Convention Bill. I am sorry for it, because it points to a record in this colony of which I for one am not proud. I wish to say this here, hon. gentlemen: As you all know, I took a very active part in the discussion of this question in different electorates of the colony during the federation campaign. My reason for doing that—the real reason which induced me to devote so much time to it—was this: that I was somewhat in the same position as my hon. friend, Mr. Barlow, in connection with this question of federation, although my position is not quite on all-fours with his. I was always sincerely in favour of federation. The conviction as to its advantages has been in my mind for years, and I have done all I could to promote it; but when it appeared—and it clearly appeared in the debate which took place in this House—that the Premier under whom I had the honour then to be working was not a federalist, I felt that I shared, politically, part of the responsibility for the action of the Government at that time, which did not produce successful effort towards federation, and I endeavoured to make up for it, and to wipe out the obligation I was under to the colony by doing all in my power to undo the mistake which had been made. I have done so, and I am proud of the result, not of my work, but of the work of all who took an active part in support of the Bill. I am glad to find that the people of Queensland, after a comparatively short period for study of the question as compared with the people of the other colonies, have given so satisfactory and so very full an affirmative vote in favour of the whole scheme of federation proposed. I am sure it is not necessary at this stage of the proceedings to enter fully into the Commonwealth Bill and discuss the various parts of it. I believe, without knowing it, I was cruel enough at one meeting to speak for two hours and a-half, and if I began again now I don't say I would run on in the same strain. I do not think it is at all necessary to do so. I believe the House is fully possessed of the views of the people of the country on the subject. I believe hon. gentlemen will—as I believe it is their duty to do—endeavour as far as possible to carry out the fully considered and clearly expressed will of the people of this colony. It is the duty of this House to act in accordance with what they have found to be the clearly expressed opinion of the electors. Hon. gentlemen, I do not intend to discuss much further this amendment to the Address. So far from joining with the Hon. Mr. Barlow in his expressions of the effect this matter will have on the interests of the people, I take an exactly opposite view. I may be sanguine, but the best consideration I have been able to give to all the matters in which this colony is likely to be affected by federation convinces me that instead of doing injury to the people federation is the

one opportunity that they need for their early development and substantial progress and wealth. It may be that some few who have not grasped the growth and development of things in this colony may be blind to the opportunity which federation gives them; but I am perfectly satisfied that with federation we have before us a development and progress for Queensland which can never be obtained without it. I express that as my strong conviction after studying the subject for a very long time, and I hope that in this House will be found a sufficient number of members who have sufficient confidence in the strength of the people of this colony, who have sufficient confidence in the resources of the colony, and who have sufficient confidence in the fair dealing of our people of the same race in Australia to justify them in joining with me in supporting the Address which has been moved by the Postmaster-General, and who will not consent to the adoption of such an amendment as that which has been proposed. I would ask hon. members just for a moment to remember the fact that I have frequently referred to of late—that during the life of Her Majesty the Queen free Constitutions have been granted to Australia, all differing according to the requirements of the people, and that the united people of Australia, by a majority of something like 225,000, have decided in favour of this Commonwealth Bill being accepted. I would rather see this House approach this Address in the spirit of asking Her Majesty, after having granted free Constitutions to the different colonies, after having given them one and all liberty, to perform the crowning act of giving them also that unity which is necessary for the protection of that liberty. I think, too, that the peoples of these colonies cannot but look with gratification on the fact that Her Majesty will have lived long enough to have seen the confederation of these free colonies which she has founded during her reign. I should also like to see the people of these colonies take up the whole of this question in the broad, patriotic spirit which has been spoken of by the Postmaster-General. There may be some small elements which prevent men accustomed to look at things with a microscope from viewing them in a broad light, and which makes them magnify the evil and make it overshadow the good. There are some people in this community, and there may probably be some in this House, who, in face of the greater things to which I have alluded, insist upon viewing the small defects, but I submit that those things pale into insignificance when compared with the greater advantages to be derived. And here I would say that no industry in this colony needs federation so much as our agricultural industry. There is no industry depending so much for its development on federation as the farming industry, and if our manufacturers are of the stuff which I believe they are they will find that with the materials they have got at their disposal, with the facilities they will have for carrying on their manufactures, and with the larger markets which will be made available, they will cease to work in the circumscribed form in which they hitherto have done, and will go in for a system which will lead to much larger developments. Hon. gentlemen, I have detained you long on this subject; I am afraid too long, but I hope you will pardon my having spoken at length. I ask you to join with me in not accepting the amendment which has been moved to the Address to Her Majesty, and I sincerely hope that this House will put aside all these small considerations and go for the larger one—the welfare and prosperity of these colonies. I can only say that it is a subject which has been very near to me. I have taken it very near to

my heart, and especially so since I have had occasion to study it more closely than before. The more closely I have studied it the stronger has been my feeling, and I conclude by expressing a sincere hope that by a very large majority this House will signify its concurrence in the action which has been taken by a very large majority of the electors of Queensland.

HONOURABLE GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear!

HON. W. ALLAN: I only rise to refer to a point which I had hoped would have been referred to by the Hon. Mr. Thynne in speaking to this addendum. In the 1st clause of the addendum it is stated—

That this colony is not a homogeneous community, but is in reality, though not in law, composed of three separate districts, two of which, the Central and Northern, have for many years past been antagonistic to, and striving for political separation from the Southern, which is the most populous, and is the oldest and most thickly and permanently settled portion of the colony, which contains its metropolitan city of Brisbane, and by far the largest proportion of its cultivated lands, and that, therefore, the majority was to a large extent a victory of the consumer over the producer.

I think that is a most extraordinary statement to have made, because if the vote given at the federal election meant anything it meant that the producers almost unanimously voted for federation. I represent to a great extent one of the producing industries, the pastoral industry. That alone produces more than half of the products of the colony, or 56 per cent. I do not think the Hon. Mr. Barlow could for a second say that the pastoralists did not vote almost in a body for the Bill. They did, as a matter of fact. Then, again, I can also state that the mining population almost unanimously voted for the Bill, and I can also state that, at all events in the country I come from—the district of Warwick, a very large farming district—there was a decided majority for the Bill. Therefore, I take it that it was a very great mistake to have included that statement in the addendum, because it is absolutely, as far as I can judge, exactly the opposite of fact. This vote was the solid vote of the producers, and the minority against the Bill consisted almost wholly of the consumers. It was, as it were, a town against the country vote. I hold that that is indisputable. I cannot see how you can get away from it. What would the town be without the country? Very little indeed. If we eliminated the country, the towns would melt away like snow; whereas the country could get along very well without the towns to a great extent. Everything comes from the land, and the voting came from the land. Another point that has not been touched upon, and which was dealt with when the Enabling Bill was before us, is the minimum vote. I think it was contended that there should be a minimum vote of 50,000 before the Bill could pass. That was proposed, but not carried.

HON. A. C. GREGORY: The proposal was that the majority should be 50,000. I have been misinterpreted several times.

HON. E. J. STEVENS: You tried to make it particularly safe.

HON. A. C. GREGORY: Yes, against.

HON. W. ALLAN: Why, you could not possibly get that minimum. There were not at that time 100,000 voters in the colony. You could not get a majority of 50,000 out of that.

HON. A. C. GREGORY: 50,000 would only be half. What I said was a majority of 25,000. I made a mistake in saying 50,000.

HON. W. ALLAN: In the other House a majority of 25,000 was proposed. I think if you take the Australian colonies as a body, a great deal more than two-thirds of the people have

said that they are in favour of the Bill. I do not wish to take up the time of the House; I simply rose to refer to that one point in reference to the producer and consumer, and I am quite sure the facts are quite opposed to what is stated in the addendum. I trust that eventually the Address will be unanimously passed, and that it will be presented to Her Majesty as if we were of one mind.

Question—[*Hon. A. H. Barlow's amendment*]—That the words proposed to be inserted be so inserted—put; and the House divided:—

CONTENTS, 10.

Hons. A. H. Barlow, B. D. Morehead, F. T. Brentnall, J. McMaster, W. D. Box, A. C. Gregory, R. Bulcock, W. F. Taylor, A. Raff, and J. Cowlishaw.

NOT-CONTENTS, 17.

Hons. W. H. Wilson, A. Gibson, J. C. Heussler, A. J. Thynne, J. T. Smith, F. H. Holberton, G. W. Gray, E. J. Stevens, J. Deane, H. Mosman, A. Norton, J. C. Smyth, J. Ferguson, J. Lalor, W. Forrest, W. Allan, and W. Aplin.

Resolved in the negative.

HON. A. C. GREGORY: I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: There is no occasion to propose the adjournment [5.30 p.m.] of the debate. We have lots of time, and it is very important that the matter should proceed. I trust the House will not consent to the adjournment of the debate at this stage.

Question—That the debate be now adjourned—put and negatived.

Original question—[*the Postmaster-General's motion*]:—again put.

HON. A. C. GREGORY: As hon. gentlemen do not seem to wish to get away before the thunderstorm that is just coming up, I will give them my reasons why I do not approve of the Federation Bill. We have a Federation Bill put before us which no honest man could possibly vote for if he knew what he was voting for, and I can only assume that hon. gentlemen are speaking in ignorance of the true business conditions which attach to it. In the first instance, the acceptance of the Federal Bill will be an act of dishonesty, because the transfer of one-fourth of the Customs and excise, amounting to a net sum of £240,000, will reduce the revenue of the colony to such an extent that the interest on the public debt cannot be paid, as the excess of revenue for 1899-1900 is estimated to be only £24,000, notwithstanding that at least £100,000 of expenditure for annual services have been charged on the loan fund, a source which will be closed by the Federation Bill, which by section 51 vests in the Federal Government the power of taxation and borrowing money on the public credit, and thus precludes any further loans being obtained by the States, which will have given up the power of granting security for loans on their revenue. The result of the cessation of the loan expenditure and contribution to the Federal Government will also cause a deficiency in the revenue of the State to the extent of at least £500,000, irrespective of the decrease in ordinary revenue contingent on the cessation of public works and the contingent discharge of at least 2,000 persons who are now paid from the loan fund. Thus the hypothecation of £240,000 per annum to the Federal Government becomes an act of fraudulent insolvency in regard to the public creditor, whose security for the payment of interest and principal of loans includes the moneys to be transferred to the Federal Government. It may be argued that the deficiency of the State revenue contingent on the transfer of the one-fourth of the Customs and excise may be raised by fresh taxation, but the deficiency of only £240,000 would entail a tax of 10s. per head on the whole population, and also the cost of collection, which

will be at least 2s. 6d. per head. As it cannot be through the Customs or excise, the income tax and the property tax which are now imposed in New South Wales must, according to the Bill, be equally levied in Queensland. The next point is that the vote on the referendum has been unduly influenced by the action of the Premier in causing the officers of the Civil Service to be assembled within the precincts of the public offices of the general Government, the Post Office and Custom House, and informed that the Government desired that they should vote for the Federal Bill. This proceeding was highly irregular and unconstitutional as an attempt to coerce the Civil servants and interfere with their civil rights as citizens, and interfering with the integrity of the ballot. The Premier has also addressed public meetings at which he asserted that the passing of the Federal Bill would not interfere with the continuance of the separate Governments of the States, though as one of the originators of the Bill he was well aware that this was not correct, as sections 51 and 106 to 109 give the Federal Government the power to abrogate any or all the enactments of the States Governments. The Premier, having been Colonial Treasurer, had necessarily the knowledge that the apparent approximation of the annual returns of revenue and expenditure has been largely due to charging numerous items of annual service to the loan fund, so that the real annual revenue and expenditure, if truly stated, instead of any surplus, would have shown very large deficiencies, and that, consequent on the establishment of Federal Government, the State of Queensland will be unable to meet the claims of the public creditors for interest on the £34,000,000 of public debt. The votes on the referendum, when analysed, indicate that though there is an arithmetical majority in favour of the Bill, the real vote of the permanent inhabitants of Queensland is adverse to the Federal Bill. Thus the Southern division of the colony shows that the electorates returning twenty-four of the members of the Legislative Assembly voted against the Bill; and that taking the Southern and Central divisions, the vote was against the acceptance of the Bill. It was only by the Northern division giving a mass vote in favour of the Bill that the apparent majority was obtained. Now, the Southern and Central divisions are occupied by a settled population as is shown by the large area of land under cultivation, amounting to 284,700 acres. The Northern division, being occupied by an erratic body of miners, has only 4,286 acres under cultivation, exclusive of the sugar plantations worked by coloured labour. Taking the Southern and Central divisions together, there are in them 85,000 electors, or five-sixths of the electors of the whole colony. The votes polled still showed a majority against the acceptance of the Federal Bill. The Northern division only includes 22,000 electors, the greater number being nomadic miners who have little interest in the welfare of the State, and are under the direction of the leaders of their trade unions, whose avowed object is to displace constitutional government and substitute democracy. I am aware that I am not speaking in sympathy with the majority of the present Parliament, but in the near future, when the infatuation which surrenders the substantial freedom of Queensland to grasp at the shadow of democracy has passed away, and the history of the period is perused with impartiality, those who now pose as patriots will be denounced as traitors to their country. It is not the question of federation which is now being fought, but the adoption of the one man one vote democracy. History shows that a pure democracy never had a permanent existence, and it is not possible

that it ever can exist while the present constitution of mankind continues, because every democrat is equal to his neighbour, and thinks himself superior. But as all cannot take part in the Government a small number must be elected, and in Queensland the constituencies will have each 12,000 electors, so that representatives will not be selected on account of personal knowledge, but on the recommendation of interested parties. The Parliament will consist of a comparatively small number of professional politicians sitting more than 1,000 miles by rail beyond the boundary of Queensland, so that our interests have little prospect of serious attention. The natural result will be that instead of a democratic Government being established, an oligarchical tyranny will come into existence. Once in three years the people will elect their representatives, the majority of whom will be influenced by the special desires of the Southern States, and for the ensuing three years we shall have to submit to the dictum of a Ministry selected chiefly by those whose interests will not be in accordance with our special necessities. Hon. gentlemen, the business position is simply as I have previously stated it—Queensland must of necessity become insolvent. If Queensland becomes insolvent and is unable to pay her creditors the interest on her public debt, the only resource for us will be to throw the colony into the Federal Government. Then comes another question which, singularly enough, has been slightly overlooked by those who have discussed the Bill—no State will be entitled to any representation in the Federal Government, or to any constitutional rights beyond what the Federal Parliament in its discretion may choose to give it. That is one of those little oversights in this matter which involves the most important questions which could exist. Mr. Coghlan, the Government Statistician of New South Wales, has pointed out that all the colonies must of necessity get into a condition of insolvency, and they will have to throw in their lot with the Central Government. Of course, Mr. Reid was so thoroughly disgusted with this report of Mr. Coghlan that he ordered that gentleman to make another report. But the fresh report disclosed the same condition of things; and though any possibly doubtful points were omitted, that really made the fresh report far more decided and distinct. It is all very well to say this will not happen. It is all very well to say we must trust our neighbours. It is all very well to talk about a "grand united Australia." But these are questions of business; and questions of business will take precedence of what we may speak of as "merely political gas"—I could give it a worse designation. But we have now arrived at this point when I know, as a matter of course, that I am in a minority. I feel satisfied that you will pass the Address through, but I consider it is proper to place on record the way in which this matter is dealt with. If this House chooses to shut its ears to reasonable argument and to simple, straightforward business considerations, it will do so at its own risk. There was a little talk in the earlier part of the debate about a threat that this Chamber would be set aside by some material alterations in its constitution, but I can tell you that if federation passes this Chamber will cease and so will the other, and the Government will pass away from Brisbane to the very serious detriment of its inhabitants, and this town will then become just a trading town on the coast and nothing more.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: A second Grafton.

Hon. A. C. GREGORY: I am not speaking now simply for the consideration of the question here, but I have lived long enough to see a good many Governments rise, pass on, and fall. I

have seen how in South America they started or attempted to start a democratic Government, but in every case the attempt to form a democratic Government simply consists in throwing the whole of the powers of government into the hands of a small number who, with their elected president, form what is called an "oligarchical tyranny." Perhaps hon. members think that a "tyrant" means one who governs wrongly or improperly, but the term means one who has absolute power. However, this House will vote with its eyes open, and whatever it does it will do at its own risk, and I certainly am one of those who wish to place their names on record as having dissented from this proposal. Though the records of this House may become mouldy volumes shut up in some obscure chamber, it may be that future historians will have a chance to see them. It will not matter to me in the least what the verdict will be, but they will say, "In those days the Government of the colony threw away their ideas of constitutional government, threw themselves into the hands of the Opposition, surrendered their rights and privileges, and had not the manhood to resign." The condition of our present Government is neither more nor less than that the Ministry have thrown themselves into the hands of the Labour party in opposition, and are going in for democracy. Well, after what on previous occasions I have heard the members of that Government say, really it shows a most extraordinary reversion of feelings and ideas, and it indicates that parliamentary government here has got to such an extreme of absurdity, mismanagement, and misgovernment—not through any inherent defects in the Constitution, but through the defects of those who practised under that Constitution—that really I do think that it is not impossible that it may after all be a good thing for the colony that this Government should be taken away and planted at 1,000 miles distance from this that it might have less chance of interfering with those things which are good and useful. The strength of the Government will necessarily be less influenced by sudden popular votes, and how much of the popular voice in Queensland will be heard from eight or nine members 1,000 miles beyond our border? The Senate, as it is under the Bill, is a useless encumbrance as regards any important questions, though it may do a little work in the ordinary way, and the members may draw their salaries. As a check upon the governing body it is utterly useless. However, I do not think it is of much use enlarging upon these things. I have spoken to you before, and told you what my views are, and not one single member of either House, and not one individual outside, has ventured to answer a single point of that which I stated here as a fact—that the colony must become insolvent. I will now refer to some parts of the debate which took place on the passing of the Bill. The Postmaster-General says now we have no right to deal with anything but the question of saying "Yea" or "Nay"—whether we will accept or reject the Address. Now, what did the hon. gentleman say when the Bill was before us? He said then—

I wish to say that I hope that hon. gentlemen—whatever may be their ideas as to whether federation is a good thing or not—will come to the conclusion that the question should be relegated to the people. If, after the question had been relegated to the people, we had no further say in the matter, that would be a different thing; but I do not think a better scheme could be devised than to refer the Bill to the people, and then to criticise their opinion afterwards.

There the hon. member distinctly states that reference to the people was not to be accepted as a final matter, but simply as an indication upon which we should either affirm or reject, irrespective of the mere question of the numerical vote.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: If the numbers were equal, or if there was a majority of one or five.

HON. A. C. GREGORY: According to what the hon. member then said, it is at the discretion of hon. members now to discuss all the details of the Bill, and not simply to accept it, as the hon. gentleman said this evening we were to do. It was not on that one single occasion that this was said. He further said—

Parliament would then be in the position that, having said that there should not be less than 80,000, they would have to accept the result of the poll, even though they did not consider 80,001 sufficient. I do not want hon. gentlemen to be placed in that position. Let us have a majority vote, and then when the matter comes before us on the Address to Her Majesty we can review the poll and say whether the result is satisfactory or not. I think that is the better arrangement. That is as much as to say that the mere question of a numerical majority was not to be taken as conclusive—that it is a question for this Parliament to consider whether it will adopt it or not. The hon. gentleman now says that the people having pronounced their verdict, and other parties having declared they concur, it is the duty of the Council to fall in with that concurrence.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: I say that it is our duty to do so, seeing there was such a substantial majority.

HON. A. C. GREGORY: That is what the hon. gentleman says now, but what he said before guided us to some extent in what we were doing. It only shows a fast-and-loose way of dealing with the question, how little regard is paid to the dictum which was laid down in this case, and how little we can rely upon the apparent promises which are not even kept to the ear while they are broken to the spirit. Then, again, the Postmaster-General said—

Parliament reserved all its own powers. The people were simply asked whether they would accept or not accept a certain Bill: but that did not conclude the matter, because when the people had expressed their opinion the Bill would come back to Parliament for consideration, and addresses would be moved in both Houses to deal further with the matter. Hon. gentlemen must not confuse matters. The enactment of the Federal Constitution must be made by the Imperial Parliament, and before that was done both Houses of the colonial legislature would have to address Her Majesty on the subject. So that the amendment of the hon. gentleman was already in the Bill itself, and was quite unnecessary.

That amendment was that we should not accept the Bill by our vote on that occasion. The question was put to the President, who ruled to the question which I put, that by passing the Bill through that stage we simply referred the matter to the people and did not adopt the Bill as an Act of Parliament. No doubt the Postmaster-General will try to show that it was not so, but I simply refer to what was the ruling of the President. It is very singular that we should now have different views put before us, but it is all easy of explanation. The Government have surrendered their position and thrown themselves into the arms of the Opposition and said, "Take this and suffer us to live." They have not only said that, but they have done it, and then have not had the manliness to resign. On any previous occasion the Government would have gone out. On this occasion, singular enough, they have coalesced with their opponents, and have thereby secured certain majorities, which they certainly could not have obtained under ordinary circumstances. Such a proceeding is about as unprecedented as well could be, and, perhaps, is one of the very best arguments in favour of federation that could be advanced—that is, that as Queensland has been unable to work its parliamentary government, the sooner that parliamentary government is set aside and something else put in its place the better. Hon. gentlemen,

I think it is not much use wasting more time upon the subject. I certainly shall call for a division, and vote against the Address, because I wish to place it on the records of the House what our views are on this side of the House; and when future events either prove that we or the Postmaster-General are right, we shall be able to see who had the greatest foresight in the matter. Unfortunately, if we pass this Address, the subject will be out of our hands, but it is highly probable that a very substantial number of the members of this House will be inclined to enter a protest, and lay it before the authorities at home, and have it put in the proper place, so that it may be considered by the Imperial Parliament when dealing with the Bill. One thing is pretty certain. There are some parts of the Bill which are exceedingly impracticable, and I doubt whether it will go through the Imperial Parliament without amendment. One important question is that no security is given to the public creditor, and there is every chance of his failing to receive his dividends. Another is that any territory surrendered to the Federal Government will have neither voice in the Federal Parliament nor any constitutional rights whatsoever—a condition of things which certainly is contrary to all our ideas of constitutional practice. No doubt the object of those to whom the Government have surrendered their power, and with whom they have coalesced, is to carry out a democracy of one man one vote. As I have said before, the one man one vote democracy is not a democracy. There never was such a democracy, and there never can be one, and it simply places the Government of the country in the hands of a much smaller number of people. The parties who will suffer most by federation will be, for instance, the city of Brisbane, because if the Government is set aside, and this merely becomes a provincial town, a large proportion of those who are now engaged in providing the city will be unnecessary, and the place will, to a great extent, collapse. The other coast towns will, no doubt, continue to carry on their business, because there must be the same amount of imports and exports simply as matters of trade; but all that will be ruled from the headquarters at Sydney. The whole of the east coast will be in the hands of those who manage the ocean traffic, which will first centre in Sydney, and then be distributed over the remainder of the coast. That will cut out a very large amount of our trade. But, perhaps, the greatest difficulty will be the stoppage of our public works. I know the Postmaster-General will say it will not put a stop to public works; and, although the Act does not say we shall not borrow money, we are handing over the power of giving security; and if we give away that power we are not likely to get any money lent to us. This year the Government are entering upon a most lavish expenditure. They propose to incur further annual expenditure, taking it from the loan vote and passing it to ordinary expenditure. I have looked into the question of expenditure and revenue, and I see they are nicely arranged to meet together. The loan votes are to be charged with annual expenditure. Of course it will be said that Parliament has voted it. So far, no doubt, Parliament has covered the legal point, but the morality of running the country into heavy debt, and then saying that revenue and expenditure nearly meet, while in reality the revenue is largely derived from loan funds which cannot continue, and which the country will never have a chance of repaying, is certainly most questionable, and I might almost say it is a dishonourable proceeding. Although governments can hardly be proceeded against in the courts, the practice will turn out to be exceedingly inconvenient. If we do not pay the

interest on our public debt the English courts will give our creditors power to send out receivers to collect our revenue. Under those circumstances we shall find ourselves in one of the most extraordinary conditions. First of all, we shall have a Federal Government with its officials to collect excise and Customs duties, and manage our post offices; we shall be nominally in charge of our railways, but will be told, "You must not make that line, or you must reduce that charge or increase this." The Federal Parliament will say: "We do not interfere with your railways, but we will not let you make this one, or you must alter the charges on that." The inter-state commission dictates terms to us in that matter, and then on top of it all we should have the English creditors collecting our revenue, and everything will be in a state of most glorious confusion.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: There is not the slightest chance of it.

HON. A. C. GREGORY: It has been done elsewhere, and there is no reason why it should not be done here when necessity arises. Hon. members may remember a great difficulty we had a few years ago when the bank holding Government funds did not have them available when wanted by our creditors. We certainly got out of the difficulty, but at a great expense. If it should have happened that we were not able to meet our engagements on that occasion our debentures would have gone down in the market and our credit would have been seriously damaged. You will find that even the Federal Government will not give the Government power to override claims properly brought against us. I am perfectly well aware that I am talking to those who listen not, except in form; that they have made up their minds, that the Government have secured a majority against any view which the opponents of the Address may express, but we will, at all events, have our views on record, so that they may be made use of when the time arrives when a solution of our difficulties will have to be found. That solution, I am sorry to say, will be one which will be exceedingly disastrous to Queensland.

\* HON. W. F. TAYLOR: It appears that we are in much the same fix in respect to this Address as we were in in respect to the Commonwealth Bill; that is we have power to pass or reject it, but apparently not to amend it. This appears to me to be rather a curious position to be placed in, because we are asking the Imperial Parliament, through Her Majesty, to pass the Commonwealth Bill as it is, no matter how bad or how good its provisions may be, simply because it was passed by a convention, and subsequently amended by the Premiers, and then went through the formality of approval by the electors. Throughout the whole of these proceedings the Parliaments have been practically ignored. When the Enabling Bill was before us we were told that although we passed the schedule, which was the Commonwealth Bill, we did not really adopt the schedule—that we were merely referring the schedule to the people. But the people had no power to amend it in any way. They simply had to accept or reject it. Even the most ardent advocates of the Bill will see that it has many faults. Still we are asked to send it to the Imperial Parliament and request them to adopt it without amendment. We are demanding from the Imperial Parliament that this Commonwealth Bill shall be the Constitution of federated Australia; and although in the estimation of the Imperial Parliament it may require very grave amendment, we tell them that this is the only Bill we want. It certainly requires amendment in respect to the powers of the Senate. No one will contend that the Senate is really an

effective body. In fact, the most ardent advocates of the Bill, who came from the south preaching federation, admitted that the Senate was placed absolutely at the mercy of the House of Representatives. I ask hon. gentlemen if that is the position they would like to see the Senate in? I would further ask them what earthly use will it be in safeguarding the interests of the States if it is to be absolutely at the mercy of the other branch of the legislature? Yet, notwithstanding these facts, we are asked to send this Bill home for adoption in its present form. It appears to me that we ought to amend this Address. We ought at least to say to the Imperial Parliament, "Pass the Bill with such amendments as you may consider advisable." If we assumed that position I do not think there would be any further trouble in passing the Address to Her Majesty. Hon. gentlemen would then feel that the Imperial Parliament in its wisdom would carefully consider the various clauses and their probable operation, and would amend or reject them according as they thought necessary. With respect to the Canadian Constitution, if you take the trouble to read it you will find that the Bill as presented to the Imperial Parliament was not the Bill as finally passed by them. You will find that in the Bill as prepared by the Canadian Convention no mention was made of how the Lieutenant-Governors of the various provinces were to be appointed. It will be found there is no mention of the right of veto of the various Bills passed by the local legislatures, or of the right of pardon. All those matters have been embodied in the Constitution as it now exists. The Lieutenant-Governors of the provinces are appointed by the Governor-General, or rather by the Ministry of the day. The right of pardon rests with the Governor-General, and also the right of veto, in other words, with the Ministry of the day. Have hon. gentlemen considered the full operation of this Bill? Have they taken into consideration the position the various colonies will be placed in? Have they considered that what has occurred in Canada will occur here—that the Governors or Lieutenant-Governors will be appointed by the Governor-General, which is to say by the Federal Government? Have they considered that the right of veto will rest entirely with the Governor-General or his Ministers—that that right will be taken away from Her Majesty, and be vested in the Governor-General? The colony, in point of fact, will lose all the touch it now has with the Imperial Government and with the Queen. I do not think that has been considered, nor the fact that the right of pardon now exercised by the Governor will be exercised, in all probability, by the Governor-General, acting on the advice of the Federal Ministry. When we come to consider the full operation of the Bill, we shall find that the Bill itself, if adopted as now presented, will create, in all probability, exactly the same procedure as that which exists in Canada at the present time. If the Government are prepared and if the colony is prepared to accept that, they have a perfect right to get the Bill passed exactly as it is. But it appears to me that something more is required. The Bill is merely a basis on which a Federation Bill should be enacted by the Imperial Government. Are we to suppose that the gentlemen who met at the Convention are endowed with such wisdom that we are to bow down and worship their decision in the way we are asked and, in fact, forced to do? Are we to suppose that the alterations made by the Premiers are so good that we are bound to accept them? For that is the position assumed by the advocates of the Bill. They assert that we must adopt it

—although it is imperfect in various respects—or reject it. There is no such thing as amending it. Now we are to carry the proceeding still further and ask the Imperial Parliament to adopt the Bill as passed by the people, who have had no voice whatever in framing it.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL: What about the Convention of 1891? How can you say that?

HON. W. F. TAYLOR: The present Bill has nothing to do with the Convention of 1891. It differs very materially from the Bill then adopted, as I could easily show the hon. gentleman. But that has been pointed out over and over again. It cannot be denied that the people of this colony have had nothing to do with the framing of the Bill, and certainly this Parliament has had nothing whatever to do with the passing of it. And yet we are asked virtually to adopt it by sending an Address to the Queen praying her to cause the Bill to be enacted under which we shall federate. Is that a position we ought to place ourselves in?

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL: The colony has placed us in that position.

HON. W. F. TAYLOR: The colony has done nothing of that sort. It is we who have placed the colony in that position. By passing the Enabling Bill we did not adopt the Constitution Bill. That was the contention of the Postmaster-General himself. He said the passing of the Bill simply enabled us to send the schedule to the people for their adoption or rejection, and that when the people pronounced on the matter he would then take other action. This is the action he is taking. It was my opinion at the time that in adopting the schedule we were altering the constitution of this Council. There is no getting over that fact, and for that reason I voted against the Enabling Bill—not because I did not wish the people to have a voice in pronouncing on the matter, but because I thought this House should first have a voice in pronouncing on the Bill itself. We were told repeatedly—in fact the President himself stated it—that in passing the Bill we simply passed a measure which enabled us to send a certain document to the people for their decision. It did not bind the Council one way or the other. The Council did not commit itself to the adoption of the Bill. What are we doing now? We are asked to adopt an Address which most certainly adopts the Bill. It states most distinctly that there is the Bill which we wish to have adopted—this Bill which has already been adopted by all the other federating colonies. Our right to use our own judgment has been denied us. We have been asked to swallow the whole thing, and now we are to ask the Imperial Government to swallow it and make no comments. I should like to see the right given to the Imperial Parliament to amend or alter the Bill as they may deem advisable.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL: They have that right now.

HON. W. F. TAYLOR: No; they have no right to alter it. The Address asks them most distinctly to adopt the measure as we were asked to adopt it in the first instance. They are to make no alteration in it.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL: They can make any alteration in it they like.

HON. W. F. TAYLOR: We were told we could make any alteration we liked, but the opportunity was never given to us. What opportunity have we had to make alterations in this Address? The alteration I should like to make in it would be to insert in the last paragraph, after the word "submitted," the words "with such alterations and additions as may be deemed desirable."

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL: That goes without saying.

1899—w\*

HON. W. F. TAYLOR: I do not think so. The Address distinctly asks the Queen to adopt the Bill as passed by the people, nothing more and nothing less. You cannot get over that. Why not give the Imperial Government the power whether they have it or not? Why not tell them in this Address that they may make such additions and alterations as they may deem advisable. I do not know whether I am quite in order, after the amendment that has just been disposed of, which was to add certain words at the end of the Address, in moving an amendment in an earlier part of the Address, but I will take the President's ruling on the point. The insertion of the words would be a certain safeguard to those who oppose the Bill, as many of us do, but who do not oppose federation. Do not run away with the idea that I oppose federation. I only oppose federation under a Bill which gives us an emasculated Senate, which leaves us completely at the mercy of the House of Representatives—a body which will be largely composed of people not resident in this colony, who know nothing about it, who have no sympathy with it, and who will simply govern us as they think fit, quite irrespective of what we think ought to be the case or not. It is not likely that if this Address goes to the Imperial Parliament just as it is they will amend it as freely as they would if those words were inserted. They would then see that we do not consider the Bill a perfect measure, that we consider it quite possible that in the wisdom of the Imperial Parliament certain alterations may be desirable, and that we leave it to their judgment as a body free from party feeling and local prejudices to make such amendments as in their wisdom they may consider necessary. I therefore beg to move that after the word "submitted," in the 3rd line of the concluding paragraph, the words "with such alterations and additions as may be deemed advisable" be inserted.

THE PRESIDENT: As we have already dealt with an amendment at the end of the [8 p.m.] paragraph proposed to be amended, the amendment proposed now is out of order.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL: I was going to take that point, but as the President has anticipated it there is no occasion for me to raise it.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: Is that ruling open to question? Does the President invite any expression of opinion upon the ruling, or is it definite?

THE PRESIDENT: No, there is no doubt about it.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: Otherwise I would submit reasons to you.

THE PRESIDENT: If the Council would like to hear Mr. Barlow's reasons I have no objection.

HON. W. F. TAYLOR: If hon. gentlemen will allow me, I submit that this Address might be resubmitted to the Council in order to allow this amendment to be made. It would be a great satisfaction to hon. gentlemen who object very strongly to the Bill to know that some little safeguard had been provided in the matter so that the Bill might be fairly and fully considered and such alterations as might be considered desirable made by the Imperial Parliament. If the Postmaster-General would resubmit the matter this might be done.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: If I am in order in speaking to a point of order—I do not know if I am.

THE PRESIDENT: No one has raised a point of order.

HON. W. F. TAYLOR: The Hon. President having ruled my amendment out of order inasmuch as it was not introduced in a proper place, I beg, by permission, to move as an amend-

ment the insertion of the following words after the words "Your Majesty" at the close of the Address:

In thus humbly praying Your Majesty, we venture to express a hope that your Parliament may amend the Bill in such manner as they may see fit.

Question on amendment—That the words proposed to be inserted be so inserted—stated.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: I would like to say that the proposed amendment is utterly unnecessary, for the simple reason that the Imperial Parliament is paramount, and may do as it chooses in the matter. This is an Address to the Queen, asking her to refer the Commonwealth Bill to the Imperial Parliament, and that she will do. The Imperial Parliament will then, of course, do as it thinks fit. It has a paramount right to make any amendments it chooses, and that being so, the words which the hon. member wishes to insert are entirely unnecessary, because the jurisdiction of the Imperial Parliament is such that it can do exactly as it likes with the Commonwealth Bill. I therefore ask the hon. gentleman to reconsider his amendment with a view to withdrawing it.

HON. W. D. BOX: It seems to me that everything the minority may want or desire is unnecessary in the opinion of the hon. gentleman in charge of the Address. I understand that a respectable minority, lately declared as ten to seventeen, wishes some addition to be made to this petition to the Queen, to call the attention of Her Majesty and of the Government of England to the fact that the adoption of this Address has not been unanimous.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: Of course, the debates in this House will be supplied.

HON. W. D. BOX: I think that is very largely the desire of the Hon. Dr. Taylor. It is a very peculiar position for this Chamber to be placed in. We have before us a Convention Bill, with which we have had nothing to do, except that a Bill was drafted, and our Premier without any authority from our Parliament, went to the southern colonies, and subsequently a certain Bill was brought to us, and we were invited to ask the electors of Queensland whether they would adopt this Convention Bill. We were told then that we were simply to ask them: "Gentlemen, will you say 'Yes,' or 'No.'" We were not to discuss that Bill in any way. We were not to say a word about it. We were to take the Bill as it was whether we thought it for the good of the people of Queensland or not, and we were told distinctly that all we had to do was to send this Bill to the people of Queensland to say "Yes" or "No" to it. I am very sure that every member of this House thought the people of Queensland, little as they knew about it, should be asked to say "Yes" or "No" to the Bill. Well, what took place? Shortly afterwards every single power the Government possessed was put forth if possible to persuade the people of Queensland to say "Yes" to the Bill. The vote has been recorded, and you know what it is. It seems to me that the Southern portion of the colony desired to say "No," and the other portions of the colony desired to say "Yes." Now we are told that this Bill must be the Bill and nothing else, and we are asked to send an Address to Her Majesty praying that this Bill may be made the Constitution of Australia. It is a funny world. (Laughter.) When I was a boy one of the earliest recollections of my life is the unparalleled rejoicing in Victoria at the time—every man, woman, and child in Victoria at the time went wild with joy because they had secured separation from New South Wales. There was separation on that great day that made Victoria the offspring of the parent colony

of New South Wales, and for a long time she was more prosperous, more populous, and more successful following on the discovery of gold than any other colony in the group. That was the outcome of separation. I was not here, but I believe the same thing happened in Queensland—that many men now in this Chamber can remember that the same enthusiasm, the same delight, and the same expressions of joy were heard from every man, woman, and child in Queensland when the separation of this colony from New South Wales was attained. Since that day we know that Queensland has advanced by leaps and bounds to the proud position she stands in to-day. Now, through the influence and the advocacy of men like my hon. friend Mr. Thynne, and through their eloquence, the people of Queensland are being blinded, to my mind, and they are putting their heads into the same noose and into the same rope they were so glad to get out of within the memory of men.

HONOURABLE GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear!

HON. W. D. BOX: It is within my memory, and I am not a very old man. History speaks for itself, and here is the opinion of a people entirely changed from expressions of delight at securing separation. They are now, according to the hon. gentleman in charge of this Address, going in for the delights of federation. The evils of federation are concentration. If we have an appeal to make now with reference to harbours and rivers or Customs and excise, where are we to send it? Not to our centre, the city of Brisbane, where our Parliament sits. No, we must go away 1,500 miles to Victoria. I hold that as a result for many years Queensland will sink, and the city of Brisbane will become merely a provincial town.

HONOURABLE GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear! No, no!

HON. W. D. BOX: I believe that many of our troubles which can now be rectified by an appeal to our own Ministers will go unheard of for the future. What chance will nine or ten members in the House of Representatives have of talking about the grievances of Queensland? Hon. members know how successful agriculture has been in Queensland, and we have had the number of acres under cultivation referred to in this Chamber. You know quite well that sugar cultivation was growing enormously when the gentleman who is now the Administrator of the Government thought it unwise that there should be black labour employed. Black labour was stopped, and the production of sugar was stopped with it. That gentleman saw the evil he had committed, and black labour was granted to us again, and what is the position now? The sugar-growers are prosperous, and in this Chamber this afternoon you have heard the number of acres of land that have been reclaimed from the primeval scrubs to grow that glorious crop. You go to Melbourne and speak to people there about black labour, but they know nothing about it, and they say, "There is no such thing as black labour. What you have got in Queensland is slavery." Where is the slavery? I have seen the plantations, and I never saw much slavery, nor do we allow slavery in this colony. But the people of Victoria believe that we have slavery here, and I prophecy that one of the first things that will follow from federation will be the prohibition of black labour, and with that will fall the production of sugar. I think the amendment of the Hon. Dr. Taylor will call the attention of the Imperial Parliament most earnestly to the division which took place this afternoon and to the divisions that will take place later on, and it will show that the members of the Legislative Council of Queensland are not entirely

satisfied with the Constitution as it will be presented to Her Majesty in the Commonwealth Bill. I think that it will interfere with the progress of Queensland, because our colonial wants—I might almost say our national wants, for Queensland is growing into a nation—our wants will not be fostered, and our interests will not be known as they are in these Chambers. When you part with your Customs, when you part with your harbours and rivers, when you part with your postal arrangements, you part with the life of your Government, in my opinion; and I believe hon. gentlemen in this Chamber will live to repent the day when they voted in favour of the Commonwealth Bill. I beg to support the amendment of the Hon. Dr. Taylor.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: There are one or two points that I would like to refer to before any further vote is taken on this motion. From the very outset of this business of federation we have all been given distinctly to understand that it was not to be regarded as a party question—that every man was free to act, or speak, or vote as he thought fit, and I presume that each of us is willing to give to every man credit for at least some judgment, and we are willing also to give him the right to exercise that judgment. I make this remark because I feel I am in a little bit of sympathy to-night with the position occupied by the Hon. Mr. Barlow. It is quite possible that one may sometimes be forced to keep silent when one would like to speak, and to abstain from voting when one would like to vote. There may be circumstances putting a man in a position of that kind, and that is why I emphasise this particular point that no man should be deemed to have done anything in opposition to the Government, or in opposition to the majority of this Chamber, because in the exercise of his individual judgment he chooses to exercise his rights.

HONOURABLE GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear!

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I have a reason for saying that, and I do not wish to say anything more upon the subject. With regard to the point raised by the Hon. Mr. Gregory as to the position of this Council in reference to the question now under consideration, the hon. gentleman might have gone a little further. He has made three quotations from the *Hansard* report of the proceedings of the late session, when the Federal Enabling Bill passed this House. He might have gone a little further and strengthened his contention by one or two more extracts. I should not refer to this if it were not for the fact that this afternoon we have been told that the country has decided this question—that we may regard ourselves as having had the question absolutely settled for us—that we cannot amend the Commonwealth Bill—that we never were in a position to amend it—that it was never submitted to us for amendment—that we have never had an opportunity of considering the Bill in detail, and that we never shall have an opportunity of considering it with a view to any amendment. But it undoubtedly did occur, when this question was raised during the debates on a previous occasion, that the Postmaster-General said at another period of the debate—

The minimum vote was a new thing when the matter of federation came before the Convention and the Parliaments. It was adopted in New South Wales with disastrous results, and also in the other colonies with the same effect.

That was in reply to an amendment by the Hon. Mr. Bulcock to fix a minimum vote—

But he went upon the general principle, that in the first place the majority should rule, and, secondly, that whatever that majority was it should not rob the Parliament of its opportunity of revision after the vote had been taken. He rested his case entirely on the wording of the clauses which said that the majority of votes should decide the question.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: Hear, hear!

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: Later still this was said by the hon. gentleman—

A Bill to provide for ascertaining the opinion of the electors upon that question would be exactly similar to this Enabling Bill. I say, also, that under clause 11, if the Commonwealth Bill is accepted by the electors, it will still have to come before this House, and the hon. gentleman may very properly raise any question at that time.

It appears that now it is not considered advisable that any question should be raised, and it scarcely seems to be considered advisable that any lengthened debate should take place on the general principle of the Commonwealth Bill. Now, there have been some points referred to to which I might make reference, but I have no wish to make any lengthy speech on the subject now. I did say the week before last that the proper time to refer to the federation question was when the Address to Her Majesty the Queen came before the Council; but there has been very little said about the Bill itself. The referendum, as a whole, I then said, might be at this time analysed, and it might easily be shown that the balance of opinion might be reconsidered, and although we are bound to accept the majority as a majority, no matter how it may have been produced—for we cannot ignore the fact of a majority, and it is useless to imagine that we can—but the analysis of the majority, if one were disposed to go into that, would, I think, be less satisfactory than the fact itself. As the case stands now, we should have to consider all the motive forces that were brought into play to secure that majority. Some reference has been made to that aspect of the question. There is no need for me to follow it up; but it is an undoubted fact that an immense amount of power—shall I say of mental pressure—of intellectual pressure?—was brought to bear. I will not bring in the financial aspect of the question at all—I do not think it is worth while—but an immense amount of mental pressure was brought to bear upon the public intelligence in order to induce the people to vote "Yes." I maintain, that there was not one-tenth part of the mental pressure brought to bear upon the public intelligence on the negative that there was on the affirmative side of the question.

HONOURABLE GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear!

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I say that without any fear of challenge. I am not going to stand here to-night as a very strenuous advocate; I am not going to enter into very strong protestations against what has been done; but surely in this matter we may look at the facts of the case, and, if we do not quite agree about the facts of the case, well, we must agree to differ. But the result of the referendum is simply this—and the figures which the Postmaster-General has presented to this Chamber this afternoon prove it—that the weakest part of the colony is controlling the strongest part of it.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: Hear, hear!

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: We cannot get away from that. The majority is not in the strongest part of the colony—not as to population—

HON. J. DEANE: Take the colony as a whole.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: Not as to commerce, not as to wealth. It is in the weakest section of the colony as regards population, and the fact of the matter is that the bulk of the population of this colony has to submit to the comparatively smaller part of it in the North. That is the position. I did not want to say that if it had not been forced from me.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: Our necessity was their opportunity.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: And this is still going on, publicly and privately. It has been

even hinted at here this afternoon that those people who voted against federation lacked intelligence, or were blinded by prejudice, or were incapable of seeing far enough—that they are not on the same mental plane as those who advocated federation and voted for it. Well, that kind of compliment is rather strange, if you look at the real facts of the case, because the fact of the matter is that those people in this colony who voted against federation know exactly where they are. They know what the condition of the colony is. Many of them were here when the separation took place, to which the Hon. Mr. Box referred, and I believe that three-fourths of the people who were here at the time of separation voted against federation.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: How can you tell?

Hon. R. BULCOCK: Do you know one who did not?

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I believe that they, knowing where they were, knowing what had been done by the colony itself, recognising what the capabilities of the colony are, what the colony is still in a position to do for itself, voted with their eyes wide open, as far as the interests of the colony were concerned. Nobody can see—nobody has so keen a foresight as to see—exactly what will take place under federation.

HONOURABLE GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear!

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I am not going to predict pessimistic aspects of the coming federation. I said before, and I say again, I am going to make the best of it if it does come, and that is the duty of everybody.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: Hear, hear!

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: But I do know now where I am as a colonist here in Queensland, while I do not know where I shall be as a colonist of Queensland five years hence, supposing I am alive then.

Hon. J. DEANE: You will come North to a certainty, where the population will be.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I hope my hon. friend will give me credit for not going to say anything further with regard to the North or any other part of the colony. I have no wish to hurt anyone's feelings—much less to say anything that might be in the nature of an insult to anybody's views. I claim the right to express my own opinions, and to exercise my own privileges, and I give to everyone else the same right. I think I can stand here to-night, and say, without the slightest shadow of a misgiving, that I have never uttered or written a word to hurt anybody during the discussion of the question. But it has seemed to me sometimes rather anomalous that our fellow-colonists in the North, who seem to have such an objection to the South, and the influence of the Southern portion of the colony, should yet be willing to go nearly twice the distance south, and put themselves into the hands of somebody who has less sympathy, and less business relationship, and less internal intercourse with them. As to the Bill itself as a whole, it seems to be a weak surrender to the demands of a class without whose votes it could not have passed. I am not saying here something that has not been said before, because it was one of the prominent topics of platform advocates all through the agitation that it was the most democratic measure in the world. Yes, it is more democratic than the Canadian system of Parliament; it is more democratic than the system of the United States of America, and it has gone a long way in that direction. As a result of that sort of influence and feeling, it is becoming very much a political crime to be conservative.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: No.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: To be reasonable.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: It is becoming a political crime to have a respect—I think I have read it somewhere in the Commonwealth Bill itself—for the "peace, order, and good government" of one's country. It has been remarked here before—and there is no need to repeat it—but it does seem that at the present time one man one vote is a far more respectable gospel than "obey them that have the rule over you"; and we can hardly venture to say a word in Parliament, or out of it, that partakes of the nature of conservatism, or to wish to let good things remain as they were—to be content to let well alone—but we come in for abuse from somebody. Many men I know have taken down this Bill at one gulp as the basis of our nationhood, and we are told that we must accept it, not because any Parliament in Australia has adopted it, not because it has been considered in any Parliament of Australia clause by clause as a proper and suitable Constitution, but by certain picked representatives of those Parliaments it has been considered and adopted, and we are to take it on the recommendation and strength of their intellectual power and political experience. Well, there are some things about it which, as I have said before and say again, I am not prepared to accept. There are things in the Constitution Bill which, if we had proper time to consider it, and holding the views I do, I could not accept. For that reason I could not vote for the Bill in the earlier proceedings; I cannot vote for this Address to-night. I have asserted before that the qualification of members of both Houses is the same. I want to be put right if I am wrong, because that point has given me some trouble. I read the Bill to say that any man twenty-one years of age, either a voter or qualified to become a voter, and a resident of three years' standing in the colonies, can be elected even to the Senate. I do not see anything in clause 44, section 2, to prevent him, even if he is under conviction and liable to imprisonment for anything less than twelve months, from being elected a member of either House. It says he cannot be elected if convicted of treason or any crime which renders him liable to imprisonment for any greater term than twelve months. I think that provision is a serious blot upon the Constitution—that a man who misconducts himself, and comes within reach of the law, and is punished, can be elected to the legislature. He may have a sentence suspending over him; he may even be allowed out under an Offenders Probation Act, and yet there is nothing to prevent him from being elected to the Australian Senate. Then I made a reference at one time to the fact that our railway construction might be interfered with, and I was told that I misread the clause. Well, railway construction and control under clause 51, subsection 34, comes under the Commonwealth control, and that same clause 51 says, "trade and commerce with other countries" are among the matters that come under the control of the Commonwealth Parliament; but clause 97 says—"The power of the Parliament to make laws with respect to trade and commerce extends to navigation and shipping, and to railways the property of any State." If they have power, therefore, to control commerce and make laws regulating trade, and if the same power by which they make laws for trade and commerce and shipping and navigation extends to railways the property of any State, I go back to my old position that they can practically control all our railways when they see fit. I do not know what is to prevent them. There is another clause, I know, which says that no railways shall be made through any State without the consent of that State. That is, I take it, until the Commonwealth

Parliament has taken absolute and entire control of our railways. Now, those are a few points I wished to refer to. The amendment this afternoon was lost. I wished that there should be some qualification of this Address, and that was my reason for voting for the amendment. I should have said, if I had spoken to it, that last year, according to the Lands Department annual report, there were under cultivation in the Southern district 278,987 acres, in the Central district 5,798 acres, and in the Northern district 78,469 acres, and those figures put right some little misapprehension that seemed to exist upon that point. Now, the Hon. Mr. Gregory has said that he would place his vote on record even against this Address to Her Majesty in order that posterity might see that all the members of this Council were not in favour of this Bill. I make this speech for precisely the same object, but my position is this: Now that the Constitution Bill has been submitted to the country, and the majority is one which it is no use minimising or depreciating, we have to take the figures as they stand and as they come, and to get furious because we have been disappointed and cannot have what we want is very much like the misspent energy which a fanatic might use when whipping a dead horse. I do not see that there is much to be gained by it, and whilst I cannot vote for the Bill—I voted for the third reading of the Enabling Bill because it had been carried on the second reading, and it seemed to me that it would be useless keeping it back from the country—yet I will not vote for the Address. In any critical position I cannot well vote, but there is one thing I can do. I shall not vote against the majority on this federation question. I shall not vote at all, and that seems to me the proper position for me to take up in this matter. Before I sit down there is one point to which I may be excused for referring. The Address says—

That this Council agrees to the following Address to the Queen, praying for the establishment of the Commonwealth of Australia, and authorises the President to sign such Address on behalf of the Legislative Council and present it to His Excellency the Administrator of the Government for transmission to the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Our Standing Order No. 240 provides that—

Addresses to Her Majesty or any members of the Royal Family shall be transmitted to the Governor with a letter from the President, requesting His Excellency to cause the same to be forwarded for presentation.

The point I raise is that the Standing Order and the motion do not quite agree.

Question—[*Hon. Dr. Taylor's amendment*].—That the words proposed to be inserted be so inserted—put; and the Committee divided:—

CONTENTS, 9.

Hons. A. H. Barlow, B. D. Morehead, J. McMaster, R. Bulcock, A. C. Gregory, W. F. Taylor, J. Cowlishaw, A. Raff, and W. D. Box.

NOT-CONTENTS, 16.

Hons. W. H. Wilson, G. W. Gray, A. Norton, W. Allan, J. C. Heussler, F. H. Holberton, H. Mosman, A. Gibson, J. C. Smyth, J. Deane, A. J. Thynne, W. Aplin, J. Lalor, J. Ferguson, E. J. Stevens, and W. Forrest.

Resolved in the negative.

Original question—[*the Postmaster-General's motion*].—put; and the Council divided:—

CONTENTS, 16.

Hons. W. H. Wilson, G. W. Gray, E. J. Stevens, W. Forrest, W. Allan, A. Norton, W. Aplin, A. J. Thynne, H. Mosman, J. Deane, J. C. Smyth, A. Gibson, J. Lalor, J. Ferguson, J. C. Heussler, and F. H. Holberton.

NOT-CONTENTS, 9.

Hons. A. H. Barlow, A. C. Gregory, B. D. Morehead, W. F. Taylor, J. Cowlishaw, R. Bulcock, W. D. Box, A. Raff, and J. McMaster.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: We have just passed the Address to Her Majesty, and I now ask you to stand up and give three cheers for the Queen.

The Council rose and gave three hearty cheers for the Queen.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: And three cheers for federation!

This call was heartily responded to by the majority of the Council.

The Council adjourned at six minutes to 9 o'clock.